The University of Oklahoma

Graduate College

THE EMPIRICAL STATUS OF GENERAL STRAIN THEORY: RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSE TO STRAIN

A Doctoral Dissertation

Submitted To

The Graduate Faculty

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctorate of Philosophy

By

Nicholas S. Dean

Norman, Oklahoma

2004

THE EMPIRICAL STATUS OF GENERAL STRAIN THEORY: RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSE TO STRAIN

A Dissertation APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

By

Dr. Susan Sharp

Dr. Harold Grasmick

Dr. Craig St John

Dr. Kirby Gilliland

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank everyone who has helped me achieve my goal of earning the highest distinction among scholars in higher education. First of all, I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Susan Sharp, Dr. Harold Grasmick, Dr. Craig St John, Dr. Wil Scott, and Dr. Kirby Gilliland. Without Dr. Sharp's patience and tutelage, this would have never been possible. Thank you for sticking with me and supporting me, Dr. Sharp, as I struggled to find my way after losing my father. Dr. Grasmick, words can not describe the importance of the time I spent with you developing an understanding of Sociological thought and practice. Your insights will forever leave a lasting imprint on my career approach to Sociological thought, analysis, and research. I thank you for all the knowledge you have given me about the field. Dr. St. John, I would like to thank you for giving me a chance to be apart of the Department of Sociology. When I first applied to the department, my sociological skills were raw and uncut, but you were willing to take a chance on me. I hope in completing the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Philosophy in Sociology that I have made you proud of me. Dr. Wil Scott, when the walls seemed to be crumbling around me, when I didn't get into the Phd program in Philosophy, it was your support and guidance that eventual led to my full acceptance in the Ph.D. program in Sociology. Thank you for all your support. You were instrumental in helping me accomplish my goal of becoming an excellent scholar. Dr. Gilliland, your initial interest in me and my talents as an undergraduate psychology major sparked my interest in research.

The research projects that I was a part of under your direction taught me the finer points of research and exposed me to life as a professional scholar. My experiences with you were priceless. I may not have made it this far if it wasn't for the excitement and curiosity you engendered in me about research in the early 1990s. Thank you taking an interest in me and exposing me to the dynamics of psychological analysis and research.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my fellow graduate students with whom I worked on data collection for this project. Dr. Dennis Brewster, Dr. Sharon Redhawk Love, and Dr. Roy Barnett were all instrumental in helping me reach my goal, and for that I would like to thank them.

I would also like thank my family and friends who have provided support and love to me during this experience. I would like to especially thank my mother Sharon Dean for always pushing me to be the best that I can be. I would like to thank my brother Byron C. Dean for providing for me my first few years of college and pushing me to excel in my college work.

Lastly, and most importantly, I dedicate this dissertation to my father, Michael Byron Dean. Even though you are not here to see me accomplish this life long goal of ours, it was your love, guidance, tutelage, and support over the years that inspired me to go for it all. "Veem, I made it!" This one is for you.

Table of Contents

TITLE PAGE.....i
SIGNATURE PAGE.....ii
COPYRIGHT PAGE.....iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iv-v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....vi-vii
LIST OF TABLES.....viii-ix
ABSTRACT.....x
CHAPTER
I. Introduction.....1
II Review of the Literature.....1
1. Emile Durkhiem.....1
2. Robert Merton and Others.....6
3. Robert Agnew's GST.....12
4. Current Research Findings.....16
5. Race, Ethnicity, and Crime.....32
a. Theoretical Nexus..... 32
b. William Julius Wilson.....40
c. Elijah Anderson.....48
d. John Ogbu.....50
III. Methodology.....54

Data from Survey of undergraduate students.....54
Limitations of the Study..... 56
IV. Variables and Variable Creation 57

Demographic Variables.....57
Key Independent variables.....58
Mediating variables, Personal Resources.....64
Negative Emotional Response variables.....69
Dependent measures.....71

V. Data Analyses:.....75

Bi-variate Correlations.....76
Regression Analysis.....78

VI. Discussion.....94
Summary of the study.....94
Major Findings.....94
Theoretical Implications and Recommendations for Future Research.....104

Bibliography.....106
List of Tables.....111

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Demographic Variables....111
Table 2: Failure to Achieve Positively Valued Goals, means and standard Deviations....112
Table 3: Failure to Achieve Positively valued Goals, Component analysis....112
Table 4: Failure to Achieve Positively Valued goals, Factor loadings....112
Table 5: Loss of Positively Valued Stimuli, Negative Life events, means and standard deviations....113
Table 6: Presence of Negative Stimuli, Family Turmoil, means and standard deviations....114
Table 7: Presence of Negative Stimuli, Family Turmoil, Component Analysis....114
Table 8: Presence of Negative Stimuli, Family Turmoil, Factor loadings....114
Table 9: Parental Punitiveness, means and standard deviations....115
Table 10: Parental Punitiveness. Component Analysis....115
Table 11: Parental Punitiveness, Factor loadings....115
Table 12: Family Financial Strain, means and standard deviations....116
Table 13: Family Financial Strain, Component Analysis....116
Table 14: Family Financial Strain, Factor loadings....116
Table 15: Abuse, means and standard deviations....117
Table 16: Attractiveness, means and standard deviations....118
Table 17: Personal Resource Variables, Self Esteem and Mastery, means and standard deviations....119
Table 18: Self Esteem and Mastery, Component Analysis....119
Table 19: Self Esteem and Mastery, Factor loadings....120
Table 20: Social Support, means and standard deviations....121
Table 21: Social Support, Component Analysis....121
Table 22: Social Support, Factor loadings....121
Table 23: Negative Affect Variables, Anger, means and standard deviations....122
Table 24: Anger, Component Analysis....122
Table 25: Anger, Factor loadings....122
Table 26: Negative Affect Variables, Depression, means and standard deviations....123
Table 27: Dependent Variables, Delinquency/Crime, means and standard deviations....124
Table 28: Delinquency/Crime, Component Analysis....124
Table 29: Delinquency/Crime, Factor Loadings....125
Table 30: Drug Use, means and standard deviations....126
Table 31: Bivariate Correlations of Theoretical Variables....127
Table 32: Unstandardized Regression of Negative Affect Variables on Strain and Personal Resource Variables....128
Table 33: Unstandardized Regression of Delinquency/Crime on Strain and Negative Variables....129

Table 34: Unstandardized Regression of Delinquency/Crime on Strain, Negative Affect Variables, and Personal Resource Variables.....130
Table 35: Unstandardized Regression of Delinquency/Crime on Composite Strain, Negative affect, and Personal Resource Variables.....131
Table 36: Unstandardized Regression of Delinquency/Crime on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resource Variables, and Composite Strain by Self Esteem Interaction term.....132
Table 37: Unstandardized Regression of Delinquency/Crime on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resource Variables, and Composite Strain by Mastery Interaction term.....133
Table 38: Unstandardized Regression of Delinquency/Crime on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resource Variables, and Composite Strain by Convetional Social Support Interaction term.....134
Table 39: Unstandardized Regression of Marijuana Use on Strain and Negative Affect Variables.....135
Table 40: Unstandardized Regression of Marijuana Use on Strain, Negative Affect, and Personal Resource Variables.....136
Table 41: Unstandardized Regression of Marijuana Use on Composite Strain, Negative affect, and Personal Resource Variables.....137
Table 42: Unstandardized Regression of Marijuana Use on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resource Variables, and Composite Strain by Self Esteem Interaction term.....138
Table 43: Unstandardized Regression of Marijuana Use on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resource Variables, and Composite Strain by Mastery Interaction term.....139
Table 44: Unstandardized Regression of Marijuana Use on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resource Variables, and Composite Strain by Conventional Social Support Interaction term.....140

ABSTRACT

Agnew (1992) argued that interpersonal strain predisposes the individual toward corrective action, which may include involvement in delinquency/crime or drug use. He also states that it may be the case that different types of strain are relevant to different subgroups in this process (Agnew, 1992). This research examined this supposition where subgroups were defined by race. The results of this study are consistent with the view offered by strain theory (Agnew, 1992). General Strain Theory predicts that interpersonal strain will affect individual adaptations to the social environment (Agnew, 1992). The adaptation chosen is said to be conditioned by such variables as personal resources and emotional response. The current research examined these predictions when the data were disaggregated by race, and the findings tend to support the theory across groups. Interestingly, there were significant differences between groups on selected theoretical variables indicating that different types of strain and the role of the personal resources significantly differ in their association with negative affective states, delinquency/crime, and drug use for the groups.

Chapter One

The Empirical Status of General Strain Theory: Racial Differences in Response to Strain

Introduction: Statement of the Problem

The aim of the present research is to investigate racial differences in response to strain consistent with the theoretical and empirical implications drawn from Robert Agnew's General Strain Theory (1992). This work is an important contribution to the literature regarding this issue for two major reasons. First, although there have been empirical tests of Agnew's General Strain Theory, very few have fully tested the theory making use of Agnew's complete causal model (including the mediating effects of negative affective states on dependent measures) which will be done here. Second, the present study will incorporate racial differences in response to strain, paying particular attention to the interaction between racial categories on strain induced outcomes. The thorough tests of the implications of the theory in explaining self-reported deviant and criminal behavior will not only add to the existing literature purporting to explain crime and deviance in general, but will also expand specific bodies of literature concerning racial differences in response to frustrating and often stressful social environments.

The Role of Strain in Deviance

Background: Durkheim

Emile Durkheim was the first theorist to discuss strain as an explanation for involvement in crime and delinquency. In Durkheim's first major work, *The Division of Labor* (1893[1947]), his primary focus was on the causes, characteristics, and functions of the division of labor in modern societies. According to Durkheim's

analysis, the division of labor serves the function of producing social solidarity in society (Turner et al., 1998). In a general sense, Durkheim's analysis examined patterns of social organization in complex industrial societies, specifically focusing on the role of the division of labor as a major organizing principle.

According to the analysis, patterns of social solidarity change as society evolves from a simple undifferentiated profile to a more differentiated, complex profiles (Turner et al., 1998). Specifically, changes in the division of labor in society influence changes in people's attachment to one another. Additionally, social structural alterations change the influence of culture on the normative regulation of individual passions and desires. The emphasis on the effects of social change on society and social solidarity occupied a central role in Durkheim's analysis of social organization. Durkheim argued that social change in society upsets traditional bonds of attachment among the people of a society and decreases the role of culture in shaping individual thoughts and behaviors. Therefore, forms of social organization that evolve as society changes over time influence normal or pathological conditions that emerge in society. It is at this point that Durkheim introduced the term "anomie" to describe the character of modern society.

Anomie was defined in *The Division of Labor* (1893[1947]) as, "the break down of social order as a result of the loss of standards and values" (Turner et al., 1998, pg. 259). Anomie was seen as stemming from insufficient social integration of the individual into the societal unit. Importantly, anomie was viewed as most likely to occur during periods of rapid social change due to the evolution of complex social structures in society that alter traditional bonds of social attachment among a

population. Durkheim introduced the terms "mechanical" and "organic solidarity" to describe the characteristics of society to better differentiate the role of social organization in shaping social bonds and normative regulation.

Mechanical solidarity typified the social bonds that are shaped by a strong culture that regulates the thoughts and actions of individuals. In societies typified by mechanical solidarity, the size of the society is small, the relationships among people are kinship based, the people are independent and autonomous, and the society is held together by punitive law (Turner et al., 1998). In contrast, societies typified by organic solidarity are characterized by large populations, the relationships among people are dominated by economic and governmental content, the people are arranged in a social structure in interrelated and mutually interdependent structures, and the society is held together by relations of exchange, social contracts, norms, and restitutive law (Turner et al.,. 1998). Durkheim stressed that the nature of societies characterized by organic solidarity make it highly likely that the occupants will experience anomie. Because of high levels of structural differentiation and value generalization in large, dense populations of modern society, there is a tendency for the social order to break down with a concomitant loss of values and standards. This predisposes members of the population to "pathological" rather than "normal" adaptations to the social conditions of society or makes it highly likely that personal dispositions will be characterized by feelings of anomie or normlessness.

In another major work entitled, *Suicide*, Durkheim (1951) further specified the nature of anomie in complex, highly differentiated societies. In *The Division of Labor* (1893[1947]), anomie was defined as insufficient social integration of the

individual into the social fabric (the break down of social order as a result of the loss of standards and values). Writings in *Suicide* (1897:1951) further specified the types of integration indicative of normal or pathological social integration.

According to Durkheim (1897:1951), there are two types of integration: attachment and regulation. Attachment refers to a bond to social groups and their goals. It involves maintenance of interpersonal ties and the perception that one is part of a large collectivity. Regulation refers to psychological and behavioral regulation of individual passions and desires that is mediated by the culture of social groupings. Regulation limits individual aspirations and needs, keeping them in check. Normal and pathological adaptations to social environments are dependent upon the degree of attachment and normative regulation that occurs in society. According to the arguments presented in *Suicide* (1897[1951]), lenient or excessive attachment to others predisposes the occupants of the society to high rates of suicide (egoistic suicide/altruistic suicide). Likewise, lenient and excessive regulation of individual passions and desires by the culture of certain societies predisposes the society to higher rates of suicide among the population (anomic suicide/fatalistic suicide). Here, the character of anomie was clearly specified; anomie or anomic suicide was viewed as the result of deregulation of individual desires and passions or seen as springing from society's insufficient presence in individuals (Turner et al., 1998). Durkheim further specified that anomie is most likely to occur in societies where factors associated with social integration of the individual are shaped by features of organic solidarity.

Durkheim's analysis of suicide is very important in terms of understanding deviance in society. According to his analysis, deviance is caused by the same factors that maintain conformity in social systems. The degree of attachment to others and normative regulation in social systems both impact conformity and deviance in society. Insufficient attachment and normative regulation cause varying forms and rates of deviance. The more a social system reveals moderate degrees of attachment and regulation, the less likely are pathological rates of deviance and the greater the social integration of individuals into the social system.

Durkheim's work on suicide was much more than just an explanation of suicide rates. It was also a theoretical commentary on cultural and structural sources of deviance in society (Turner et al., 1998). Maladaptive social integration of individuals into the social system due to poor regulation of passions and desires and poor attachment to the collective goals and purposes of social groups cause an imbalance in the societal environment. This imbalance in turn predisposes members of the population to egoism (detachment) or anomie (deregulation), which are likely to lead to elevated levels of deviance and by extension, suicide. Durkheim specifically theorized that these occurrences were more likely to occur with increased changes in society through social differentiation and value generalization typical of societies characterized by organic solidarity.

During the period of time of Durkheim's writings, most theorists were focused on characteristics of individuals in their search for causes of deviance in society. Durkheim was one of the first to suggest that the broader social context and issues of social organization were important in understanding the nature of society and rates of

deviance. Such an insight was revolutionary for Durkheim's time, and it has informed contemporary theorizing on deviance and crime in social systems (Turner et al., 1998).

Strain / Anomie Theory

Robert Merton (1938) picked up on the idea of anomie developed by Durkheim but used it to refer to a different aspect of social life. In his (1938) article titled, "Social Structure and Anomie," Merton argued that anomie/strain is derived from the disjuncture between society's prescribed goals and means for accomplishing those goals. According to Merton, society teaches its members that economic success should be highly valued by all. At the same time, society does not provide equal access to the culturally prescribed means that people should follow to reach the goal of economic success. Therefore, some people find themselves in a position in society where they highly value the societal goal of economic success but face blocked opportunities toward achieving this goal. This situation is Merton's conception of anomie which is commonly referred to as strain. The social structure promotes the accomplishment of economic goals but does not provide the means to everyone to achieve the goal.

One of the implications of Merton's form of theorizing is that crime should be most prevalent in those groups that have the highest probability of facing the disjuncture between goals and opportunities to fulfill the goal. According to the theory, lower class individuals are more likely to be affected because they have the most ground to cover in trying to accomplish the goal of material success. It is this group that is most likely to face blocked opportunities to achieve the socially prescribed goal of

economic success, which makes it more likely that that they will turn to illegitimate means to reach their economic goals. Because of the social and environmental conditions of life for members of the lower class, illegitimate opportunity structures are ever present. When faced with limited legitimate structural opportunities for economic advancement, members of the lower social classes may turn to the illegitimate opportunity structures within their social environment to achieve material success. Specifically, lower class members are theorized to respond to their handicapped position by turning to property crime to fulfill economic aspirations that are hindered by the opportunity structure of society. Thus, lower-class adaptations to the anomic character of their lives produce a tendency to economically advance themselves through illegitimate psychological and behavioral orientations, particularly, property crimes.

Merton (1938) notes that innovation, the tendency toward illegitimate orientations to achieve material success, is only one of four possible adaptations that individuals may make when faced with the disjuncture between socially prescribed goals and legitimate opportunities for material success. It is in this particular adaptive orientation to anomic situations that crime and deviance centered on property crime emerges.

Merton's theory has been criticized on the grounds that it depends heavily on the goal of material success as a means of explaining the nature of strain and its connection to crime. Many have argued that material success may be a distant goal of youth that may not produce high levels of strain because it depends on expectations about the future (Cohen 1955; Cloward and Ohlin 1960). Suggestions include

looking at more immediate goals and aspirations of youth as a means of explaining strain. Areas like status, popularity, attractiveness to the opposite sex, and fitting in with one's peers are seen as more predictive of strain by youth, given their social structural positions and likelihood of focus on more immediate goals than distant goals.

Albert Cohen (1955) introduced a variation of strain theory that utilized more proximate causes of strain. Cohen's theory focused on the development of delinquent subcultures among youth. According to the theory, youths that experience stress and frustration from status deprivations found in the context of school environments may react by taking on values in opposition to those found in the school environment. Status deprivation and the associated feelings stem from "problems of adjustment" faced by lower class youth when confronted with middle-class standards of success. The youths form delinquent subcultures in response to the problem by rejecting middle class values and turning to delinquent values as a means of status attainment. This is not the only response of youth facing status deprivation and problems of adjustment, but it is more likely to be used by lower class boys in school environments where social status is measured by a "middle class measuring rod." Thus, delinquent cultures arise out of the common reaction of some lower class youth to the problem of adjustment to middle-class standards of status found in school environments.

Cohen's theory can be summarized as follows: All youths desire status from their peers and from the adults with whom they come in contact. Status in school is distributed to youths on the basis of ascribed characteristics (the social class position

of their parents) and achieved characteristics (the middle-class measuring rod). All youth are aware of these criteria for gaining status and are aware of the approximate locations of themselves and other youths in these status hierarchies. Youths with little status feel deprived and injured by their low status position and are more likely to encounter problems of adjustment. In the context of schooling, lower-class youth tend to have lower levels of status attainment (both ascribed and achieved) than other youths. This makes the problem of adjustment more typical of lower-class youth than others. Delinquent subcultures originate among low class youth who have neither ascribed nor achieved status in school environments. Youths in the subculture express ambivalence toward conventional values, particularly the established criteria for obtaining status found in school contexts. Specifically, these youth express support for delinquent values and rejection of conventional values when in the presence of other subculture members, but they may express support for conventional values and rejection of delinquent values when isolated from other sub-cultural group members. Thus, Cohen's theory expresses the importance of more immediate goals of youth in society that may be more important in producing stress and strain and delinquent subcultures than Merton's conceptualization.

Cohen (1955) also notes that not all youth that experience status deprivation turn to the delinquent subculture for status and respect. According to Cohen (1955), there may be non-delinquent responses to status deprivation among youth who take the role of "Corner Boys" and "College Boys" (Cohen 1955). The "stable corner boy" tends to accept his low class position and does not get involved in delinquency as a means of gaining status or respect. For the corner boy, there is no gap between aspirations

and expectations because he accepts his position in life. Without the strain and frustrations derived from the disjuncture between aspirations and expectations due to the acceptance of their lot in life, they are less likely to commit delinquency or become members of the delinquent sub-culture. The "college boy" who does not participate in the delinquent sub-culture has managed to live up to the middle-class measuring rod and has gained status in conventional society despite the lack of status he may have experienced in previous school contexts.

The pioneering work of Richard Cloward and Lloyd Ohlin (1960) has also added important theoretical contributions to the strain literature. In their book entitled, *Delinquency and Opportunity: Theory of Delinquent Gangs*, the authors described three forms of delinquency that result from a disjuncture between one's aspirations and expectations for social achievement and economic status or simply from blocked opportunities for achievement. Activities among juvenile gangs in which status is awarded include: 1) the commission of profit making, utilitarian crimes, 2) skill in using violence, and 3) using illegal drugs. Within the theory, attention is given to the presence of delinquent subcultures that tend to form when there is a gap between the youths' aspirations and expectations or when frustrations arise based on blocked opportunities to fulfill aspirations. The authors suggested that the types of response to blocked opportunities/strain result from not only differential access to legitimate opportunity structures but also differential access to illegitimate opportunity structures. Sub-cultural delinquents are seen as those that aspire to money and find themselves in relatively stable lower class neighborhoods organized around stable adult criminal patterns. Violence-oriented youth are a product of frustrations

stemming from blocked opportunities who find themselves located in environments where the neighborhood is unstable and lower class in nature. Their neighborhoods lack stable adult criminal activity and are generally characterized by an absence of both legitimate and illegitimate opportunities for material success. In this type of environment, violence is a means of gaining status since material success is viewed as out of reach. The drug-using delinquent subculture (retreatists) that arises is composed of those youths that are "double failures." They are characterized by an absence of both legitimate opportunities in the dominant culture and illegitimate opportunities in the criminal or violent subcultures. They turn to extensive drug use with other youth who are in a similar structural position as themselves.

According to the theory, youths that experience a gap between their aspirations and expectations about money become sub-cultural delinquents only in the presence of illegitimate opportunities available in areas with stable adult criminal patterns. In areas of this character, it is noted that some youth may attribute the gap to personal shortcomings and engage in individual adaptations that might include delinquency but not participation in the delinquent subculture. Other youths may blame society for the gap and feel a sense of injustice and perceive the discrepancy as a result of society's differential distribution of legitimate opportunities to earn money. These youth are more likely to withdraw from society and form delinquent subcultures with new status criteria. Thus, the theory is one that explains the origin of delinquent subcultures as a response to the gap between aspirations and expectations for monetary success. The theory also notes that not all members of the subculture have experienced the gap between expectation and aspirations, and among those that

experience the gap the responses may vary (violence/conflict orientation or retreatism). Therefore, the theory is well-suited to address questions of how delinquent subcultures arise, how they develop law-violating ways of life, and how subcultures persist and change over time. It also illuminates important conditional variables in the relationship between strain and delinquency, namely the role of the availability of illegitimate opportunity structures in the production of delinquent subcultures and patterns of delinquency.

Building on the theoretical foundations of Durkheim, Merton, Cohen, and Cloward and Ohlin, Robert Agnew (1992) developed "General Strain Theory" to extend the narrow conceptualizations of both Durkheim and Merton to explain the role of strain in crime and deviance. Specifically, Agnew addresses and attempts to overcome previous criticisms that have been leveled against Merton's theoretical analysis of the relationship between social structure and anomie. Agnew's General Strain Theory extends Merton's theory by adding additional sources of strain, specifying conditions under which strain leads to crime and delinquency, explaining the predisposition of some individuals toward crime, looking at constraints to delinquent and non-delinquent coping, and outlining the characteristics that inhibit effective coping. Sufficient attention is also given to coping strategies that are most often employed to deal with strain.

Agnew's General Strain Theory posits three sources of strain: 1) failure to achieve positively-valued goals, 2) the removal of positively-valued stimuli, and 3) the presentation of negative or noxious stimuli (Agnew 1992). The failure to achieve positively-valued goals is further broken into three categories: a) the disjuncture

between aspirations and expectations, b) the disjuncture between expectations and actual achievements, and c) strain produced from the attribution of just and fair outcomes. Furthermore, strain is linked to crime and deviance through its relationship with negative affective states (Agnew 1992). Most notable in the work of Agnew is the affective state of anger. According to Agnew's theoretical argument, strain is most likely to lead to crime and deviance when anger is present in the individual.

Factors that affect whether strain leads to violent crime or property crime are dependent upon the type of strain experienced. When there is a failure to achieve positively-valued goals or a disjuncture between a person's aspiration and expectations, Agnew (1992) notes that psychological literature suggests that strain is only weakly related to anger and crime. The major issue highlighted with respect to this finding suggests that aspirations are "ideal states" that people don't expect to accomplish. Thus, the individual's own subjective acknowledgement of the lack of correspondence between the aspiration and expectation makes it less likely that he or she will respond to the disjuncture with anger and criminal or deviant adaptations. Agnew (1992) states that the disjuncture between expectations and actual achievements yields a drastically different picture of failure to achieve in the evolution of angry temperaments and crime and deviance. When a disjuncture between expectations and actual achievements exists, individuals may respond with a wide range of behaviors including violent or property crime. The argument here is that expectations are derived through interactions with people of similar social type and through social comparison. Because expectations are derived through association with others, the accomplishment of the goals has a basis in reality and is seen as

possible. Thus, when one's expectations and achievements are not consistent, one may attribute injustice or differential treatment as the source of the failure and may adapt to the situation in ways that may produce the tendency to crimes against persons or property. In such situations, individuals may seek to prevent the loss through revenge against those that are attributed blame for the failure. They may respond by lashing out in the form of vandalism and theft, or they may withdraw from conventional society and activities and commit victimless crimes against themselves like alcohol and drug abuse. Therefore, the first type of strain may produce abnormal adaptations when the individual's expectations and actual accomplishments differ. Additionally, Agnew (1992) notes delinquency/crime is also highly likely when individuals feels as though they are not receiving just and fair outcomes based on their social inputs. They may respond to such situations by increasing their inputs or efforts, decreasing the outputs of others through crime and deviance, or by seeking revenge against those attributed responsibility for their failing.

With the second type of strain, the loss of positively-valued stimuli, the individual may try to prevent the loss of the stimuli, seek revenge against those who are responsible for the loss, or withdraw from conventional society and activities. Each response has the potential of producing violence, property crime, or vandalism. The last form of strain, the presentation of negative or noxious stimuli, typically results in escape or avoidance behavior, or again, the individual may seek revenge against those that are attributed responsibility for the presentation of the negative or noxious stimuli.

In his theoretical description of General Strain Theory, Agnew (1992) also indicated that there are some intervening processes that must be taken into account in order to fully understand the conditions under which strain leads to crime and analogous behaviors or other more acceptable orientations. Specifically, factors associated with an individual's coping mechanisms, constraints associated with delinquent and non-delinquent coping, certain dispositional characteristics of the individual (affective states), and the recency, duration, and clustering of stressful life events all influence pathological social and behavioral outcomes. Particularly, strain is more likely to result in criminogenic responses when an individual's coping mechanisms are taxed.

Emotional coping, behavioral coping, and social coping mechanisms may counteract the influence of strain on the occurrence of criminal adaptations only to the extent that they are available to the individual. When these mechanisms are either unavailable or severely limited, criminal or delinquent responses to the strain become more likely.

Dispositional factors are also theorized as important intervening factors in understanding the nature of one's response to strain with criminal or non-criminal responses because of the role of negative affective states and their relationship to behavioral responses. Individual level variables such as temperament, prior criminal or delinquent behavior, and patterns of social learning conducive to crime (delinquent associations) all affect types of responses to stressful life events. Specifically, angry temperaments, prior criminality, and criminal or delinquent associations increase the

likelihood that individuals will respond to strain with aberrant social behaviors, especially crime.

Finally, variables associated with magnitude, temporal recency, duration, and clustering of stressful events influence response type (Agnew 1992). In situations where the magnitude of strain is high, the strain is more recent than distal, the experience of strain is chronic, or there is a clustering of stressful life events, individuals will often adapt to strain irrespective of its source with criminal or delinquent behaviors rather than using non-delinquent coping strategies to deal with the socially induced stressful life events.

Tests of General Strain Theory have produced mixed results. This has been mainly because most models purporting to test the theory have been incomplete models that have only provided partial support at best. Agnew has been at the forefront of testing the theory. Agnew (1992) has found that negative relations with parents and teachers and dissatisfaction with school each are positively related to adolescent feelings of anger, which in turn are positively related to three forms of delinquent behavior: serious delinquency, aggression, school deviance (Agnew 1985). In another study using longitudinal data, Agnew (1989) found a relationship between these variables and subsequent delinquency, further supporting key features of his model.

Agnew and White (1992) conducted a more comprehensive empirical test of General Strain Theory using data that accurately captured most of the main contentions of the theory. In an article entitled, "An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory," Agnew and White (1992) examined the impact of strain on delinquency that

is conditioned by several variables specified by the theory. Variables associated with social control, differential association, self-efficacy, delinquent friends, and interaction terms were used to test the validity of the theory. Their findings revealed that five of the strain measures had a significant effect on delinquency and drug use. Negative life events and life hassles were the most important strain variables. Also significant were measures dealing with parental fighting, negative relations with adults (delinquency only), and neighborhood problems (drug use only). These results supported General Strain Theory. A summary measure of strain was subsequently created from the strain items and also found to be significant for delinquency and drug use. The authors also looked at the relationship between the interaction of the summary measure of strain on delinquent friends and self-efficacy. Results suggested that strain produces delinquency and drug use when the number of delinquent friends is high. Strain produces delinquency but not drug use when self- efficacy is low. All findings were significant at either the $p<.05$ or $p<.01$ level. Thus, the findings generally supported General Strain Theory as a valid theoretical explanation of crime. The findings continued to be consistent even when controlling for social control and differential association variables.

In 1994, Raymond Paternoster and Paul Mazerolle conducted a comprehensive test of General Strain Theory using cross-sectional and longitudinal data. The authors tested the theory using several sources of strain, some consistent with Agnew and White (1992). These included measures tapping magnitude and duration of strain, and coping mechanisms to manage or cope with strain. Other variables were also developed to test the interaction of strain with selected variables (self-efficacy,

delinquent peers, low self-control, social support, and moral inhibitions). Findings indicated that four of the five strain measures in the analysis were significantly related to delinquency in the expected direction (neighborhood problems, negative life events, school/peer hassles, and negative relations with adults). Thus, these initial findings supported Agnew's GST. Additionally, the authors found that conventional moral beliefs and good grades in school inhibited delinquent involvement, whereas delinquent peers significantly contributed to delinquency.

The authors also examined some of the effects of strain on delinquency under particular conditions. Agnew (1992) states that the duration of strain and effective coping mechanisms may affect both delinquent and non-delinquent outcomes. The longer the duration of strain, the more likely one will respond to the strain with delinquency. Effective means of dealing with strain decrease its importance (Agnew 1992). The authors assess these theoretical positions and find that neither the duration nor the importance of strain affected its impact on delinquency. The authors also tested the contention that there are constraints to delinquent and non-delinquent coping. In this instance, support for the theory entailed a significant interaction between the indicators of strain and each of the relevant conditional variables. Findings indicated that the effects of the strain scale on delinquency were both positive and significant. The interaction of the strain scale with delinquent peers, moral beliefs, delinquent dispositions, self-efficacy, and conventional social support revealed that only one was significantly related to delinquency. Strain and self-efficacy were significantly related but in the opposite direction predicted. Strain appeared to have a pronounced effect on delinquency at higher levels of self-efficacy.

Agnew suggested that for individuals that are high in self efficacy, strain would be responded to with non-delinquent coping strategies, because they are likely to perceive themselves capable and empowered (Paternoster and Mazerolle 1994). Therefore, strain does not have a less pronounced effect among those with constraints to delinquent coping (strong moral beliefs, high self-efficacy, and conventional social support). Nor does it have a more substantial effect for those youths whose delinquent coping strategies are more abundant (delinquent peers, delinquent disposition). Lastly, the authors examined the relationship of strain with social control and delinquent peers. Agnew (1992) states that strain weakens individuals' social bonds to conventional people and institutions and strengthens the bond with unconventional ones. Thus, strain should weaken conventional social control and increase ties to delinquent others. The findings with respect to these contentions of the theory confirmed Agnew's hypothesized relationship. Strain weakens ties to conventional social control and strengthens ties to delinquent peers. Thus, the findings of Paternoster and Mazerolle (1994) provided partial support of GST. Measures of exposure to negative stimuli were significantly related to delinquency, and general strain led to delinquent involvement by weakening the conventional social bonds and strengthening the bond to delinquent peers.

In an article by Lisa Broidy (2001) titled, "A Test of General Strain Theory", the author tested General Strain Theory, including measures of anger and other emotions as well as a measure of legitimate coping. Her study tested the main contentions of GST: a) each of the three types of strain are associated with anger and other negative emotions; b) anger and other negative emotional responses to strain are each

associated with the use of legitimate coping; and c) controlling for the use of legitimate coping, strain-induced anger will increase the likelihood of illegitimate outcomes, whereas other negative emotional responses will not. Results with respect to the first hypothesis were mixed. The effect of strain on negative emotions other than anger were constrained to the positive effect of strain (presentation of negative stimuli and removal of positive stimuli) on other negative emotions. Blocked goals, unfair outcomes, and stressful life events were significantly related to anger, with the exception that strain induced by failure to reach one's goal had an opposite effect on anger. A lack of success at reaching one's goals appeared to reduce the likelihood that individuals would respond to strain with anger. In this model, it is clear that the nature of the relationship between strain and delinquency depends on the nature of the strain and the type of emotional response considered. Also noted was a significant positive correlation between sex and other emotions. Strain-induced anger was equally likely among males and females, but other negative emotional responses to strain (particularly depression) were more likely among females. These findings tended to support the idea that strain-induced negative affective states may be shaped by both the type of strain and gender.

With respect to the second hypothesis, that anger and other emotions are associated with legitimate coping strategies, results indicated that non-angry negative emotions were significantly associated with legitimate coping. However, contrary to the hypothesis, the relationship between strain-induced anger and legitimate coping was not significant. Hypothesis three was partially supported. Strain induced anger increased the likelihood of illegitimate outcomes when controlling for legitimate

coping, whereas other negative emotional responses did not. Anger significantly increased the likelihood of illegitimate outcomes. However, the significant negative relationship between other negative emotions and illegitimate coping were inconsistent with the theory. Individuals who responded to strain with negative emotions other than anger were significantly less likely to adopt illegitimate coping strategies. Although Agnew stated that responding with other emotions was unlikely to trigger illegitimate coping, there was no explicit mention that other emotions will decrease the likelihood of illegitimate outcomes.

Finally, the author noted the role of gender. Gender remained a significant predictor of criminal outcomes, controlling for strain theory variables (Broidy 2001). Females were significantly more likely to respond to strain with non-angry emotions and were significantly more likely to employ legitimate coping strategies, whereas males were significantly more likely to engage in delinquency as a consequence of strain-induced anger. This leads to the assumption that the strain/crime relationship may be more complex than general strain theory suggests.

Other research has indicated that there are few important gender differences in the impact of stressful life events on delinquency and drug use among males and females (Hoffman and Su 1997). The authors focused exclusively on sex-differentiated responses to stress, based on substantial theoretical and empirical research that has demonstrated that female and male adolescents react differently to stressful life events. Specifically, the research focused on the findings that females were more tied to the interpersonal model of development and that males were tied to individualistic models of development. These theories assert that distinct patterns of socialization

occur for males and females. Females tend to rely on expressive interpersonal relationships and have a greater need for affection, whereas males tend to be more concerned with individuality and the instrumental nature of social relationships. Thus, in their predictive model stressful life events would have greater effect both directly and indirectly through conventional attachment for male delinquency and drug use. However, the researchers found no such differences in their research. Both males and females responded similarly to stressful life events with delinquency and drug use (Hoffman and Su 1997).

Similar findings were also generated in the research of Paul Mazerolle (1998). The author investigated potential differences between males and females to assess whether significant differences existed across groups. In assessing the mean level differences of selected variables across gender groups, there were important differences in measures of constraints against delinquency (moral beliefs) and in measures that were expected to increase the likelihood of delinquent responses (delinquent disposition). Females had significantly higher levels of moral beliefs and better school grades than males. Males had stronger delinquent dispositions, more delinquent peer affiliations, and higher levels of negative relations with adults. Finally, males participated in delinquency significantly more than females. These results were seen as important conditional factors in the relationship between strain and delinquency. These findings were also consistent with other research revealing that ties to school were important insulators against delinquency for females (constraint against delinquency) and that family turmoil predicted personal crime more than property crime among males (Mazerolle 1998).

Cross-sectional results comparing predictors of delinquency across gender groups indicated that the predictors were both similar and different across groups. For females, negative life events and negative relations with adults predicted delinquent activity (Mazerolle 1998). For males, neighborhood problems and negative relations with adults were related to delinquency. Thus, similarity existed with respect to negative relations with adults across groups, but differences existed with respect to negative life events and neighborhood problems. These results illuminate the differential effects of various types of strain across gender groups. Other significant predictors in the model were the relationship between delinquent activities and both moral beliefs and exposure to delinquent peers, regardless of gender. Age and grades in school were related inversely to delinquency for females and for males. Having a delinquent disposition predicted delinquent activity (Mazerolle 1998). These models and results were seen as informative by the author, but it is stated that they only present the relationships between delinquent activity and various independent variables within gender groups. Mazerolle (1998) stated that to understand gender differences one must not stop at looking at within group differences but must also evaluate across group differences.

In evaluating the across group differences, there were few differences between males and females. No differences were found when measures of strain were compared across groups, and the other measures in the model revealed only one significant difference between males and females, namely grades in school. Grades insulated delinquency for females but were not significantly related to delinquency for males. Delinquent disposition did differ across genders but at lower levels of

significance ($p<.10$). Therefore, at a general level, the results tended to support previous research revealing that males and females experience similar levels of stress and strain yet may differ in coping responses or factors affecting the likelihood of delinquent activity.

Longitudinal results revealed similar findings (Mazerolle 1998). Few of the strain predictors were related to wave 2 delinquency across the groups, and no significant strain predictors overlapped for males and females. For males, noxious life events were associated with greater delinquent activity, and noxious relations with adults increased delinquency for females. Relationships between other measures revealed that weak moral beliefs, exposure to delinquent peers, and prior delinquency increased delinquent activity regardless of gender (Mazerolle 1998). Compared to the cross-sectional analysis, the longitudinal model revealed that grades were inversely related to delinquency for males but not for females. Particularly interesting was the finding that prior delinquency predicted future delinquency much more strongly for females. This seemed to point to the idea that different processes may be at work for males and females. Also, after constructing a composite scale for the strain variables, the results revealed that the composite increased delinquent activity for both males and females while controlling for other variables. Comparison of the coefficients across gender revealed only a marginal difference across groups, at lower levels of significance. Finally, in looking at the effects of strain across gender by crime type, the author found no differences in the strain predictors of property delinquency across genders and one difference for the effect of exposure to delinquent peers. Delinquent peer exposure was predictive of property delinquency for both males and females but

was significantly more pronounced for males (Mazerolle 1998). For the strain predictors of violence, the results revealed some important differences. Negative life events and noxious relations with adults exhibited different effects across gender groups in predicting violent delinquency. Exposure to negative influences predicted future violence for males but not for females.

In sum, Mazerolle (1998) found some gender differences in the strain-related predictors of delinquency but the differences were not significant. Noxious relations with adults predicted delinquency for females but not males, but this was not a significant difference. The measure for negative life events predicted delinquency for males and not for females, but again this was not significant.

Results from the crime-specific analysis revealed minimal gender differences in the effects of strain. With violent behavior, gender differences were found in the effects of strain on subsequent violence. Negative life events and negative relations with adults were predictive of delinquency for males but not females. The findings, therefore, indicated different effects of strain and coping across genders. The results also revealed that the groups differed in aspects of their anger and outcomes of their anger. Females were more likely to internalize their anger where males were more likely to externalize the anger. So, even though there were more similarities than differences in responses to strain across genders, those areas of difference that exist provide fertile ground for further research in this area of study with respect to strain theoretical explanations of delinquency.

Timothy Brezina (1996), in analyzing the role of strain on delinquency, examined other aspects of the relationship not specifically focusing on gender differences.

Brezina (1996) explored the ways that delinquency may enable adolescents to cope with strain. According to General Strain Theory, delinquent behavior is a coping mechanism used by adolescents to deal with emotional problems generated by negative social relationships with others. Brezina (1996) examined how delinquency was used by adolescents to cope with negative relations with others. Research conducted on the cross-sectional effects of strain on coping responses revealed that strain was positively associated with affective emotional states (anger, resentment, anxiety, and depression). When an interaction term of strain and delinquency was added to the model, the interaction term had a small but significant effect on the four affective states. Consistent with the hypothesized relationship between strain, delinquency, and negative affect, delinquent behaviors reduced the effects of strain on negative affect. Therefore, adolescents that responded to strain with delinquency were less likely to experience negative emotional consequences of strain. He also noted that strain had a greater effect on negative affect, particularly anger, when delinquency was low than when delinquency was high. Thus, there is clear evidence that delinquency reduces the effect of strain on negative affect even though it does not eliminate the emotional consequences of strain. In a longitudinal analysis, Brezina (1996) found similar patterns in the data. Specifically, one would expect Time 2 delinquency to reduce the impact of Time 2 strain on Time 3 anger if delinquency was a coping mechanism used by adolescents. Results of the longitudinal model confirmed this relationship. As participation in delinquent behavior increased, the effect of Time 2 strain on Time 3 anger decreased. These findings support the

contention of Agnew that delinquency is a coping mechanism used by adolescents to counteract the effect of strain on negative affective emotional states.

More recent research by Brezina (1998) has looked at the relative role of adolescent maltreatment and delinquency. Theoretically, according to GST, stressful life events cause negative affective states which in turn increase the probability of delinquent responses. Brezina (1998) tests the contention that maltreatment produces delinquency because it affects social control, factors associated with social learning, and the generation of negative affective states. Results of the study revealed that adolescent maltreatment creates conditions that free individuals to become involved in deviance, a finding consistent with social control theory. Maltreatment reduced parental attachment and commitment to school. These things in turn increased the probability of delinquent behavior. Maltreatment was also found to be strongly associated with adherence to deviant beliefs. Adolescent maltreatment served as a learned model of aggressive behavior. It increases the likelihood that deviance will be seen as an acceptable response to strain precipitated by maltreatment. Consistent with GST, Brezina also found that maltreatment was significantly related to anger which in turn affected delinquency. Thus, adolescent maltreatment gives rise to delinquency because it tends to reduce social control, foster deviant socialization, and generate anger.

Agnew and Brezina (1999) expanded the notion of maltreatment to include negative relations with peers in an attempt to further specify the conditions under which negative relations with others influence delinquency. Specifically, the authors address criticisms that there may be a need for a distinct form of strain theory needed

to explain delinquency of males and females. Their study tested this argument by examining the relative effects of interpersonal strain on male and female delinquency. Existing literature examining the role of interpersonal relationships for males and females has consistently found that for females, interpersonal relationships are more expressive and very important in their lives. For males, interpersonal relationships tend to be more instrumental and of less importance. Therefore, the authors hypothesized that the effects of interpersonal problems with peers among adolescent girls would have a more pronounced effect on delinquency than for boys given the relative importance of such relationships for the respective groups. The results of their analysis provided little support for the hypothesized relationship proposed by the authors. In support of their contention, the authors found that peer problems among females entering high school increased escape attempts from school by females. Poor peer relations among females were also the best predictor of fighting. These findings challenge existing literature that asserts that females respond to peer problems by engaging in internalizing rather than externalizing behaviors. Contrary to their predictions, positive relations with the opposite sex increased female delinquency. Thus, peer relation variables have little positive effect on female delinquency other than the relationship between poor peer relations and fighting.

Other studies focusing on male and female delinquency using the GST model have also revealed mixed results. In a 2001 article by Sharp et al.,, the authors examined the relative effects of strain on traditional female deviant behaviors. The authors asserted that existing models purporting to explain deviance have primarily focused on criminality, delinquency, or types of deviance more typical of males. The authors

set out to explain traditional female deviant behavior, specifically purging, to test the explanatory power of strain theory to account for this behavior among females. The authors tested their proposition by analyzing the prediction of GST that various stressors were associated with deviant behavior through their effect on the mediating negative affect variables of anger and depression. Specifically for the authors, the loss of positively valued stimuli, failure to achieve valued goals, chronic stressors such as parental hostility and feeling unattractive, and a sense of equity should affect purging behavior through their effect on negative emotions anger and depression (Sharp et al., 2001). Results of the study revealed that the only significant direct relationship was that between goals and purging behavior. The analysis of the indirect effects of the independent variables on the dependent measure via the negative affective states of anger and depression indicated that goals, parental hostility, and feeling unattractive were significantly related to depression. Negative life events were weakly associated with depression and not related to anger. The fairness variable was not related to depression and negatively related to anger.

Specifically, the results indicated that reaching one's goals was inversely related to depression. The more one feels as though she is reaching her goals, the less depressed she feels. The more parental hostility and feelings of unattractiveness a respondent reported, the higher the feelings of depression (Sharp et al., 2001). The cumulative effect of negative life events slightly increased feelings of depression and the more fairly a respondent felt she was treated, the less likely she was to respond with anger.

The authors further tested the connection between the dependent measure of purging and the negative affective states of anger and depression. The analysis revealed that both anger and depression were significantly associated with purging behavior. Both feelings of anger and depression significantly increase the probability of purging behavior. When anger and depression were both included in the analysis only the significant effects of depression remained (Sharp et al., 2001). Next, the authors examined the relative effects of the interaction between anger and depression on the dependent measure to better understand the relationship between the two. Results again revealed a significant positive relationship. To better understand the relationship between the interaction term and purging behavior, the authors dichotomized the depression measure into high depression and low depression categories. The analysis under these conditions revealed that anger has a pronounced effect on purging behaviors among females only when depression was high.

In the study, the authors examined whether GST was suited for explaining traditionally female deviant behavior, specifically purging. The results were generally supportive of the theory but the findings suggest that the relationship between strain, negative affect, and delinquency may be more complex than GST asserts. Agnew's General Strain Theory (1992) suggests that strain creates negative affective states, particularly anger, which in turn affects deviance. Results of the study revealed that anger and depression interact in their effect on female deviance. Anger under conditions of high levels of depression increased purging behaviors among females, whereas anger under low levels of depression did not produce purging but did influence the occurrence of other types of deviance.

The preceding review of the literature examining General Strain Theory reveals that there is partial support for many of the main contentions of the theory. Negative relations with others, under certain conditions, produces strain in the individual which affects crime and delinquency through its relationship with negative affective states. More recent examinations of the theory focusing on gender differences in response to strain also seem to confirm the relationship between strain, negative affective states, and crime and deviance. Males and females tend to respond to different sources of strain, the negative affective responses vary by gender, and the types of crime and deviance engaged in varies accordingly. The findings with respect to gender open up new avenues of research in the application of General Strain Theory. If gender differences in crime and delinquency can be explained in terms of strain theory, one could reasonably expect that there exists a potential in the theory for explaining racial differences in crime and delinquency. Interestingly, this line of research has been neglected in tests of the theory and has generally been ignored in the criminological literature.

Summary of Strain Literature

The preceding literature review highlights the major variables that will be used in this analysis. Strain will be measured along the three broad theoretical areas suggested by Agnew (1992): 1) failure to achieve positive goals (goal strain), 2) loss of positively valued stimuli (negative life events), and items tapping 3) the presence of negative or noxious stimuli (family turmoil, parental punitiveness, family financial strain, abuse, attractiveness). The key mediating variables to be used to tap negative affective states will be measured by two constructs, anger and depression. Other key

mediating variables identified as important in understanding the effect of strain on negative affect and negative affect on delinquent/non-delinquent outcomes include measures of coping resources (self-esteem, mastery, and social support). Therefore I include measures capturing these constructs in the analysis. Key dependent measures identified in the literature that will be used in the analysis include delinquency/crime and drug use (measured by marijuana use). Important control variables highlighted in the literature that will be used in the analysis include measures of the demographic variables of age, gender, and parental income.

Race, Crime, and Delinquency

General Strain Theory (Agnew 1992) was developed as a general explanation for the occurrence of crime and delinquency. It has more recently been adapted to explain differences between males and females in participation in crime and deviance through the exploration of varying negative affect states and their role as mediating variables in the relationship between GST independent variables and dependent measures. In general, negative relations with others influence feelings of strain which in turn affect negative emotional states and participation in crime and delinquency. Often neglected in criminological studies, however, are issues of race and the power of the various criminological theories in explaining racial differences in involvement in crime and delinquency. While it is acknowledged among scholars that there are important racial differences in criminal behavior, there has been a systematic omission of studies that have thoroughly investigated the causes of such differences (Hawkins 1995). Race in criminological studies typically occupies the role of control variable, and systematic analyses of racial differences under the conditions of the

various theoretical explanations of crime are rare. This study sets out to examine the often neglected issue of race and crime using the General Strain Theory paradigm developed by Agnew (1992).

Agnew's (1992) theory seems particularly well-suited to explaining differential rates of offending among black and whites. According to GST, negative relations with others produce strain and frustrations that increase the probability of engagement in crime through the effects on affective emotional states. The failure to achieve positively-valued goals, the removal of positively-valued stimuli, and the presentation of negative stimuli constitute the three sources of strain (negative relations with others) that predispose the individual to elevated levels of negative affective emotions which, in turn, affects involvement in crime.

An additional consideration that is relevant in understanding why Agnew's (1992) argument is particularly well-suited to explaining African American involvement in delinquency comes from the area of Medical Sociology. Thomas and Hughes (1986) note that differences in psychological well being between African American and whites continue to exist even when controlling for differences in education, income, and job characteristics. According to their argument, African Americans are subject to a racial tax in terms of psychological health. Essentially, their membership in a racial minority group compounds the effects of their poor socioeconomic status on psychological health. Accordingly, African Americans are exposed to elevated amounts of negative life events in their relations with the dominant group because of their minority status. The unequal treatment often faced by the group often produces increased feelings of distress that may include anger and depression. Therefore,

African Americans are more likely to respond to negative relations with others with the negative emotions highlighted by Agnew (1992) which he asserts are correlates of delinquency. Inequitable relations with others predisposes the group to psychic distress or negative affective emotional states that in turn would predispose the group members to delinquency according to strain theory.

The history of the African American experience has been one characterized by involuntary servitude, disfranchisement, social segregation, and high levels of inequality in access to society's institutions of wealth, power, and social prestige (Hawkins 1995). Thus, one can reasonably assume that the historically handicapped position of blacks in society may be related to elevated levels of strain/frustration and negative emotions that may account for criminal involvement. The social structural position of blacks predisposes the group to social pressures not present for other groups in society. These may be important factors to be considered in understanding offending among the population.

Walker et al., (2000) explain race and ethnicity differences in deviant and criminal involvement as a consequence of the social structural position of blacks compared to whites. The authors focus on economic inequality as an important factor accounting for the high rate of offending among the black population. Data from the Bureau of Census Statistical Abstracts (1997) reviewed by the authors revealed glaring disparities in income, wealth, unemployment, and poverty status between whites and blacks. Income measures revealed that black median family income is 61% that for white Americans (Walker et al., 2000). The data on wealth revealed an even larger gap between whites and blacks. As of 1991, median wealth of white

families was $44,408, compared with only $4,604 for blacks. It is obvious that income inequality and inequalities in wealth go hand in hand. The low median income of blacks handicaps them in the ability to save each month. With higher median incomes than blacks, whites are able save more money and use it to increase their wealth by buying homes, stocks and bonds, or other investments (Walker et al., 2000). The glaring differences in income and wealth have important effects on further perpetuating inequality among blacks and whites. Whites are better able to endure economic hardships and changes in the economy because of their higher incomes and rates of savings and investment. Likewise, blacks are unable to endure economic hardships without further degradation of their quality of life because income inequality and the lack of wealth do not cushion them against economic downturns and its impact. Therefore, inequalities in income and wealth make the lives of blacks more tenuous and unstable. These things continue to hold true when considering the position of the growing black middle-class (Hawkins 1995; Walker et al., 2000; Marger 2003) In turn, they have direct consequences on quality of life and the structure of the community among the black population. Specifically, these characteristics lead to higher concentrations of the black population in geographic areas characterized by high rates of poverty and social disorganization (Walker et al., 2000; Bursik and Grasmick 1992; Agnew 1999). Existing research has indicated that these factors are of paramount importance in understanding the elevated levels of crime and delinquency in black communities.

Factors associated with unemployment and poverty among blacks and whites reveal similar patterns of inequality. In 1996, the unemployment rate for blacks

(10.7%) was twice that of whites (4.7%) (Statistical Abstracts 1997). This pattern has been evident for decades and for some years in the 1980's the gap even widened (Walker et al., 2000). Measures of poverty using 1995 Census Bureau statistics also revealed glaring disparities between whites and blacks. For whites, 11.2% were below the poverty line, compared to 29.3% of blacks. This disparity is more troubling when examining the percentage of children under the age of eighteen living below the poverty line. In 1995, 41.5% of all African American children were living below the poverty line compared to 15.5% of white children. According to Walker et al., (2000), childhood poverty status is associated with many other social problems, inadequate nutrition, single-parent households, low educational achievement, high risk of crime victimization, and high rate of involvement in crime; the data suggest a grim future for a very large percentage of black children.

Mere economic factors do not tell the whole story of the subordinate position of blacks and their lack of access to wealth, power, and social prestige. Non-economic resources in the form of human and social capital are also important considerations when understanding the position of blacks relative to whites. Racial differences in these constructs have significant effects on the ability of blacks to achieve the American dream of economic success. Human capital includes values, habits, and beliefs that shape behavior. It is generally agreed upon by psychologists and sociologists alike that the family is the primary unit for transmitting values to children. These values generally include self-respect, self-reliance, hard work, and respect for other people. If there is family disruption, which is common among African Americans, these values are not effectively transmitted to the children

(Walker et al., 2000). High rates of female-headed households with children, estimated to hover around 50% for blacks (Marger 2003, Henslin 2003), impede the ability of the black family to monitor behavior and instill values needed for social success in mainstream social environments. In this case, improper socialization occurs or socialization may be to deviant subcultures rather than values prevalent in mainstream society. As a result of frequent family disruption and the high rates of female-headed households in the black community, black children find themselves in tenuous positions lacking those values and habits needed for upward mobility and material success. Thus, turning to illegitimate value orientations and delinquent behavior is more likely given their lack of human capital.

According to Anderson (1990), the problem of blacks in the area of human capital is that the human capital characteristics that they harbor are a reflection of the state of their community. The values, habits and beliefs harbored by members of the community reflect avenues toward status attainment as determined by the local community standards. With community life often characterized by poverty, unemployment, and family turmoil, coupled with severely limited opportunities for conventional success, a value system evolves that emphasizes aggressiveness, toughness, and a prowess toward crime as a means of status attainment among community peers. It is not that blacks do not harbor human capital characteristics. It is more that the characteristics that they do possess are often in direct contrast to those found in the larger society, often entailing the positive acceptance of crime and delinquency as a means of garnering self-esteem and social respectability.

Social capital includes associations and networks that are useful for individual achievement. "Networking" or developing relationships with people and institutions that are able to offer jobs is key in landing gainful employment and advancing one's career. Currie (1985) examined racial differences in social capital and crime and concluded that whites had significantly more personal connections that helped them find jobs than African Americans. The lack of social capital of African Americans in turn increased the probability that they participated in criminal activity at a much higher rate than whites. Thus, poor social capital characteristics of blacks can be seen as an important factor in keeping blacks out of the labor market. At the same time, such factors increase the likelihood of participation in delinquency and crime.

Although blacks may harbor lower levels of social capital that can be used in conventional society for social success, the social capital characteristics that they do possess are tied to illegitimate opportunity structures. Anderson (1990) notes that the social capital of blacks is tied to propensities to engage in criminal or delinquent behavior. Status in depressed black communities is gained through "displays of wealth" or through possession of expensive material goods. Moreover, it is also established through the commission of crime and delinquency or displaying an image of the propensity to engage in such activities. Therefore, blacks do harbor social capital characteristics but these factors operate within local community networks. Here associations gained and lost within the depressed black community are used to establish personal credibility and social respect among community occupants, not within the larger mainstream society. Within such environments, one's propensity to engage in crime, delinquency, and violence are vehicles for status attainment, where

the status one receives is determined by community networks or associations. In sum, the social structural position of blacks and the character of their lives, reduce the level of conventional human and social capital that the young people possess, and as a consequence, these conditions contribute to increased levels of capital characteristics that are associated with involvement in criminal activity (Walker et al., 2000).

From the preceding arguments, it is easy to imagine how the handicapped socio-economic position of blacks, the structure of the black community, and the presence of dysfunctional family units, greatly increase the probability that blacks live under depressed conditions that are characterized by high levels of strain and frustration. The strain and frustrations derived from the conditions of life among the black population in turn increase negative affective emotional states, which according to Agnew (1992), predispose the individual to engagement in crime and delinquency. Therefore, it is my contention in the context of this research that persistent inequality in access to social rewards produces elevated levels of strain among the black population. This, in turn, predisposes the group to involvement in criminal and delinquent activities according to General Strain Theory (Agnew 1992). What is of particular interest in this research are differences among blacks and whites in the effects of strain on criminal and delinquent outcomes. It is evident that different sociological processes may be at work in producing strain and aberrant behavior between racial groups. In this research, I attempt to uncover those differences in social variables that may account for differences in propensity to respond to strain as proposed by Agnew (1992) with negative affect and engagement in criminal or delinquent behavior by race.

Despite numerous changes in the social structure of American society and the enactment of governmental policies aimed at improving the social conditions of the lives of African Americans, African Americans continue to lag behind whites on all measures of socio-economic status. Measures of educational, occupational, and economic characteristics of the population further reveal the glaring disparities between African Americans and whites on these measures (Marger 2003). Some researchers have attributed the continued subordination of blacks in the area of economics to lingering racism within the institutions of society. Denial of necessary opportunities and resources that can be used for upward mobility and entrance into the middle class in society have been severely constrained since the time of forced migration of African Americans into American society (Marger 2003). This trend in access to society's social rewards continues now in the modern era and can be seen as a major explanatory factor in the prevalence of African Americans in the bottom tiers of society's class system.

The recent work William Julius Wilson (1980, 1987, 1996) has added important theoretical arguments to understanding the plight of African Americans in society and the class system. According to Wilson (1996), discrimination based on race has impacted the black community through systematic denial of necessary economic resources that could be used for upward mobility. At the same time, traditional patterns of black-white relations have been fundamentally altered so that class factors are also important influences on the life chances of black people. Therefore, the socioeconomic position of blacks in society and their lack of sufficient access to society's economic and political institutions can be linked to both vestiges of

prejudice and discrimination faced by blacks and the evolving nature of the class system.

According to Wilson (1987, 1996), to understand the current socioeconomic situation of the black population, one must first understand the three distinct classes that exist within the community: a black middle class consisting of white-collar and skilled blue-collar workers, a working class of semi-skilled workers, and a lower class composed of unskilled laborers and service workers. At the very bottom of the lower class is an underclass that includes those lower-class workers whose income falls below the poverty level, the chronically unemployed, discouraged workers who have dropped out of the labor market, and the more or less permanent welfare recipients.

According to the argument, after World War II, some blacks were able to take advantage of openings in the industrial labor market and use those positions for upward mobility. Others were not able to take advantage of the expansion of opportunities and their situations rapidly deteriorated. Wilson (1987) argues that the changing nature of society's labor market and the vestiges of the effects of continued subjugation of the black population combined to produce a highly vulnerable population of blacks lacking effective opportunities for upward mobility. Thus, the problems of the black community- high rates of joblessness, school dropouts, crime and delinquency, and teenage motherhood are products of both the changing economic structure of society and of prejudice and discrimination which have been crucial factors in the lives and life chances of blacks. The lives of both mobile blacks and the underclass tend to be characterized by social isolation from the mainstream.

This is particularly true for members of the underclass, and it has created concentrated areas of black disadvantage (Wilson 1980, 1987, 1996).

Wilson's argument relies heavily on the idea that the black social position in society can not totally be explained by discrimination. To a large extent, the occupational structure of society is of primary importance in the modern era in explaining the social position of a significant proportion of the black population. The need for an increasingly well-trained, highly-skilled labor force in the industrial economy is seen as the primary cause of the lack of access to society's social institutions and social rewards system by underclass blacks. Wilson (1987) notes that prejudice and discrimination are important in explaining the social positions of blacks relative to other groups in society only when examined with respect to earlier eras of black/white relations. Modern relations and access to opportunities, according to Wilson (1987), are primarily influenced by the restructured urban economy.

Irrespective of the era and explanation for the position of blacks in society, the arguments by Wilson (1980, 1987, 1996) seem to lend themselves very well to explaining involvement in crime and delinquency among the black population as a consequence of strain. According to Wilson's argument, high levels of prejudice and discrimination in early eras of black/white relations decreased the ability of blacks to access society's social rewards on par with the white population. The failure to achieve positively-valued goals by legitimate means due to unequal access to society's opportunity structure in turn precipitated the initial emergence of the underclass and the problems found therein. Thus, the initial denial of opportunity created conditions among blacks where strains and frustrations stemming from

blocked opportunities to achieve economic goals caused abnormal adaptations to the conditions of life among members of the black community. Agnew (1992) notes that strain is most likely to result in delinquency and crime when one's negative relations with others are attributed to perceived unjust and unfair treatment. Therefore, the abnormal adaptations of blacks to the social circumstances of their lives may be in part precipitated by feelings that their position in society is the result of unfair and unjust treatment. The adaptation then can be seen as a reaction to the perceptions of the cause of their situation.

In the modern era, Wilson (1987) explains black subordination as a consequence of the changing urban economy. Again, one can easily adapt this argument to notions of strain and the connection to crime and delinquency. The poor skills and low levels of education among blacks in the modern era have directly led to the development of a significant portion of the population that lives under poverty-stricken conditions. Such conditions normally engender strain and frustrations due to the social circumstances of life. Thus, in either case, it is highly likely that blacks would experience more strain in their personal lives and pursuits relative to other racial and ethnic groups.

Although Wilson (1980, 1987, 1996) does not explicitly focus on the role of prejudice and discrimination on crime and delinquency in his analysis, it is informative to note that his arguments lend themselves very well to explain how the social context of the lives of blacks in American society may have important influences on higher levels of strain and frustration, and thus crime and delinquency. Generally, Wilson outlined how blacks have traditionally found themselves lacking in

opportunities or social capital that could be translated into economic success. This has led to a significant portion of the population that is unable to achieve material success on par with whites. Therefore, a highly segregated population that lacks positive social environments that could help cultivate mainstream value orientations exists, as well as a highly vulnerable population subject to de-jure and de-facto prejudice and discrimination. These characteristics accurately depict the main explanatory sources of strain as theorized by Agnew (1992) in his formulation of GST: failure to achieve positively-valued goals, removal of positive stimuli, and the presentation of negative or noxious stimuli. Thus, the social environmental context of the lives of many blacks in American society easily fits the assumption that strain, negative affect, and crime and delinquency should be more prevalent among this group. Again, although Wilson (1980, 1987, 1996) did not theorize that this relationship exists, his theoretical description of the social lives and socio-economic character of blacks lends itself very well to understanding the higher rates of crime and delinquency among the black population. Thus, given the context of the lives of blacks, one could reasonably expect higher levels of strain among members of the black population. This in turn can influence greater propensities to engage in norm or law violating behavior.

What is important about Wilson's argument with respect to the current research is this: The black population has suffered tremendously due to the changes in the economic structure of modern society. Changes in the labor market and the shift of inner-city jobs to the suburbs has left behind a highly vulnerable group that persistently faces economic hardship and limitations in opportunities that could be

used for upward mobility purposes in society. This society, the black underclass, adapts to the structural conditions of their lives in numerous ways. One of the most prevalent adaptations include rejection of the standards and values of the larger society and acceptance of values and behavior orientations a reality that is in direct opposition to the mainstream. A subculture develops among the group that exists within the larger social environment that extols the virtues of norm-violating behavior which often includes crime and delinquency. Status in the community is not gained by adherence to the values of the mainstream society; it is achieved through acceptance of a culturally-specific status system that operates in such a way that status is gained or lost by participation in the community subculture. Often in acting in accord with the subculture, status is gained and one's self-esteem is protected by involvement in crime or delinquency. One's social support systems extol the virtues of criminal involvement and one is often encouraged and supported in his criminal or delinquent behavior by other members of the community.

Albert Cohen (1955) explained the situation among blacks succinctly. According to his argument, delinquency among blacks ensues because of strain and frustrations derived from status deprivations. Status deprivation and the associated feelings that accompany it stem from "problems of adjustment" faced by lower class youth, particularly black youth, in the context of school environments. According to Cohen (1955), status among youth is determined by a middle-class standard which youths come to understand in the context of schooling. But among lower-class youth, status deprivation is high because they lack middle-class backgrounds of socialization which would allow them to accumulate status from their peers. Therefore, according

to Cohen (1955), lower class youth turn to delinquent subcultures among other status-deprived youth and engage in crime and delinquency as means of protecting their self-esteem, and garnering status and respect among their peers. Thus, Cohen's essential argument is as follows: The social conditions and socialization patterns of depressed social-class individuals (blacks) makes assimilation to mainstream values through which status is afforded very tenuous. Moreover, lower class youths who encounter these standards of status in school contexts find themselves handicapped in their abilities to gain status from their peers through conventional activities. The strain and frustrations derived from such social circumstances produce problems of adjustment where lower-class youth are more likely to respond to status deprivation by joining delinquent subcultures where status, respect, and esteem are afforded through criminal and delinquent acts. Thus, those groups in society most likely to occupy the lower social classes are more likely to engage in crime and delinquency as a means of obtaining status, respect, and esteem among their peers, irrespective of the larger social environment and the concomitant middle-class values that may prevail.

Given the historic levels of socioeconomic inequality among blacks and whites in American society, it is intuitive that blacks are more likely to make up the lower-social classes and therefore be subject to higher levels of strain and frustration due to status deprivation and "problems of adjustment." From this, one can reasonably assume that involvement in crime and delinquency with the black population can be linked to the strain of status deprivation due to its social structural position and the effects of class factors on quality of life. Again, it is important to point out at this point that strain, even in its various sources of origination, tends to predispose

individuals to deviant and criminal involvement. Therefore, even though the source of strain is slightly different from that theorized by Agnew (1992), the effects are very similar. In any case, negative relations with others or an inability to achieve status in conventional society predisposes individuals to involvement in deviance or criminal behavior.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) argue along a similar vein. Youth involvement in delinquency is viewed as a consequence of a disjuncture between aspirations and expectations for social achievement/economic status or blocked opportunities for achievement in conventional society. According to their theoretical argument, delinquency ensues when access to legitimate opportunity structures are blocked or limited and illegitimate opportunity structures are open. This is particularly relevant for the present study. In the context of this research, it is argued that the social structural position of blacks and their inability to achieve in conventional society elevates levels of strain which in turn increases involvement in delinquency and crime. Particularly, the historically depressed social conditions of the lives of blacks has produced a geographic concentration of this group in communities where high rates of poverty, dislocation, and crime exist (Hawkins 1995). In such environments, legitimate opportunity structures are minimal or non-existent and illegitimate opportunity structures are abundant. Thus, it is my contention that the argument of Cloward and Ohlin (1960) is important in understanding delinquent and/or criminal involvement among blacks due to their emphasis on social structural features of society and how these features shape behavior. Those groups in society most affected by blocked legitimate opportunities for achievement while in the presence of

illegitimate opportunity structures in highly disorganized communities, will turn to the illegitimate structures as a means of accomplishing their goals. Wilson (1987) and Agnew and White (1992) argue a similar point. The social conditions of blighted neighborhoods predispose the occupants to elevated levels of strain and frustration due to the social circumstances under which they live. These factors, in-turn, make deviant and criminal outcomes highly likely.

Therefore, the structure and quality of the lives of blacks makes it more likely that this group will find itself in social environments lacking opportunities for legitimate success. At the same time, these very same qualities make illegitimate opportunities more abundant for the group and therefore make crime and delinquency highly probable among this population.

Elijah Anderson (1990, 1999) offers a variation on the existing arguments that may also be important when considering the connection between race, deviance, and crime. According to Anderson (1990), the concentration of disadvantage among the black population leads to the creation of a culture directly opposed to that found in mainstream society. The lack of achievement in conventional society by blacks has led to the creation of a "code of the streets" where criminal and delinquent involvement as a means of gaining status replaces middle-class values and conventional modes of status attainment. Strain and frustrations derived from the lack of conventional success as measured by middle-class standards produces the evolution of a culture among blacks where status is gained or lost through participation in the culture, values, and practices that extol the virtues of crime and delinquency as modes of gaining status. Thus, to understand the causal mechanism

behind the involvement in crime and delinquency among blacks, according to Anderson (1990, 1999), all one needs is to examine the social structural context of the lives of blacks relative to other groups and their persistent problems of obtaining status through conventional activities. High-rate offending can be seen as an adaptive response of blacks to status deprivation found in mainstream society. Offending ensues as a means of protecting one's self-esteem, gaining respect, admiration, and social status among a highly vulnerable black population lacking opportunities and avenues that could be used for upward mobility and social status in conventional society. This consideration is compatible with general strain theory's perspective that delinquency is a coping mechanism (Brezina 1996).

In such environments, one's self-esteem is intimately tied to involvement in crime and delinquency. Because one's self-esteem does not depend on accomplishments in the larger society, the subculture and the activities within the subculture take its place. Self-esteem revolves around acting in accordance with the "code of the streets." This often entails engaging in crime and delinquency as a means of protecting one's status among peers. Also, in such environments, social support systems are ever present. The problem is that the support garnered from community members itself mirrors praise and tacit acceptance of the principles of the code. Community support mechanisms often teach community occupants values, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors proper to committing crime and often support and encourage criminal involvement. Therefore, contrary to the expectations of strain theory, strong self-esteem and social support for blacks predispose them to increased probabilities of offending rather than reducing the effects of strain on offending which one would

expect with the theory. Thus, Anderson's argument means that there may be different processes at work in the production of crime and delinquency for blacks than for other racial groups. Particularly, groups should differ in the role of the mediating variables of self-esteem and support on negative affective states and delinquent/criminal outcomes.

A variation on the theme presented by Anderson (1990, 1999) has also been elaborated on in the area of education research. John Ogbu (1991, 2003) who has studied education achievement differences between African Americans and other groups links the disparity to what he terms "oppositional frames of reference". According to Ogbu (1991, 2003), among African Americans there exists a cultural response to discrimination and racism (negative relations with others/strain) that produces contempt for conventional society and behaviors. African Americans, as involuntary immigrants, have no cultural frame of reference/identity based on their land of origin which could be used in the development of their self-identities or which to compare their current situation. Because their "cultural frames of reference" have been developed in the context of American race relations, there exists a general distrust or contempt for all things mainstream.

According to Ogbu (1991, 2003), the history of race relations in American society has shaped the African American cultural frame of reference in such a way that black come to see the discrimination they face as not being temporary in nature or unintentional but more due to issues of race. Prejudice and discrimination are viewed as parts of the institutional operations of society. These things lead African Americans into coping strategies to handle their situation that revolve around social

solidarity and challenges to the rules of the dominant society (Ogbu 1991, 2003). In other words, African Americans use their cultural frames of reference developed in American society in defining their world. That frame of reference which has been shaped by high levels of prejudice and discrimination faced by the group leads to the rejection of dominant group values and the acceptance of those values in direct opposition to those found in the mainstream. They define themselves in their core identities in terms of their opposition to the dominant group. Because of the historical levels of negative relations and unequal treatment that the group has been subject to at the hands of the dominant group, their self-esteem and self-pride are derived from the development of an oppositional identity/frame of reference which defines the meaning of being black. Value is placed on social solidarity and there is strong opposition to society's rules which African American perceive as being against them. With the cultural perception that the rules are staked against them, African Americans have developed a cultural perspective that to make it in America, there must be collective efforts and challenges to the barriers set up by the dominant group.

Ogbu (1991, 2003) explains the differences in educational achievement among black and white youth as a consequence of the oppositional frame of reference of black children. Schooling is seen as the white thing to do for black youth and, as a consequence of their emersion in the oppositional cultural frame of reference into which they have been socialized, they oppose schooling or place less value on educational attainment. This leads to glaring disparities between the groups in scores on standardized tests.

Ogbu's arguments fit nicely with those of Cohen (1955) and Anderson (1990, 1999). Cohen noted that delinquency typically ensues among youth due to reaction formation. The reaction of lower class youth to status deprivation found in school, which is determined by middle class standards, causes them to develop oppositional values and behaviors as a means of status attainment. According to Ogbu (1991, 2003), African American children lag behind other children in education achievement because of their oppositional identity/frame of reference or rejection of values and standards endorsed by the dominant group. More important is the similarity between Ogbu (1990, 2003) and Anderson (1990, 1999) on the role of self-pride, self-esteem, and self-identity. According to both theorists, African American identities revolve around value and behavioral orientation to reality that are in stark contrast to those found in the mainstream. Whether one is examining education failure or involvement in delinquency and crime among African American youth, they both stem from the same source according to the arguments of both theorists. There exists a cultural frame of reference or ethnic identity among African Americans that is, in part, shaped by oppositional values and behavior orientations to mainstream society. Based on these arguments, again, it is reasonable to believe that the personal resource variables for blacks may operate contrary to Agnew's (1992) theoretical assumptions.

Statement of the Problem

This dissertation tests various propositions from Agnew's (1992) General Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency. The focus of the analysis centers on the Agnew's contention that strain increases the probability of involvement in crime and delinquency through its relationship with the mediating variable of negative affective

states. Specifically, the research will explore racial differences in self-reported involvement in crime and delinquency as a consequence of strain and negative affective emotional states, based on the differential experiences of strain by both blacks and whites. The goal of the research is to show that different social process are important to understand when examining the different types of offending that may occur among blacks and whites in the population.

Research Hypotheses:

H1: The effect of measures strain on negative affect (anger) will differ by race.

H2: The effect of measures strain on negative affect (depression) will differ by race.

H3: Differences exist between blacks and whites in the connection between strain and negative affective states on delinquency/crime.

H4: The effect of strain and negative affective states on delinquency/crime will differ by race when controlling for personal resources.

H5: Differences exist between blacks and whites in the connection between strain and negative affective states on marijuana use.

H6: The effect of strain and negative affective states on marijuana use will differ by race when controlling for personal resources.

Chapter Two
Methodology

Sample

Data for this project were gathered in two survey periods conducted during the 1999-2000 academic year. Data used to test the theory discussed in the preceding chapter were drawn from a survey of 708 college students, age 18 and above, attending three southwestern universities: one rural, one commuter, and one Carnegie I research institution. Participation in the survey was entirely voluntary. Members of the target sample who did not participate in the study were not penalized, while voluntary participants were not paid. A list-wise deletion of missing cases, a filtering of age outliers (under 18 and over 25 years), and a restriction of the analysis to racial categories of Black and White resulted in a sample of 571 for the analyses that follow.

Procedures

The data were obtained by utilizing an anonymous survey administered to volunteer respondents during regularly scheduled class periods. The survey consisted of 264 questions measuring demographics, attitudes and behaviors. Specifically, the questions measured the following characteristics: attitudes and behaviors, demographics (age, race, parental income, marital status), goal orientation, peer and parental attachment, relationships with parents, alcohol use, drug use, violence, criminal behavior, values and moral beliefs, orientations, opportunity to engage in criminal or delinquent behavior, self-efficacy, self-esteem, religious affiliation, self-control, coping factors, and negative affective states. The survey instrument was administered to students enrolled in Introductory Sociology courses, with the

cooperation of the various instructors. These courses meet general education requirements at all three universities, increasing the diversity of the sample. Instructors willing to permit admission to their classes were requested not to attend class on the day of the survey in order to insure anonymity of students who participated or declined to participate in the study.

Potential respondents were asked to read the informed consent form. If students opted to participate, they were directed to sign one of the informed consent forms and retain the second copy. If students opted not to participate they were asked not to sign the form, but to keep one copy. Surveys were passed out to all students in attendance, with instructions that only those having signed the informed consent were permitted to complete the survey. All others were given the opportunity to examine the survey without participation, but were to remain in the classroom. Students completing the survey were asked to respond to each item by marking the choice which best represented their experience or attitudes. Respondents were instructed that if they felt uncomfortable or disturbed in any way by the questions being asked, they could opt to stop and seek counseling services at the respective universities where the survey was being held. No students requested counseling services.

All students were given the class period to complete or review the survey, after which they were asked to deposit the survey in a stack at the front of the class before leaving the classroom. The research team members were not permitted to answer questions until all surveys were collected.

Limitations of the study

Before discussing the variables and variable creation, it is appropriate to address the generalizability of these data. Given the sample sources, the researcher is aware of the sample limitations that might make it somewhat unwise to make inferences about behaviors in general. Nonetheless, this investigation is designed to test General Strain Theory, utilizing undergraduate students as a representative group who may experience elevated levels of strain in their everyday routines as college students. Therefore, this exploratory study may lend important information relevant in understanding the impact of strain and negative affective states on the propensity to engage in delinquency and drug use among various racial and gender categories of young adults.

Chapter Three
Variables and Variable Creation

Demographic Variables

The analyses included controls for age, gender, and family income. In this study, age was measured as an interval level variable measured by the subject's response to, "What was your age (in years) on your last birthday?" The mean age was 19.51 years. There was no significant difference in age by race (blacks 19.36, whites 19.53). Race was measured as a nominal level variable by including in the survey the question; "What race do you consider yourself? Response categories were White, Black/African American, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian or Other. Given the nature of this study, only the categories of Black/African American and White were used in the analysis. Race was recoded into a dichotomous variable. Race was coded (1) black and (0) white. Whites comprise the majority in the sample with 86.4 percent (N=497), Blacks comprised 12.9 percent (N=74). The analyses in this research will be conducted separately for the racial categories of Black and White. Gender was a dichotomous variable coded 0 for males, and 1 for females. Males comprised 42.2% of the total (N=241). Females made up 57.4% of the sample (N=328).

Parental income was measured as an ordinal level variable. Subjects were asked to estimate their parent's/guardian's annual income. Response categories included: (1) less than $15,000, (2) 15,000 to 29,000, (3) $30,000 to 44,999, (4) 45,000 to 59,999, (5) 60,000 or more. The mean parental income category was (3) 30,000 to 44,999. The modal category was 60,000 or more per year (N=264). The mean income for blacks fell in category (3) 30,000 to 44,999 and for whites category (4) 45,000 to 59,999. This difference was significant ($t = 6.178$, $p \leq .001$). Whites in the

sample have higher family incomes than blacks. Descriptive statistics for the sample are presented in Table 1.

[Table 1 About Here]

Key Independent Variables

Strain Variables

The measure of strain used in the analysis is derived from three separate measures consistent with measurement suggestions by Agnew (1992). Measures of "Failure to Achieve Positively Valued Goals", "Loss of Positive Stimuli", and "Presentation of Noxious or Negative Stimuli" were created from the following questionnaire items.

a. Failure to Achieve Positively Valued Goals:

The measure of failure to achieve positively valued goals (goals) consists of four Likert-type items answered on a five-point scale of: (1) very successful, (2) successful, (3) somewhat successful, (4) not at all successful, (5) no goals in this area. Responses of (5) no goals in this area, essentially represent "no strain". Therefore, in the analysis responses of (5) no goals in this area were recoded (1) very successful (representing no strain). The items were: Please indicate how successful you have been in reaching the following goals over the past five years:

1) Academic or Career Goals (ACGOAL)

2) Social/Family Life Goals (SFGOAL)

3) Athletic Goals (ATGOAL)

4) Money Goals (MGOAL)

[Table 2, 3, & 4 About Here]

Item means and standard deviations are represented in Table 2. The principal components analysis presented in Table 3 revealed one-factor, as there is one eigenvalue larger than one. Therefore, the analysis consisted of a one-factor solution on these items to derive the factor loading and reliability statistic for these items presented in Table 4. The new variable "Goals" is created by summing the scores of the four items. The factor loadings, all larger than .60, provide a strong indication that the items presented in the scale measure the construct. The reliability analysis for "Goals" indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .6063. No significant differences exist between blacks (8.76) and whites (8.80) on goal achievement measures when comparing means.

b. Loss of Positively Valued Stimuli:

Loss of positively valued stimuli (NEGEVNT) was measured with six Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) Not at all bothered or did not occur, (2) does not bother me very much, (3) somewhat bothers me, (4) bothers me quite a lot. The items were:

1) Parent's Divorce.

2) Loss of a family member through death.

3) Loss of friend(s) through death.

4) Family members moved away.

5) I moved away from friends or family.

6) Close friend(s) moved away.

[Table 5 About Here]

Item means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 5. The variable (NEGEVNT) was created by summing the scores on this variable. No factor analysis was need for this variable. According to the strain literature, the cumulative effect of negative life events or chronic stressors predisposes the individual to crime and delinquency through its effect on the mediating variables of negative affective states. Therefore, the variable is created by summing the scores on the variables. There was no significant difference in mean scores on negative life events for blacks (10.98) and whites (10.43) $t = -1.261$, $p \geq .05$.

c. Presentation of Negative or Noxious Stimuli.

The presentation of negative or noxious stimuli component of strain theory was measured by nineteen items reflecting measures presented by Agnew and White (1992) and Sharp et al., (2001).

1. Family Turmoil

Family Turmoil (FTURMOIL) was measured through the use of five Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) Not bothered at all, (2) Not bothered very much, (3) somewhat bothered, (4) very bothered. The items were:

1) My parents fight a lot.

2) My parent(s) blow their tops when I bother them.

3) My parent(s) argue with each other.

4) My parent(s) get cross and angry over little things.

5) My parent(s) complain about me.

[Table 6, 7, & 8 About Here]

Item means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 6. The principal components analysis presented in Table 7 revealed one-factor, as there is one eigenvalue larger than one. Therefore, the analysis consisted of a one factor solution on these items to derive the factor loadings and reliability statistic for the items listed in Table 6. The new variable, "FTURMOIL" is created by converting the data from the variables into z-scores and adding them together. The factor loading, all larger than .60, provide a strong indication that the items presented in the scale measure the construct (see Table 8). The reliability analysis for "FTURMOIL" indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .8167. A comparison of group means by race on the variable revealed a significant racial difference in mean scores with whites (7.98) scoring significantly lower than blacks (9.06) t= -2.128, p=.034.

2. Parental Punitiveness

Parental Punitiveness (PPUN) was measured through the use of four Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) not at all or did not occur, (2) does not bother me very much, (3) somewhat bothers me, (4) bothers me quite a bit. The items were:

1) My parents were very strict.

2) I was not allowed to express my own opinions at home.

3) I was not allowed to go out with some of my friends.

4) My parent(s) try to control what I do.

[Table 9, 10, & 11 About Here]

Item means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 9. The principal components analysis presented in Table 10 revealed one-factor, as there is one eigenvalue larger than one. Therefore, the analysis consisted of a one factor solution on these items to derive the factor loadings and reliability statistic for these items presented in Table 11. The new variable, "PPUN" is created by converting the data from the variables into z-scores and adding them together. The factor loading, all larger than .60, provide a strong indication that the items presented in the scale measure the construct The reliability analysis for the scale indicated an alpha of .7712.

A comparison of group means on the variable revealed a significant difference in group means with whites (6.54) reporting significantly lower scores on parental punitiveness compared to blacks (7.60) $t = -2.799$, $p \leq .005$.

3. Family Financial Strain

Family Financial Strain (FinStra) was measured through the use of three Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) Not at all or did not occur, (2) does not bother me very much, (3) somewhat bothers me, (4) bother me quite a lot. Scores on the variables ranged from a minimum of 1 and maximum of 4. The items were:

1) Family experiencing financial difficulties.

2) Parents could not afford to get me some of the things I wanted.

3) My parents can never afford to buy me the kind of clothes I want.

[Table 12, 13, & 14 About Here]

Item means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 12. The principal components analysis presented in Table 13 revealed one factor, as there is one

eigenvalue larger than one. Therefore, the analysis consisted of a one-factor solution on these items to derive the factor loadings and reliability statistic for the items presented in Table 14. The new variable, "FinStra" is created by converting the data from the variables into z-scores and adding them together. The factor loadings, all larger than .60, provide a strong indication that the items presented in the scale measure the construct. The reliability analysis for the "FinStra" scale indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .7079. There was a significant difference in mean scores between whites (4.02) and blacks (4.92) on this variable. Whites were significantly more likely to report lower levels of family financial strain compared to blacks $t= -4.01$, $p \leq .001$.

4. Abuse

Abuse (ABUSE) was measured through the use of two Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) not at all or did not occur, (2) does not bother me very much, (3) somewhat bothers me, (4) bother me quite a lot. Scores on the variable ranged from a minimum of 1 and maximum of 2. The items were:

1) I was physically abused.

2) I was sexually abused.

[Table 15 About Here]

Item means, and standard deviations are presented in Table 15. The variable "Abuse" was created by summing the scores on the variables. No significant difference in mean scores for whites (2.28) and blacks (2.40) was found for this variable $t= -.968$, $p \geq .05$.

5. Attractiveness

Attractiveness (ATTRACT) was measured through the use of two Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) not bothered at all, (2) not very much, (3) somewhat bothered, (4) very bothered. Scores on the variable ranged from a minimum of 1 and maximum of 4. The items were:

1) I think I am not good looking.

2) I feel I am unpopular with the opposite sex.

[Table 16 About Here]

Item means, standard deviations are presented in Table 16. The variable "Attract" was created by summing the scores on the variables. No significant difference exists between whites (3.56) and blacks (3.24) on the variable when comparing means $t= 1.37, p > .05$.

6. Composite Strain

Given the large number of strain variables, a summary measure of strain was created to simplify the analysis of interactions when exploring the relationship between strain and constraints to delinquent behavior/personal resources. The summary measure (Composite) was created by summing the scores on the measures of strain utilized in the research.

Key Mediating Variables: Personal Resources

Mastery

According to Agnew (1992), strain is less likely to engender anger, in turn, resulting in decreased involvement in crime and deviance, when feelings of mastery

are high. Likewise, the theory postulates that strain is less likely to influence involvement in crime and deviance through the mediating effect of negative affective states when self-esteem is high. Thus, in this analysis I include measures of both mastery (MASTERY) and self-esteem (Self est.) to utilize these constructs in a more complete analysis of the main contentions of the theory. Thirteen questionnaire items were used to create measures of mastery and self-esteem. The items were run simultaneously in a factor analysis, suppressing values below .40. Results of the factor analysis for the items using a varimax rotation are displayed in Table 19. Mastery (MASTERY) and Self-esteem (Self est.) are measured through the use of thirteen Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree, (4) strongly agree. The items were:

1) There is no way I can solve some of the problems I have.
2) I can do just about anything I really set my mind to.
3) What happens to me in the future depends mostly on me.
4) I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
5) All in all, I'm inclined to feel that I am a failure.
6) I am able to things as well as most other people.
7) I take a positive attitude toward myself.
8) I certainly feel useless at times.
9) There is no sense in planning a lot – if something good is going to happen, it will.
10) I am responsible for my own successes.
11) My misfortunes are the result of mistakes I have made.
12) I am responsible for my failures.

13) Most of my problems are due to bad breaks.

[Table 17, 18, & 19 About Here]

Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 17. The principal components analysis presented in Table 18 revealed two factors, as there are two eigenvalues larger than one. Therefore, a two-factor solution is generated for these items. Factor loadings and reliability statistic for the items are represented in Table 19. Item 9, "There is no sense in planning a lot- if something good is going to happen, it will," was dropped from the analysis due to poor factor loading. The new variable, "MASTERY" is created by converting the data from variables 3, 10, 11, and 12 into z-scores and adding them together. The factor loadings, all larger than .50, provide a strong indication that the items presented in the scale measure the construct (see Table 19.). The reliability analysis for mastery indicated a Cronbach's alpha of .6604. Comparison of groups means revealed that there were no significant differences between whites (12.94) and blacks (13.12) on the variable $t = -.829$, $p > .05$.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem was measured through the use of six Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree, (4) strongly agree. Items 5 and 8 were recoded so that high scores on these variables reflect high levels of self-esteem ((4) strongly disagree, (3) disagree, (2) agree, (1) strongly agree). The items were:

1) I can do just about anything I really set my mind to.

2) I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.

3) *All in all, I'm inclined to feel that I am a failure.

4) I am able to do things as well as most other people.

5) I take a positive attitude toward myself.

6) *I certainly feel useless at times.
* Items recoded

Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 17. Eigenvalues for these items were run simultaneously with the mastery items (see Table 18). The self-esteem (SESTEEM) scale was created by summing the z-scores for the items on this variable. Factor loadings for these items are displayed in Table 19. One item was dropped from the creation of the scale because it lowered the reliability. The reliability analysis for Self-esteem without item 1 indicated an alpha of .8158. Comparison of group means revealed significant differences between whites (19.97) and blacks (21.02) on the variable t= -3.063, $p \leq .01$. Whites were significantly lower on self-esteem than blacks in the sample.

Social Support

Agnew (1992) postulates that when higher levels of social support are available to the individual, strain is less likely to lead to crime and deviance through its relationship to the mediating variable of negative affective states. Therefore, a measure of social support is used in this research to evaluate this contention of the theory. Social support (Support) was measured through the use of three Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1)never/rarely, (2) sometimes, (3) often, (4) almost always, (5) does not apply. Responses of 5 on this variable were recoded to 1 reflecting that this occurrence has not happened.

The items were: How often do you:

1) Seek advice or confidence in your parents?

2) Feel your parents give you care and attention?

3) Feel wanted by your parents?

[Table 20, 21, 22 About Here]

Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 20. The principal components analysis presented in Table 21 revealed one factor, as there is one eigenvalue larger than one. Therefore, the analysis consisted of a factor solution on these items to derive the factor loading and reliability statistic for the scale presented in Table 22. The variable "Support" was created by summing the z-scores for the items. The factor loadings, all larger than .60, provide a strong indication that the items presented in the scale measure the construct. Item one was dropped from the scale because it lowered the reliability of the scale. The reliability analysis for Social Support without item one indicated an alpha of .8590. Comparison of group means indicated that whites (10.29) were significantly higher on social support than blacks (9.68), $t=2.493$, $p \leq .05$.

Agnew (1992) does not hypothesize that all individuals that experience strain will be involved in delinquency and crime. Only some strained individuals will turn to delinquency and crime. The association between strain and delinquent/criminal involvement is theorized to be conditioned by such variables as delinquent peers, moral inhibitions, the individual's level of self-control, and personal coping resources such as self-esteem, mastery, and conventional social support. Results in support of Agnew's theory would take the form of significant interaction effects among the highlighted variables and strain on delinquent/criminal outcomes. Given the limitations of the data, interaction variables were only created for those variables measuring personal resources.

Three interaction terms were created by multiplying the composite strain measure by each of the personal resource variables: Self-esteem (Se Int), Mastery (Mast Int), and Convention Social Support (Sspt Int.) Three separate regression equations in which only one interaction term and its component elements are included along with other exogenous variables appear in the results section of this research.

Negative Affective Emotional Response Variables

Anger

Strain is related to crime and delinquency through its effects on the mediating variable, negative affective states (Agnew 1992). According to the theory, strain is most likely to produce involvement in crime and deviance when it engenders the negative affective state of anger in individuals. Thus, in order to examine the main contention of the theory of the mediating effects of negative affect on crime and deviance, a variable measuring anger is included in the analysis. Anger was measured through the use of three Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) almost always. The items were: When bad things happen, what do you do?

1) Blow up

2) Take it out on other(s)

3) Take it out on things

[Table 23, 24, & 25 About Here]

Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 23. The principal components analysis presented in Table 24 revealed one factor, as there is one eigenvalue larger

than one. The scale "Anger" was created by first converting the items to z-scores and then summing the z-scores for the items. Factor loading are presented in Table 25. The reliability analysis for "Anger" indicated an alpha of .6858. Comparison of group means on the variable revealed that whites (4.92) score significantly lower on anger than blacks (5.51), $t= -2.509$, $p \leq .05$.

Depression

In explaining crime and deviance as a result of the effect of strain on negative affective states, Agnew (1992) opens avenues of examination for the theory to explain behaviors synonymous with deviance that may result from negative affective states other than anger. Particularly when examining gender differences in response to strain, it has been noted previously that males and females are subject to different patterns of socialization that influence the levels of importance they attach to social relationships (Broidy and Agnew 1997; see also Sharp et al., 2001) . For females, social relationships tend to be expressive and negative relations with others more likely engenders feelings of depression rather than anger. For males, relationships are more instrumental and negative relations with others tend to predispose them to higher levels of anger rather than depression. Agnew (1992) also notes that strain may engender emotions other than anger that are less likely to result in delinquency, including depression. I include measures of both anger and depression in the analysis to explore this aspect of the theory. Depression (Depress) was measured through the use of two Likert-type items answered on a four-point scale of: (1) never, (2) rarely, (3) sometimes, (4) almost always. Scores on the variable ranged from a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 4. The items were: When bad things happen, what do you do?

1) Withdraw

2) Shutdown

[Table 26 About Here]

Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 26. The variable "Depress" was created by summing the items on the variable. Comparison of group means on the variable revealed that whites (4.78) were significantly lower in depression than blacks (5.33) $t = -2.56$, $p \leq .05$.

Dependent Variables

The dependent measures used in this analysis tap involvement in a wide variety of deviant/criminal behaviors. Given the character of the sample for this research, the distribution of the measures related to serious crimes are skewed to the low end of the distribution. To account for high levels of variance needed in the analysis of the dependent measure, measures were developed that are more appropriate when utilizing a college population. The dependent measures in the analysis therefore include constructs measuring delinquency/crime and drug use (marijuana).

Delinquency

Delinquency (DELINQ) was measured through the use of twelve items answered either (1) yes or (0) no. Scores on the variables ranged from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 1. These items asked, during the past two years did you:

1) Break into a building to look for something to steal or to steal something?

2) Steal or try to steal a motor vehicle?

3) Hit or struck one your parents?

4) Use a weapon to get something from a person?

5) Run away from home?

6) Hurt someone badly enough so they needed bandages or a doctor?

7) Damage property on purpose?

8) Steal something worth less than $50?

9) Steal something worth more than $50?

10) Cut school/class?

11) Get in trouble at school for fighting or violating rules?

12) Gamble illegally on a sporting event?

[Table 27, 28, & 29 About Here]

Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 27. The principal components analysis presented in Table 28 revealed one factor, as there is one eigenvalue larger than one. The eigenvalues provide an indication of the number of underlying factors measured by the 12 items. Two rules of thumb may be used to make this determination. The discontinuity (scree) test states that the number of factors is equal to the number of eigenvalues before the main break. Kaiser's rule states that the number of factors is equal to the number of eigenvalues greater than one. Using a factor analysis with varimax rotation, the items loaded on one factor. The factor loadings on the items are presented in Table 29. Factor loadings below .30 were suppressed in the analysis. Items measuring "run away from home" and "Cut school/class" were dropped from the analysis due to poor factor loading with the other items. The delinquency scale (DELINQ) was created after the factor analysis by standardizing the scores on ten items then combining them together. An additional item, "Use a weapon to get something from a person" (Item 4) was dropped from the

scale because the reliability test indicated that the alpha would go up slightly with the exclusion of this measure. The reliability analysis for the nine Delinquency items indicated an alpha of .6839. Comparison of group means on the variable indicated that whites (.6619) and blacks (.7778) did not differ significantly on the variable t= -.741, $p \geq .05$.

Drug Use

Drug use was measured through the use of one Likert-type item answered on a five-point scale of: (1) never, (2) once, (3) 2-5, (4) more than 5 times, (5) regularly. Scores on the variable ranged from a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 5. The variable was restricted to marijuana use and the item asked: How many times in the past two years have you used:

1) Marijuana (MARIJUA)

[Table 30 About Here]

The means and standard deviations are reported in Table 30. The difference in means for whites (1.96) and blacks (1.82) on the variable was not significant t= .835, $p > .05$. Item correlations for the variables utilized in this research are found in Table 31 of the appendix. A detailed discussion of the variable correlations can be found in the discussion section of the research.

This study will examine General Strain Theory (Agnew 1992) as an explanation for the causes of crime and delinquency. Specific efforts will be made in examining General Strain Theory to account for racial differences in involvement in crime and delinquency. Literature on the connection between race and crime indicates that strain theory may be an adequate explanation for involvement in crime and delinquency. What is interesting is that different social processes may be at work in explaining propensities to engage in crime and delinquency by whites and blacks. This research sets out to examine factors consistent with the proposal of Robert Agnew in his development of GST, specifically focusing on how well the theory is designed in explaining the differential offending of blacks and whites.

The important function of the data analysis is to examine the theoretical and empirical implications of General Strain Theory proposed by Agnew (1992). Most important to the investigator is racial differences in response to strain. Specifically, what factors are important in understanding the causes of participation in delinquency and drug use among blacks and whites? Multiple regression analysis will be used to specify the nature of relationships among the variables by racial category.

Chapter Four
Data Analyses

Plan of Analyses

The aim of the present research was to examine strain theory as an explanation of criminal/delinquent behavior and drug use. In the research, first I regressed measures of negative affective states on age, gender, family income, measures of strain and personal resources. According to strain theory, strain increases the likelihood of negative affective responses, particularly anger. This relationship is believed to decrease when personal resources are high. Therefore, I next examine the relationship between strain and anger controlling for personal resources. The relationship between strain and negative affect, as well as strain and personal resources, is theorized to exist in the same way when depression is the dependent variable. Included in the analyses are regressions with depression regressed on strain and then strain and personal resources to tap this dimension of the theory.

In the second set of analyses, I regress measures of Crime/Delinquency and Drug Use on age, gender, family income, strain, negative affect, and personal resources. In this section of the analyses, I explore the main contentions of Strain Theory that strain has a positive relationship with delinquency and drug use through its effect on the mediating variable of negative affective states (anger). According to the theory, strain leads to anger, which then predisposes individuals to crime/delinquency and drug use. This relationship is theorized to exist even when controlling for personal resources. In separate analyses, I regress delinquency and then drug use on 1) strain and anger, 2) strain, anger, and personal resources. The analyses were duplicated

with depression replacing anger as the negative affective component of the theory. The results of the bi-variate correlations and regression analysis are presented below.

Bi-variate Correlations

Results of the bi-variate correlations of the theoretical variables utilized in the research revealed that Age was significantly correlated to Gender (-.149), Parental punitiveness (.086), Family financial strain (.088), and Attractiveness (-.103) at the .05 level of significance. Goal strain (.169), abuse (.134), and social support (-.150) were significant at the .01 level. Gender was significantly correlated to Family Income (-.098), Abuse ((.085), and Attract (.086) at the .05 level of significance. Negative life events (.119), Anger (-.13), Self-esteem (-.11), Support (.144), Delinquency (-.34),and Drug Use (-19) were all significant at the .01 level. Race was significantly correlated with Family turmoil (.092), Anger (.109), Depression (.111), and Support (-.105) at the .05 level. Family income (-.25), Parental punitiveness (.120), Family financial strain (.169), and Self-esteem (.128) were significant at the .01 level.

Family Income was significantly correlated with Family turmoil (-.111), Parental punitiveness (.092), and Atrractiveness (-089) at the .05 level. Negative life events (-.12), Family financial strain (-.36), Abuse (-.21), and Support (.179) were significant at the .01 level. Goals strain was significantly correlated with Family turmoil (.110), Financial strain (.195), and Delinquency (.090) at the .05 level. Attractiveness (.169), Anger (.158), Depression (.200), Self-esteem (-.38), and Support (-.16) were all significant at the .01 level. Negative life events were significantly correlated with Anger (.132) at the .05 level of significance. Parental

punitveness (.126), Financial strain (.124), Abuse (.148), and Depression (.114) were significant at the .01 level.

Family turmoil was significantly related to Parental punitiveness (.433), Financial strain (.262), Abuse (.228), Attractiveness (.289), Anger (.216), Depression (.218), Self-esteem (-.20), and Delinquency (.160) at the .01 level of significance. Parental punitiveness was significantly correlated with Financial strain (.161), Abuse (.181), Attractiveness (.210), Anger (.159), Depression (.222), Self-esteem (-.13), Support (-.33), and Delinquency (.175) all at the .01 level. Family financial strain was significantly correlated to Abuse (.188), Attractiveness (.130), Anger (.138), Depression (.236), Self-esteem (-.12), Support (-.18), and Delinquency (.117) at the .01 level.

The data further revealed that Abuse was significantly correlated with Attractiveness (.141), Anger (.143), Depression (.156), Self-esteem (-.19), and Social support (-.21) at the .01 level. Drug Use was significant at the .05 level. Attractiveness was significantly correlated to Depression (.330) at the .05 level and Self-esteem (-.40) and Support (-.13) at the .01 level. Anger was correlated to Depression (.146), Self-esteem (-.16), Delinquency (.332), and Drug use (.182) all at the .01 level.

Results of the bi-variate analysis for the remaining variables revealed that Depression was significantly correlated with Self-esteem (-.27) and Support (-.16) at the .01 level. Mastery was correlated with Self-esteem (.299) and Drug use (.140) at the .01 level. Delinquency (.099) was significant at the .05 level. Self-esteem correlated strongly with Social support (.199) at the .01 level. Conventional social

support was positively related to Delinquency (.14) at the .01 level and Delinquency was significantly correlated with Drug Use (.452) at the .01 level.

Hypothesis 1 & Hypothesis 2

In the first set of analyses, I tested the contention that strain will have a different effect on negative affective states by race. The results revealed that were no differences in the effect of strain on negative affect by race. For whites, gender (*B*= -.166, p≤ .001), negative life events (*B*= .106, p≤ .05), the presence of family turmoil (*B*= .137, p≤ .01), and abuse (*B*= .104, p≤ .05) were all significantly related to anger. For blacks, nothing was significant when regressing anger on the strain measures. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on negative life events (t = 1.13, p >.05), family turmoil (t = 1.52, p >05), and abuse (t = -.34, p >05) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 32 revealed no significant differences between the groups.

When personal resources (self-esteem, mastery, and support) were added to the analyses, gender (*B*= -.190, p≤ .001), family turmoil (*B*= .128, p≤ .05), parental punitiveness (*B*= .109, p≤ .05), and self-esteem (*B*= -.132, p≤ .05) were significantly related to anger for whites. Gender, family turmoil and parental punitiveness increased feelings of anger while self-esteem significantly decreased feelings of anger for whites. Again, for blacks none of the independent variables were significantly related to feelings of anger. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on family turmoil (t = 1.78, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), Parental punitiveness (t = .207, p >.05), and self-esteem (t = .29, p >.05) revealed that family turmoil was significant. Family turmoil had a stronger effect on anger for whites than blacks.

In the second set of analyses, I repeated the preceding regression, this time using depression as the dependent variable. When depression was regressed on measures of strain, for whites, goal strain (B= .103, p≤ .05), family financial strain (B= .130, p≤ .01), abuse (B= .095, p≤ .05), and attractiveness (B= .287, p≤ .001) were all significant. High scores on the strain measures significantly increased feelings of depression. For blacks, only goal strain (B= .393, p≤ .05) was significantly related to feelings of depression. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on goals strain (t = -1.81, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), family financial strain (t = .080, p >.05), abuse (t = 3.18, p ≤.001, 1-tailed), and feelings of attractiveness (t = .615, p >.05) revealed that goal strain and abuse were significant. Goal strain had a stronger effect on depression for blacks than whites. The presence of abuse had a stronger effect on depression for whites than blacks.

When variables tapping personal resources were added, family financial strain (B= .11, p≤ .05), attractiveness (B= .252, p≤ .001), and self-esteem (B= -.125, p≤ .05) were significant for whites. Family financial strain and feelings of unattractiveness significantly increased feelings of depression while scores on self-esteem significantly reduce feelings of depression. When depression was regressed on strain and personal resources for blacks only, none of the independent variables were significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on family financial strain (t = .59, p >.05), attractiveness (t = .28, p >.05), and self-esteem (t = .14, p >.05) revealed no significant differences between the groups. Findings from the preceding analyses revealed partial support for hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2.

[Table 32 About Here]

Hypothesis 3

In hypothesis 3, I explore the relationship between crime/delinquency, measures of strain, and negative affect. My contention was that there would be differences in the role of strain and negative affect on delinquency/crime by race. Results of the analysis regressing crime/delinquency on strain and anger revealed that for whites, age (B= -.100, p≤ .05), gender (B= - .350, p≤ .001), goal strain (B= .100, p≤ .05), and anger (B= .194, p≤ .001) were all significantly related in the expected directions (see Table 33). Gender, high on goal strain and feelings of anger significantly increased the likelihood that the individual would respond with criminal or delinquent coping responses. For blacks, again gender (B= -.410, p≤ .001), goal strain (B= - .347, p≤ .05), and anger (B= .418, p≤ .01) were significant. Interestingly, goal strain was negatively related to crime and delinquency. For blacks, feelings of goal strain decreased the likelihood of criminal and delinquent responses. This issue will be further explored in the discussion section of this paper. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on goal strain (t = 1.77, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), and anger (t = -1.59, p >05) revealed that only goal strain differed significantly between the groups. Given that the directions of the relationships were different by race, this was not unexpected.

When depression was used as the negative affect variable, for whites, gender (B= -.387, p≤ .001) and goal strain (B= .107, p≤ .05) remained significant. For blacks, only gender (B= -.452, p≤ .01) was significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on goal strain (t = 1.79, p ≤.05, 1-tailed),

derived from differences on this variable found in Table 33 revealed significant differences between the groups. Goals strain had a significantly different effect on delinquency for whites than blacks.

When both anger and depression were added to the analysis, for whites, age (B= -.097, p≤ .05), being female (B= -.353, p≤ .001), goal strain (B= .094, p≤ .05), and anger (B= .191, p≤ .001) remained significant. When both measures of negative affect were run simultaneously in the analysis for blacks, being female (B= -.403, p≤ .01), parental punitiveness (B= .332, p≤ .05) and anger (B= .465, p≤ .001) were significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on goal strain (t = 1.78, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), anger (t = -2.00, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), and parental punitiveness (t = -1.57, p >.05) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 33 revealed that goal strain and anger were significant. Goal strain had a different effect on delinquency/crime for whites and blacks. In contrast, anger had a significantly stronger effect on delinquency/crime for blacks than whites.

The results of the analysis revealed partial support for hypothesis 3. The effect of strain and negative affective states on measures of crime and delinquency differed by race. Particularly, goal strain and anger differed in its association with delinquency/crime for the respective groups.

[Table 33 About Here]

Hypothesis 4

In hypothesis 4, I tested the contention that the effect of strain, controlling for negative affect and personal resources, on crime and delinquency would differ by race. When crime/delinquency was regressed on strain, anger, and personal resources,

the results revealed that for whites, age (B= .098, p≤ .05), gender (B= -.368, p≤ .05) and anger (B= .174, p≤ .001) were significant. For blacks, gender (B= -.319, p≤ .05), parental punitiveness (B= .361, p≤ .05), self-esteem (B= .679, p≤ .001), and anger (B= .502, p≤ .001) were significant (see Table 34). Interestingly, self-esteem was significant in a positive direction. High levels of self-esteem significantly increased the likelihood of responding to strain with crime and delinquency for blacks. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on parental punitiveness (t = -1.90, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), self-esteem (t = -4.40, p ≤.001, 1-tailed), and anger (t = -2.63, p ≤.001, 1-tailed) revealed that they were all significantly different for the groups. Parental punitiveness, self-esteem, and anger were related differently to delinquency/crime for blacks than whites. Parental punitiveness and anger had greater effects for blacks and self-esteem was positively related again to delinquency/crime.

When depression was included in the analysis as the measure of negative affect, for whites, gender (B= -.404, p≤ .001) was the only independent variable significantly related to crime/delinquency. For blacks, gender (B= -.432, p≤ .01), parental punitiveness (B= .399, p≤ .05), family financial strain (B= .354, p≤ .05), and self-esteem (B= .561, p≤ .001) were significantly related to crime and delinquency. Again self-esteem was positive and significantly related to crime/delinquency. The results of the analysis tend to support the contention of hypothesis 4. Racial differences exist in the effect of strain, negative affect, and personal resources on measures of crime/delinquency. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on parental punitiveness (t = -1.73, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), family financial strain

(t = -1.20, p >05), and self-esteem (t = -3.16, p ≤ .001, 1-tailed) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 34 revealed that punitiveness and self-esteem were significantly different between the groups.

[Table 34 About Here]

Composite Strain and Interaction Terms

When the composite strain measure and interaction terms of composite strain by personal resources (self-esteem, mastery, social support) were added individually to the analysis, for whites, gender (*B*= -.370, p≤ .001), composite strain (*B*= .107, p ≤ .05), and anger (*B*= .178, p≤ .001) were all significantly related to delinquency/crime. These findings tend to support Agnew (1992). The model for blacks revealed that gender (*B*= -.348, p≤ .01), composite strain (*B*= .570, p ≤.001), self-esteem (*B*= .794, p≤ .001, and anger (*B*= .422, p≤ .001) were all significant (see Table 35). A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on composite strain (t = -3.36, p ≤.001, 1-tailed), anger (t = -2.20, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), and self-esteem (t = -5.50, p ≤.001, 1-tailed) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 35 revealed that they all significantly differed between groups. Composite strain, self-esteem, and anger were all more strongly related to delinquency/crime for blacks than whites, with self-esteem having a positive relationship to delinquency/crime.

When the analysis was repeated using depression, for whites, gender (*B*= -.403, p≤ .001), and composite strain (*B*= .140, p≤ .01) remained significant. For blacks, gender (*B*= -.466, p≤ .001), composite strain (*B*= .739, p≤ .001), self-esteem (*B*= .695, p≤ .001, and mastery (*B*= -.370, p≤ .05) were significant. A comparison of

regression coefficients for the respective groups on composite strain (t = -3.93, p ≤.001, 1-tailed), mastery (t = 2.70, p ≤.001, 1-tailed), and self-esteem (t = -4.40, p ≤.001, 1-tailed) revealed significant differences between the groups. Composite strain and self-esteem were more strongly related to delinquency/crime for blacks but feelings of mastery were more strongly related to delinquency/crime for whites.

[Table 35 About Here]

When the composite strain and interaction term for composite strain by self-esteem were added to the analysis with all the other exogenous variables (excluding depression), for whites, gender (*B*= -.370, p≤ .001) and anger (*B*= .178, p≤ .001) were significant. The composite strain and the interaction term were not significantly related to delinquency/crime. Interestingly, the effect of the composite strain measure disappeared when the interaction term was added to the analysis. This suggests that self-esteem may have a conditional effect in the connection between strain and delinquency. For blacks, gender (*B*= -.311, p≤ .01), anger (*B*= .424, p≤ .001), and the interaction term (*B*= 2.50, p≤ .05) were all significant (see Table 36). Interestingly, the interaction term was positive and significant. This indicates that the effect of strain on delinquency increases when self-esteem is high among blacks. This finding is in direct contrast to the theoretical relationship hypothesized by Agnew (1992). According to the theory, strain interacts with the personal resource variables to provide constraint to delinquent coping. Strain should interact with self-esteem in that strain will have no effect on delinquency at higher levels of self-esteem. For blacks, just the opposite is occurring. The current findings tend to support the work of Anderson (1990). This will be discussed further in the discussion section of the

present research. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on anger (t = -2.35, p $\leq$.01, 1-tailed) and self-esteem interaction term (t= -2.19, p $\leq$ .05, 1-tailed) derived from differences on the variable found in Table 36 revealed that both significantly differed between the racial groups. Anger and the interaction term were more strongly related to delinquency/crime for blacks than whites.

When depression was added to the analysis, for whites, only gender (*B*= -.403, p$\leq$ .001) remained significant. For blacks, gender, (*B*= .-.430, p$\leq$ .001), mastery (*B*= -.326, p$\leq$ .05), depression (*B*= -.289, p$\leq$ .05), and the self-esteem interaction term (*B*= 2.59, p$\leq$ .05) were significantly related to delinquency/crime. The composite strain measure was not significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on mastery (t = 1.13, p >.05), self-esteem interaction term (t = 1.52, p >05), and depression (t = -.34, p >05) revealed none were significantly different between the groups.

[Table 36 About Here]

When the analysis was ran with the interaction term of composite strain by mastery included with the other control variables, for whites, gender (*B*= -.369, p$\leq$ .001) and anger (*B*= .177, p$\leq$ .001) were significant. For blacks, gender (*B*= -.349, p$\leq$ .001), self-esteem (*B*= .794, p$\leq$ .001), and anger (*B*= .422, p$\leq$ .001) were all significant. The composite and mastery interaction term were not significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on anger (t = -2.17, p $\leq$.05, 1-tailed), and self-esteem (t = -4.79, p $\leq$.001, 1-tailed) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 37 revealed significant differences

between the groups. Both anger and self-esteem were more strongly associated with delinquency/crime for blacks than whites.

When depression was added to the analysis, only gender (*B*= -.401, p≤ .001) remained significant for whites. For blacks, gender (*B*= -.466, p≤ .001) and self-esteem (*B*= .695, p≤ .001) remained significant. The composite and interaction term were not significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on self-esteem (t = -4.36, p ≤.001, 1-tailed) revealed significant differences exists between the groups. Self-esteem was more strongly associated with delinquency/crime for blacks than whites.

[Table 37 About Here]

When the interaction term for composite strain by social support was added to the analysis, for whites, gender (*B*= -.375, p≤ .001) and anger (*B*= .175, p≤ .001) were significantly related to delinquency/crime. For blacks, gender (*B*= -.341, p≤ .001), self-esteem (*B*= .785, p≤ .001), and anger (*B*= .423, p≤ .001) were significant. The composite and interaction term were not significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on anger (t = -2.22, p ≤.05, 1-tailed) and self-esteem (t= -5.43, p ≤.001, 1-tailed) revealed that significant differences exists between the groups. Again, both anger and self-esteem were more strongly related to delinquency/crime for blacks than whites.

When depression was included in the analysis, for whites, nothing was significant. For blacks, gender (*B*= -.456, p≤ .001), self-esteem (*B*= .671, p≤ .001), mastery (*B*= -.387, p≤ .05), and depression (*B*= -.296, p≤.05) were significantly related to delinquency/crime. Again, the composite and interaction term were not significant.

A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on mastery (t = 2.74, p $\leq$.001), self-esteem (t = -4.12, p $\leq$.001), and depression (t = 2.18, p $\leq$.05) revealed all significantly differed between the groups. Self-esteem, mastery, and depression were more strongly associated with measures of delinquency/crime for blacks than whites.

[Table 38 About Here]

Hypothesis 5

In the next sets of regression analyses, I analyzed the role of strain, negative affect, and personal resources in explaining self-reported drug use. The measure of drug use utilized in this research is marijuana use. This measure was used because it is the most relevant social construct of drug use typical of a college sample. Therefore, I included a measure of marijuana use to assess respondent's self-reported involvement in drug use.

In the first set of analyses, I regressed marijuana use on strain and negative affect states (anger and depression). When anger was input as the measure of negative affect, for whites, gender (*B*= -.175, p$\leq$ .001), goal strain (*B*= .113, p$\leq$ .05), and anger (*B*= .123, p$\leq$ .05) were all significantly related to marijuana use. For blacks, only gender (*B*= -.317, p$\leq$ .05) was significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on goal strain (t = .83, p >.05) and anger (t = .05, p >05) revealed no significant differences between the groups.

When depression was input as the measure of negative affect, for whites, gender (*B*= -.195, p$\leq$ .001), goal strain (*B*= .116, p$\leq$ .05), and abuse (*B*= .108, p$\leq$ .05) were significant. For blacks, gender (*B*= -.333, p$\leq$ .05) remained significant. A

comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on goal strain (t = .60, p >.05) and abuse (t = .45, p >05) revealed no significant differences between the groups.

When both anger and depression were included in the analysis, for whites, gender (*B*= -.172, p≤ .001), goal strain (*B*= .109, p≤ .05), and anger (*B*= .127, p≤ .05) were significant. For blacks, none of the independent variables were significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on goal strain (t = .51, p >.05), and anger (t = -.128, p >.05) revealed no significant differences between the groups. The contention of Hypothesis 5 was that the effect of strain and negative affect (anger) on marijuana use would differ by race. The results of the analysis of the data with respect to this contention fail to support the hypothesis when the analysis was run separately by race.

[Table 39 About Here]

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 contended that the effect of strain, negative affect, and personal resources on marijuana use would differ by race. The analysis revealed that for whites, gender (*B*= -.191, p≤ .05), anger (*B*= .102, p≤ .05), self-esteem (*B*= -.122, p≤ .001), and mastery (*B*= .141, p≤ .01) all had a significant effect. Interestingly, mastery operated in a direction unanticipated. Mastery had a significant positive effect on marijuana use. High feelings of mastery increased the likelihood of marijuana use among white males. For blacks, only the variable measuring social support (*B*= .539, p≤ .01) was significant. Social support networks for blacks increased the likelihood of marijuana use. This result will be further explored in the

discussion section of the research. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on anger (t = -.403, p >.05), self-esteem (t = -1.85, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), mastery (t = 1.00, p >05), and social support (t= -2.33, p ≤.01, 1-tailed) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 40 revealed significant differences between the groups on self-esteem and social support. Self-esteem was more strongly related to decreased marijuana use for whites while social support was more strongly related to increased marijuana use for blacks.

When depression was included in the analysis as the measure of negative affect, for whites, gender (*B*= -.208, p≤ .001), self-esteem (*B*= -.137, p≤ .05), and mastery (*B*= .143, p≤ .01) remained significant. For blacks, social support (*B*= .522, p≤ .05) remained positive and significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on self-esteem (t = -1.70, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), mastery (t = 1.15, p >.05), and social support (t = -2.00, p ≤.05, 1-tailed) revealed significant differences between the groups. Again, self-esteem was more negatively related to marijuana use for whites, and social support was more positively associated with marijuana use for blacks. There were no significant differences between the groups in the effects of mastery on marijuana use. Findings again support the main contention of hypothesis 6. Racial differences exist in the role of the independent variables in explaining involvement in drug use activities.

[Table 40 About Here]

Composite Strain and Interaction Terms

When the composite strain measure and interaction terms of composite strain by personal resources (self-esteem, mastery, social support) were added individually to

the analysis, with composite strain entered, for whites, gender (*B*= -.181, p≤ .001), self-esteem (*B*= -.125, p ≤ .05), mastery (*B*= .152, p≤ .01), and anger (*B*= .112, p≤ .05) were all significant. The model for blacks revealed that only social support (*B*= .397, p≤ .05) was significantly related to drug use. The composite strain measure was not significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on mastery (t = 1.39, p >.05), self-esteem (t = -2.21, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), anger (t = -.741, p >05), and social support (t= -2.17, p ≤.05, 1-tailed) revealed significant differences between the groups. Self-esteem was more strongly related to decreased drug use for whites, while social support was more strongly related to increased drug use for blacks. There were no significant differences between the groups on mastery and anger in the analysis.

When the analysis was repeated including depression, for whites, gender (*B*= -.197, p<.05), self-esteem (*B*= -.141, p<.05), and mastery (*B*= .157, p≤ .01) remained significant. For blacks, gender (B= -.331, p< .05) and social support (B= .350, p< .05) were significantly related to drug use. The composite measure of strain was not significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on mastery (t = 1.73, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), self-esteem (t = -1.98, p ≤.05, 1-tailed), and social support (t = -1.84, p ≤.05, 1-tailed) revealed significant differences between the groups. Mastery and self-esteem were more strongly related to marijuana use for whites, whereas social support was more strongly related to marijuana use for blacks.

[Table 41 About Here]

When the composite strain and interaction term for composite strain by self-esteem were added to the analysis with all the other exogenous variables (excluding depression), for whites, gender (B= -.180, p≤ .001), mastery (B= .156, p≤ .01), and anger (B= .115, p< .05) were significant. The composite strain and the interaction term were not significantly related to drug use. For blacks only support (B= .400, p≤ .05) was significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on mastery (t = 1.34, p >.05), anger (t = .072, p >05), and social support (t = -2.22, p ≤.05, 1-tailed) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 42 revealed one significant difference between the groups. Social support again was more strongly associated with marijuana use among blacks than whites.

When depression was added to the analysis, for whites, gender (B= -.196, p< .001) and mastery (B= .160, p≤ .01) were significant. For blacks, gender, (B= -.325, p< .05) and social support (B= .353, p≤ .05) were significantly related to drug use. The composite strain and the interaction term were not significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on mastery (t = 1.68, p ≤.05, 1-tailed) and social support (t = -1.76, p ≤.05, 1-tailed) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 42 revealed that both were significantly different between the groups. Mastery was more strongly associated with marijuana use for whites, and social support was more strongly associated with marijuana use for blacks.

[Table 42 About Here]

When the analysis was run with the interaction term of composite strain by mastery included with the other control variables, for whites, gender (B= -.185, p≤ .001), self-esteem (B= -.111, p≤ .05) and anger (B= .117, p≤ .05) were significant.

For blacks, gender (*B*= -.285, p≤ .05) and social support (*B*= .404, p≤ .05) were significant. The composite strain and the interaction term were not significantly related to drug use. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on self-esteem (t = -2.13, p ≤.05), anger (t = .614, p >.05), and social support (t = -2.17, p ≤.05) derived from differences on these variables revealed significant differences between the groups. Self-esteem was more strongly related to drug use for whites, and social support was more strongly related to marijuana use for blacks. Anger was not significant.

When depression was added to the analysis, gender (*B*= -.201, p≤ .001) and self-esteem (*B*= -.129, p≤.05) remained significant for whites. For blacks, gender (*B*= -.333, p≤ .05) and social support (*B*= .370, p≤ .05) remained significant. Again, the composite strain and the interaction term were not significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on self-esteem (t = -1.94, p ≤.05) and social support (t = -1.82, p ≤.05) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 43 revealed significant differences between the groups. Again, self-esteem was more strongly related to decreased drug use for whites, and social support was more strongly related to marijuana use for blacks.

[Table 43 About Here]

When the interaction term for composite strain by social support was added to the analysis, for whites, self-esteem (*B*= -.130, p ≤ .05), mastery (B= .159, p≤ .05), and anger (B= .099, p≤ .05) were significantly related to drug use when controlling for anger and personal resources. For blacks, only gender (*B*= -.298, p≤ .05) was significant. The composite strain and the interaction term were not significant. A

comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on self-esteem (t = -2.38, p $\leq$.01), anger (t = -.669, p >.05), and mastery (t = 1.34, p >.05) derived from differences on these variables found in Table 44 revealed one significant difference between the groups. Self-esteem was more strongly related to decreased marijuana use for blacks than whites.

When depression was included in the analysis, for whites, gender (*B*= -.190, p$\leq$ .001), self-esteem (*B*= -.146, p$\leq$ .01), and mastery (*B*= .164, p$\leq$ .001) were significantly related to drug use. For blacks, gender (*B*= -.347, p$\leq$ .05) remained significant. The composite strain and the interaction term were not significant. A comparison of regression coefficients for the respective groups on mastery (t = 1.60, p >.05) and self-esteem (t = -2.16, p $\leq$05, 1-tailed) revealed one significant difference between the groups. Again, self-esteem was more strongly related to decreased marijuana use for whites.

[Table 44 About Here]

Chapter Five
Discussion

Agnew (1992) argued that interpersonal strain predisposes the individual toward corrective action which may include involvement in delinquency/crime or drug use. He also stated that it may be the case that different types of strain are relevant to different subgroups in this process (Agnew 1992). The current research examined this contention where subgroups were defined by race. The results of this study are somewhat consistent with the view offered by strain theory (Agnew 1992). General Strain Theory predicts that interpersonal strain derived from negative relations with others will affect individual adaptations to the social environment (Agnew 1992). The adaptation chosen is said to be conditioned by such variables as personal resources and emotional response. I examined these contentions when the data were disaggregated by race. Interestingly, there were significant differences between groups on selected theoretical variables indicating that different types of strain and the role of the personal resources significantly differ in their association with negative affective states, delinquency/crime, and drug use for the groups.

The findings indicated that strain lead to negative affective emotional responses, in this study operationalized as anger and depression. In general, the strain variables used in this study worked better in predicting negative emotional responses for whites than blacks. In the study, I measured failure to achieve positively valued goals with the variable goals strain. The loss of positively valued stimuli was measured with the variable negative life events. The presence of negative or noxious stimuli was measured by including five separate variables, family turmoil, parental punitiveness, family financial strain, abuse, and feelings of unattractiveness. For whites, the loss

of positively valued stimuli, negative life events, and the presence of negative or noxious stimuli, family turmoil and parental punitveness, were linked to feelings of anger. Depression was most likely when there was the presence of negative or noxious stimuli for whites (family financial strain, the presence of abuse, and feelings of unattractiveness). Depression was most likely for blacks when there was the failure to achieve positively valued goals (goal strain). The personal resource variable, self-esteem, significantly reduced the effect of strain on both measures of negative affect for whites. This finding was consistent with the proposal of Agnew (1992) on the role of personal resources. Agnew (1992) stated that interpersonal strain increases the likelihood that individuals would experience one or more of a range of negative emotions. The findings of the present research support this contention, more so for whites than blacks, although goal strain was significantly related to depression among blacks but not whites. This underscores the need for further research on this area to more clearly understand the connection between strain and negative affective emotions for African Americans. It is highly likely that the data did not include measures of strain more likely to create negative affect in African Americans.

In the research, strain variables were created to capture the essence of those variables suggested by Agnew (1992). Goal strain in this study was measured as the disjunction between expectations and actual achievements. Agnew (1992) suggests that two additional sources of goal strain are also important; the disjuncture between aspirations and expectations and perceived just and fair outcomes. The limitations of the data precluded developing measures of these constructs. It is possible that the

inclusion of these measures might change the associations found for African Americans. It may also be entirely likely that the types of strain described by Agnew (1992) do not predict negative emotions for blacks. However, the research on African Americans suggests other types of strain that may be more relevant. Further research should be pursued in this area to better understand the connection between interpersonal strain and negative affect for blacks.

Future research might focus on measures of strain that tap feelings of just and fair outcomes (Agnew 1992; Thomas and Hughes 1986), macro-level variables associated with the character of the larger social environment (Agnew 1992), perceptions of race relations (Ogbu 1991, 2003), and beliefs about the rules defining appropriate responses to provocations (Anderson 1990, 1999). The medical sociology literature notes that feelings of emotional distress among African Americans are highly likely when a degree of felt inequity in relationships with others exists. It may be likely that a measure of strain that captures feelings of equity or inequity in relationships for African Americans might be a more appropriate predictor of negative affective emotions for the group. Thomas and Hughes (1986) suggest that even when controlling for socio-economic characteristics between whites and blacks, being black is still a significant determinant of psychological distress because of the prejudice and discrimination faced by blacks despite changes in attitudes and access to social resources afforded the group over the past forty years. Therefore, perceptions of inequity in social relationships may be an important influence on the emergence of negative affective states.

Agnew (1992) suggests that macro-levels variables associated with the larger social environment may affect the probability of delinquent versus non-delinquent coping by influencing the importance attached to selected goals, values, and identities. Agnew (1992) notes that among the urban poor, there is a strong emphasis placed on economics and status. There is stress placed on achieving these things by members of the community, and few alternative goals are emphasized. In such environments, the individuals have more difficulty cognitively minimizing the importance of such goals and, in turn, experience more distress. Therefore, measures capturing the importance of the community emphasis on money and status may be relevant for African Americans in understanding negative emotions.

Agnew (1992) also notes that the larger environment may affect the individual's sensitivity to particular strains by influencing the individual's beliefs regarding what is and what is not adverse. According to the subculture of violence thesis, urban black males learn at a young age that certain provocations or insults are highly adverse. Anderson (1990, 1999) notes that petty public insults among urban black males jockeying among one another for status can quickly escalate into violence because of the feeling of felt injury or loss of status that may accompany the insult in such highly fragile environments. Therefore, measures of felt injury due to insults could be important in understanding negative affect for African Americans.

Ogbu (1991, 2003) argues that feelings about race relations are important in understanding African American orientations. According to the argument, the history of race relations in American society has led to the evolution of an oppositional culture among African Americans that rejects mainstream values and behaviors.

Measures capturing the cultural frame of reference discussed by Ogbu (1991, 2003) could be important considerations also when examining the emergence of negative affect and its association with delinquency for the group.

Strain theory was somewhat supported when delinquency/crime and drug use were the dependent variables although the support was stronger for delinquency. Goal strain and measures of the presence of negative or noxious stimuli had significant direct effects on delinquency when controlling for anger. It is interesting to note that in the first regression of crime and delinquency on strain and anger, the goal strain variable was negatively related to delinquency for blacks. Goal strain was positive, suggesting that failure to achieve positively valued goals was significantly more likely to lead to delinquency for whites than blacks. For blacks, this is probably a consequence of the research sample. African Americans in college are aspiring to middle class status and have adopted the values and habits requisite for social success. Goal strain is viewed as a natural feature of their social struggle to attain middle-class status and therefore is less likely to engender corrective action in the form of delinquency/crime.

Another noteworthy finding was that the effect of goal strain on delinquency for both groups disappeared when the personal resource variables were introduced. This finding was consistent with Agnew's (1992) suggestions. The personal resource variables mediated the effect of strain on delinquency.

In the study, anger also increased involvement in delinquency net of the effects of the other exogenous variables for both groups. It is important to note that when the dependent variable was delinquency, the strain model with the inclusion of anger

worked better for blacks than whites. This indicates that angry emotional feelings had a stronger effect on delinquency for blacks. Interestingly, the strain variables were not predictors of negative emotions for blacks when anger and depression were dependent variables. This strongly suggests a failure to capture the types of strain that lead to negative emotions for blacks.

Depression was not significantly related to delinquency/crime for either group. The findings were consistent with Agnew's (1992) suggestions. Negative emotions other than anger were theorized to be less likely to lead to delinquency/crime. Delinquency is one of many coping responses individuals may exhibit as a response to interpersonal strain and its negative emotional consequence.

Also consistent with the Agnew's assumptions was the role of personal resources. The when the analysis was conducted controlling for personal resources, strain no longer had an affect on delinquency for whites. It is noteworthy that for blacks the personal resource variable of self-esteem operated contrary to Agnew's (1992) theoretical expectations. Self-esteem was positively related to involvement in delinquency/crime net the effect of the other variables. This will be discussed in greater depth later in this section.

Also for blacks, the inclusion of the personal resource variables in the regression of crime/delinquency on the strain and negative affect variables was noteworthy. In the model with anger as a measure of negative affect, parental punitiveness had a positive and significant effect once the personal resource variables were introduced. When depression was used as the measure of negative affect, financial strain became significant. This lends support to the arguments of Anderson (1990, 1999) and Ogbu

(1991, 2003). For African Americans, interpersonal strain leads to delinquency and crime because of culturally-determined oppositional identities (Ogbu 1991, 2003). According to the argument, the identity of African Americans is shaped by the rejection of conventional society and behavior and the acceptance of values and habits that are in direct contrast (Anderson 1990, 1999; Ogbu 1991, 2003). There is also a cultural expectation that as a members of the group, other African Americans will support and defend this particular way of life. Thus, among African Americans, the community supports involvement in activities that are in direct contrast to the expectations of the larger environment. Personal resources do not mediate the effects of the strain experienced by African Americans in American society. They may instead amplify the need for corrective action geared toward the rejection of mainstream values, behaviors, and institutions. Therefore, the findings in the research that strain and personal resources were positive and significantly related to delinquency but negatively related to each other tend to support the contentions that there may be cultural attributes or cultural frames of reference that are important in understanding African American involvement in delinquency and crime.

Finally, it is also interesting that the data reveal that the independent measures of strain did not directly predict delinquency as well as the composite measure of strain. This finding was not unanticipated. Agnew (1992) argues that the cumulative effect of strain on delinquency is much stronger than the individual effect of particular stressors. The statistically significant findings for the composite measure of strain support this argument. The measure of composite strain had a positive and significant effect on delinquency/crime across groups.

The analysis of General Strain Theory on reported involvement in drug use as measured by marijuana use also confirmed some of Agnew's hypothesized relationships, although only for whites. Particulary, goal strain, the presence of abuse, and anger all predicted drug use in the expected directions. Interestingly, mastery for whites operated contrary to Agnew's (1992) theoretical assumptions. Feelings of mastery or control over one's life among whites increased involvement in marijuana use. This indicates that feelings of being in control may allow people to rationalize their use of drugs. Among African Americans, the personal resource variable of social support was positively associated with marijuana use contrary to theoretical expectations on the role of personal resources in mediating the effect of strain on drug use. Again, according to Ogbu (1991, 2003) and Anderson (1990, 1999) the culture of African Americans would support behavior such as drug use. Therefore it was anticipated that personal resources could operate contrary to the expectations of the theory according their studies of the black community.

When the composite measure of strain and the interaction terms of composite strain by personal resources were included in the analysis consistent with Agnew's (1992) recommendations, the analysis failed to confirm the hypothesized relationships between the variables. Composite strain and anger significantly increased involvement in delinquency but not drug use across groups, net of the effect of the other variables. Interestingly, for blacks, social support remained positive and significant with the inclusion of the composite measure. For whites, mastery remained positively related to drug use, while self-esteem was negatively related.

Agnew (1992) argued that strain interacts with the personal resources to reduce the effects of strain on delinquency/crime and drug use. Interpersonal strain under high availability of personal resources should have a decreased effect on the dependent variable. In the research, the only significant interaction term in explaining delinquency was composite strain by self-esteem for blacks. The relationship again was contrary to the expectations of General Strain Theory (Agnew 1992). Composite strain interacted with self-esteem to increase involvement in delinquency/crime although this did not hold true for drug use. All other interaction terms were not significant. This is somewhat in keeping with the contentions of Ogbu (1991, 2003) and Anderson (1990, 1999). Personal resources condition the impact of strain on delinquency by increasing the effect rather than decreasing the effect. Also of note is the fact that the amount of explained variance in the model for delinquency increased for blacks with the inclusion of the self-esteem interaction term. This illuminates the need for further research in this area with respect to the utility of theory in explaining the role of the mediating variables for African Americans.

When comparing the regression coefficients for the respect groups in this study in an attempt to uncover possible differences between the groups in the role of the independent variables on the dependent variables, the results revealed that significant differences exist between the groups on selected variables. For whites, family turmoil was more strongly associated with anger, goal strain and abuse with depression, feelings of mastery with drug use and delinquency when controlling for composite strain, and depression with drug use when controlling for composite stain and the self-esteem interaction term. For blacks, anger, parental punitiveness, self-esteem,

composite strain, and the self-esteem interaction term were all more strongly related to delinquency/crime. Social support had a positive and significant relationship with involvement with drug use for African Americans. These findings underscore Agnew's argument that different types of strain may be relevant for different subgroups. The results of the present research reveal that there are different processes that are relevant in understanding the difference in propensities to engage in delinquency and drug use by whites and blacks. A comparison of the findings with respect to their utility in explaining self-reported involvement in delinquency and drug use by the respective groups further shows that the component of the theory concerning the relationship between negative affect and deviance works better for blacks in the sample than for whites. For blacks anger, parental punitiveness, and composite strain all showed significantly stronger effects on delinquency and drug use for the group compared to whites. However, the measures of strain, when considered individually, were better able to predict anger in whites than in blacks. Finally, the strain model was better able to predict delinquency than drug use for both groups.

Chapter Six
Implications and Policy Recommendations

The findings of the current research provide some support of the main contentions of General Strain Theory as proposed by Robert Agnew (1992). Strain is related to delinquency/crime through negative affective states. Specifically, strain has an increased effect on delinquency/crime and drug use in the presence of anger. Despite these findings, one thing must be noted. The measures of strain utilized in this study were not significantly related to negative affective emotions for blacks when the analysis was deconstructed to examine the role of strain in the production of such emotions. Future research could examine more appropriate measures of strain for African Americans in attempting to uncover those influences appropriate in understanding negative affective emotions. The work of Elijah Anderson (1990, 1999) and and John Ogbu (1991, 2003) provides ample information from which further research on this issue could proceed. Thus, the goal of further research would be focused on those factors associated with strain among African Americans that are most important in influencing negative affective states.

In the area of social policy, the current research can be used to tailor social policy so that the policies designed to alleviate delinquency/crime accurately reflect the causes of such behaviors for respective ethnic groups. The current research indicates that for both blacks and whites, strain derived from failure to achieve positively valued goals (except for blacks), loss of positive stimuli, and the presence of negative stimuli all increase norm or law-violating behavior in the presence of anger. Social policy then should be developed and geared toward alleviating such sources of strain

and frustration or at the least, implemented in such a way that individuals are taught to more constructively deal with such problems encountered in everyday life.

Furthermore, social policy geared toward the African American community should embrace teaching and training youth to move beyond the "oppositional frame of reference" or "code of the streets" and aspire to become a part of the larger social environment. Such training and mentorship of black youth may have a significant impact on changing their psychological and behavioral orientations to life which would lead to decreased emphasis placed on rebellion and more emphasis placed on legitimate avenues and opportunities for social success.

Finally, more research is needed in the field of criminology in examining the utility of the various theories in explaining collective differences between racial groups in involvement in delinquency/crime and drug use. Even though the current research lends moderate support to General Strain Theory as an explanation of delinquency/crime, it is obvious that within the theory different processes are at play in explaining involvement in such behaviors by the respective groups. Further criminological research with data disaggregated by race would enhance the knowledge of the field of criminology by more accurately depicting the variables of importance in understanding collective differences in delinquent/criminal involvement by race. This information could then be subsequently used to further implement social policies and the development of community organizations designed to alleviate the existence of delinquency, crime, and drug use within the United States.

Bibliography

Agnew, R. 1992. Foundation for a General Strain Theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology* 30: 47-87.

-------- 1995. Testing the Leading Crime Theories: An Alternative Strategy Focusing on *Motivational Processes*. 32:363-398

-------- 1985. A revised Strain Theory of Delinquency. *Social Forces* 64: 151-167

-------- 1999. A General Strain Theory of Community differences in Crime Rates. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 36:123-155.

-------- and Timothy Brezina. 1997. Relational problems with peers, gender, and delinquency. *Youth and Society* V29.

-------- and Helene Raskin White. 1992. An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory. *Criminology* 30: 475-498.

Akers, R. and John Cochran. 1985. Adolescent Marijuana use: A test of Three Theories of Deviant Behavior. *Deviant Behavior* 6:323-346.

Anderson, Elijah. 1990. *Streetwise: Race, Class, and Change in an Urban Community*.Chicago, Ill. The University of Chicago Press.

---------. 1999. *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*. New York, NY. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Arneklev, B., H Grasmick, C.R. Tittle, R Bursik. 1993. Low Self-control and Imprudent Behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 9:225-247.

Averil, J. 1983. Studies on Anger and Aggression: Implications for theories of Emotion. *American Psychologist.* November 1983: 1145-1160.

Bernard, Thomas. 1984. Control Criticisms of Strain Theories: An Assessment of Theoretical and Empirical Adequacy. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 21: 353- 372.

------- 1987. Testing Structural Strain Theories. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 24: 262-290.

Braithwaite, J. 1989. *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

-------- 1981. The Myth of Social Class and Criminality Reconsidered. American *Sociological Review* 46:36-57.

Brezina, T. 1998. Adolescent Maltreatment and Delinquency: The question of Intervening Processes. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 35:71-99.

-------- 1996. Adapting to Strain: An Examination of Delinquent Coping Responses. *Criminology* 34:39-60.

Broidy, Lisa. 2001. A Test of General Strain Theory. *Criminology* 39:9-35.

Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1997* (Washington D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1997)

-------. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1994* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994)

Bursik, Robert, and Harold Grasmick. 1992. *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control.* New York, Ny Lexington.

-------- and Robert Agnew. 1997. Gender and Crime: A General Strain Theory Perspective. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34:275-306.

Cernkovich, S. and P. Giordano. 1979. Delinquency, Opportunity, and Gender. *Criminology* 70:145-151

Cohen, Albert K. 1955. *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*. New York, NY. The Free Press. Macmillan Publishing Company.

Cloward, Richard. 1959. Illegitimate Means, Anomie, and Delinquent Behavior. *American Sociological Review* 24:164-176.

--------- and L. Ohlin. 1960. *Delinquency and Opportunity*. New York, Ny: The Free Press.

Crutchfield, Robert. 1995. *Ethnicity, Labor Markets and Crime. Excert from Ethnicity,Race, and Crime: Perspectives Across Time and Place.* Darnell Hawkins, Editor. Albany, NY. State University of NewYork Press.

Currie, Elliot. 1985. *Confronting Crime*. New York, NY. Pantheon.

Dunaway, R. Gregory and Francis T. Cullen, Velmer S.Burton Jr., T. David Evans. 2000. The Myth of Social Class and Crime Revisited: An Examination of Class and Adult Criminality. *Criminology* 38:589-631.

Durkheim, Emile. 1951. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology.* New York, NY. Free Press. (originally published in 1897).

----------. 1947. *The Division of Labor in Society.* New York, NY. Free Press. (originally published in 1893)

Felson, Marcus. 1998. *Crime and Everyday Life*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA Pine Forge Press.

Gibson, Margaret A. and John U. Ogbu. 1991. *Minority Status and Schooling: A Comparative Study of Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities.* Garland Publishing, Inc. New York & London.

Hawkins, Darnell F. 1995. *Ethnicity, Race, and Crime: Perspectives Across Time and Place.* Darnell Hawkins, Editor. Albany, NY. State University of New York Press.

Hoffman, John and S. Susan Su. 1997. The Conditional Effects of Stress on Delinquency and Drug use: A Strain Theory Assessment of Sex Differences. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34:46-78.

LaFree, Gary. 1995. *Race and Crime Trends in the United States, 1946-1990. Excert from Ethnicity, Race, and Crime: Perspectives Across Time and Place.* Darnell Hawkins, Editor. Albany, NY. State University of New York Press.

Mann, Coramae Richey and Marjorie S. Zatz. 1998. *Images of Color, Images of Crime.* Los Angeles, Ca: Roxbury Publishing Company.

------- 1995. *The Contribution of Institutional Racism to Minority Crime. Excert from Ethnicity, Race, and Crime: Perspectives Across Time and Place.* Darnell Hawkins, Editor. Albany, NY. State University of New York Press.

Marger, Martin M. 2003. *Race and Ethnic Relations: American and Global Perspectives.* 6th ed. Belmont, CA. Wadsworth /Thomson Learning.

Massey, Douglass S. and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, England.

Mazerolle, Paul. 1998. Gender, General Strain, and Delinquency: An Empirical Examination. *Justice Quarterly* 15:65-91.

McCord, Joan. 1995. Excert from *Ethnicity, Race, and Crime: Perspectives Across Time and Place.* Darnell Hawkins, Editor. Albany, NY. State University of New York Press.

McCord, William and Jose Sanchez. 1983. The Treatment of Deviant Children: A Twenty-Five Year Follow-Up Study. Crime and Delinquency 29:239-251.

Merton, Robert. 1957. *Social Structure and Anomie.* New York: Free Press

Messner, Steven F. 1988. "Merton's Social Structure and Anomie" The Road Not Taken. *Deviant Behavior* 9:33-53.

Ogbu, John U., 2003, *Black American Students in an Affluent Suburb: A study of Academic Disengagement.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Mahwah, New Jersey.

Paternoster, Raymond, and Raul Mazerolle. 1994. General Strain Theory and Delinquency: A replication and Extension. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 31:235-262.

Sampson, Robert J. 1987. Urban Black Violence: The Effect of Male Joblessness and Family Disruption. *American Journal of Sociology* 2:348-382.

Sharp, Susan F. and Toni Terling-Watt, Leslie Atkins, Jay Trace Gilliam, Anna Sanders. 2001. *Deviant Behavior.*

Tausig, Mark and Janet Michello, Sree Subedi. 1999. *A Sociology of Mental Illness.* Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.

Thomas, Melvin E. and Michael Hughes. "The Continuing Significance of Race: A Study of Race, Class, and Quality of Life in America, 1972-1985." *American Sociological Review*, 50, no. 6 (December 1986): 830-841.

Tittle, Charles and Robert Meier. 1990. Specifying the SES/Delinquency Relationship. *Criminology* 28:271-299.

------ and Wayne J. Vellemez, Douglas A. Smith. 1978. The Myth of Social Class and Criminality: An Empirical Assessment of the Empirical Evidence. *American Sociological Review* 4:643-656.

Traub, Stuart H. and Craig B. Little. 1994. *Theories of Deviance.* Fourth Edition. Itasca, Ill. F.E. Peacock Publishers Inc.

Turner, Jonathan H. and Leonard Beeghley, Charles H. Powers. 1998. *The Emergence of Sociological Theory. 4th ed.* Belmont, CA. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Walker, Samuel, and Cassia Spohn, Miriam Delone. 2000. *The Color of Justice: Race,Ethnicity, and Crime in America.* Belmont, Ca. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Waters, Mary C. 1999. *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, England.

West, Cornell. 1993. *Race Matters.* Boston, MA Beacon.

Wilson, William Julius. 1980. *The Declining Significance of Race: Blacks and Changing American Institutions. 2nd ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

-------. 1987. *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, The Underclass, and Public Policy.* Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

-------. 1996. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor.* New York, NY. Vintage Books.

Woodson, Carter G. 1990. *The Mis-Education of the Negro.* Trenton, NJ. Africa World Press, Inc.

Tables

Table 1. Demographic Variables

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Age		
18	123	21.50
19	231	40.50
20	118	20.70
21	48	8.40
22	24	4.20
23	14	2.50
24	6	1.10
25	7	1.20
Race		
Black	74	13.00
White	497	87.00
Gender		
Female	328	57.40
Male	241	42.20
Parental Income		
Less than 15,000	32	5.60
15,000 to 29,000	52	9.10
30,000 to 44,999	110	19.30
45,000 to 59,999	96	16.80
60,000 or over	264	46.20

Table 2. Failure to Achieve Positively Valued, Goals

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Goals		
Academic or Career goals (ACGOAL)	1.98	0.83
Social/Family goals (SFGOAL)	2.00	0.79
Athletic goals (ATGOAL)	2.17	1.02
Money goals (MGOAL)	2.65	0.82

Table 3. (Goals)

Variable	Communality	Factor	Eigenvalue	Per. Of Var	Cum. Pct
1	1	1	1.868	46.688	46.688

Table 4. Goals (Goals)

Variable	Factor 1
1	0.704
2	0.758
3	0.608
4	0.653

Cronbach's alpha .6063

Table 5. Loss of positively valued stimuli (NEGEVNT)

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Negative events		
Parents divorce	1.53	0.93
Loss of a family member through death	2.62	1.17
Loss of friend(s) through death	2.03	1.24
Family members moved away	1.82	1.01
I moved away from friends or family	1.93	1.12
Close friend(s) moved away	2.14	1.11

Table 6. Presence of Negative Stimuli

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Family Turmoil		
My parents fight a lot	1.45	1.22
My parents blow their tops when I bother them	1.45	.800
My parents argue with each other	1.92	1.02
My parents get cross and angry over little things	1.81	1.02
My parent(s) complain about me	1.48	0.85

Table 7. Principal Component Analysis (FTURMOIL)

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance
1	2.959	59.173

Table 8. Factor Analysis (FTURMOIL)

Variable	Factor 1
1	0.685
2	0.757
3	0.819
4	0.854
5	0.719

Cronbach's alpha = .8167

Table 9. Presence of Negative Stimuli

Variables*	Mean	Std. Deviation
Parental Punitiveness		
My parents were very strict	1.83	0.87
I was not allowed to express my own opinion at home	1.47	0.85
I was not allowed to go out with some of my friends	1.57	0.90
My parents try to control what I do	1.79	1.00

*** Codes are as follows: 4 = very bothered, 3 = somewhat bothered, 2 = not bothered very much, 1 = not bothered at all**

Table 10. Principle Components Analysis (PPUN)

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance
1	2.393	59.832

Table 11. Factor Analysis (PPUN)

Variable	Factor 1
1	0.811
2	0.774
3	0.805
4	0.698

Cronbach's alpha = .7712

Table 12. Presence of negative stimuli

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Family Financial Strain		
Family experiencing financial difficulties	2.24	1.10
Parents could not afford to get me some of the things I wanted	1.90	0.88
My parents can never afford to buy me the kind of clothes I want	1.27	0.59

Table 13. (FFS) Principle Components Analysis

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance
1	1.933	64.426

Table 14. Factor Analysis (FFS)

Variable	Factor 1
1	0.842
2	0.880
3	0.671

Cronbach's alpha = .7079.

Table 15. Presence of Negative Stimuli

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Abuse		
I was physically abused	1.13	0.54
I was sexually abused	1.17	0.64

Table 16. Presence of Negative Stimuli

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Attractiveness		
I think I am not good looking	1.77	0.94
I feel I am unpopular with the opposite sex	1.76	0.96

Table 17. Mastery / Self-esteem Means, Standard Deviations

#	Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	*There is no way I can solve some of the problems I have.	3.18	0.82
2	I can do just about anything I really set my mind to.	3.43	0.59
3	What happens to me in the future depends mostly on me.	3.49	0.59
4	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others	3.5	0.55
5	*All in all, I'm inclined to feel that I am a failure	3.65	0.56
6	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	3.33	0.6
7	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	3.21	0.67
8	*I certainly feel useless at times.	3	0.83
9	*There's no sense in planning alot - if something good is going to happen, it will.	2.76	0.78
10	I am responsible for my own successes.	3.42	0.61
11	My misfortunes are the result of mistakes I have made.	2.93	0.68
12	I am responsible for my failures.	3.13	0.58
13	*Most of my problems are due to bad breaks.	2.98	0.63
	* indicates that items were recoded. High scores indicate mastery/ self-esteem		

Table 18. (MASTERY) (SESTEEM) Principle Components Analysis

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance
1	3.900	30.001
2	1.804	13.878

Table 19. Factor analysis Mastery / Self-esteem Items

#	Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2
1	1	0.511	
2	2	0.625	0.337
3	3	0.36	0.645
4	4	0.656	
5	5	0.715	
6	6	0.67	
7	7	0.754	
8	8	0.669	
9	9		
10	10	0.349	0.574
11	11		0.735
12	12		0.773
13	13		

Alpha / Mastery= .6604 Alpha/ Self-esteem=.8158

Table 20. Social Support

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Social Support		
Seek advice or confidence in your parents?	2.83	0.96
Feel your parents give you care and attention?	3.63	0.73
Feel wanted by your parents?	3.75	0.66

Table 21. Principle Components Analysis (SUPPORT)

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance
1	2.077	69.249

Table 22. Factor Analysis (SUPPORT)

Variable	Factor 1
1	
2	0.921
3	0.867

Cronbach's alpha = .8510

Table 23. Anger

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Anger		
Blow up	2.07	0.86
Take it out on others	1.40	0.69
Take it out on things	1.50	0.78

Table 24. (ANGER) Principle Components Analysis

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance
1	1.859	61.972

Table 25. Factor Analysis (ANGER)

Variable	Factor 1
1	0.762
2	0.818
3	0.781

Cronbach's alpha = .6858

Table 26. Depression

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Depression		
Withdraw	2.85	0.94
Shutdown	2.01	1.00

Cronbach's alpha = .6575

Table 27. Delinquency/Crime Means, Standard Deviations

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Delinquency		
Break into a building to look for something to steal or to steal something?	.031	.180
Steal or try to steal a motor vehicle?	.007	.083
Hit or struck one of your parents?	.014	.120
Use a weapon to get something from a person?	.003	.059
Run away from home?	.017	.13
Hurt someone badly enough so they needed bandages or a doctor?	.054	.230
Damage property on purpose?	.120	.320
Steal something worth less than $50?	.180	.380
Steal something worth more than $50?	.065	.250
Cut school/class?	.770	.420
Get in trouble at school for fighting or violating rules?	.100	.300
Gamble illegally on a sporting event?	.110	.310

Table 28. Principle Components Analysis

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance
1	2.919	24.326

Table 29. Factor Analysis (DELINQ/CRIME)

Variable	Factor 1
1	0.663
2	0.487
3	0.555
4	0.326
5	
6	0.594
7	0.640
8	0.549
9	0.556
10	
11	0.384
12	0.455

Cronbach's alpha (DELINQ) = .6839

Table 30. Drug Use items

Variables	Mean	Std. Deviation
Drug Use		
Marijuana (MARIJUA)	1.95	1.41

Table 31. Bivariate Correlations of Theoretical Variables

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
Age	1.00																	
Gender	-.149*	1.00																
Race	-.040	-.018	1.00															
Income	-0.11	-.098*	-.25**	1.00														
Goals	.169**	-.077	-.006	-.058	1.00													
Negative events	-.038	.119**	.054	-.12**	.013	1.00												
Family turmoil	.025	.013	.092*	-.111*	.110*	.085	1.00											
Parental punish	.086*	.041	.120**	.092*	.076	.126**	.433**	1.00										
Financial strain	.088*	-.003	.169**	-.36**	.195*	.124**	.262**	.161**	1.00									
Abuse	.134**	.085*	.041	-.21**	.048	.148**	.228**	.181**	.188**	1.00								
Attract	-.103*	.086*	-.059	-.089*	.169**	.052	.289**	.210**	.130**	.141**	1.00							
Anger	.032	-.13**	.109*	-.005	.158**	.132*	.216**	.159**	.138**	.143**	.086	1.00						
Depression	-.032	.063	.111*	-.056	.200**	.114**	.218**	.222**	.236**	.156**	.330**	.146**	1.00					
Mastery	.051	-.069	.035	.005	-.063	.071	-.003	.046	-.007	.074	-.059	.049	-0.013	1.00				
Self Est.	.012	-.11**	.128**	.067	-.38**	-.060	-.20**	-.13**	-.12**	-.19**	-.40**	-.16**	-.27**	0.299**	1.00			
S. support	-.15**	.144**	-.105*	.179**	-.16**	.037	-.253	-.33**	-.18**	-.21**	-.13**	-.058	-.16**	-0.035	0.199**	1.00		
Delinq	-.009	-.34**	.031	.020	.090*	.070	.160**	.175**	.117**	.079	-.006	.332**	0.057	0.099*	-0.041	.14**	1.00	
MarijUse	.019	-.19**	-.035	.079	.080	.024	.059	.041	-.031	.102*	-.035	.182**	-0.010	0.140**	-0.048	-.017	.452**	1.00

** significant a the 0.01 level
* significant at the 0.05 level

Table 44. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Marijuana Use on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resources and Composite Strain/Social Support Interaction (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White		Black	
Age	.011	.014	-.047	-.063
	(.011)	(.014)	(-.045)	(-.061)
Gender	-.491	***-.542	*-.857	*-.999
	(-.171)	(-.190)	(-.298)	(-.347)
Income	.061	.070	-.125	-.114
	(.050)	(.058)	(-.130)	(-.119)
Composite	-.318	-.227	.647	.685
	(-.351)	(-.251)	(.853)	(.904)
Self Est	*-.067	**-.076	.207	.186
	(-.130)	(-.146)	(.370)	(.334)
Soc Spt	-.080	-.062	.445	.415
	(-.101)	(-.078)	(.799)	(.745)
Mastery	**.131	***.134	-.060	-.113
	(.159)	(.164)	(-.074)	(-.140)
Anger	*.099		.168	
	(.119)		(.243)	
Depress		-.026		-.053
		(-.031)		(-.066)
Sspt Int.	.032	.026	-.060	-.057
	(.357)	(.296)	(-.830)	(-.793)
R-square	.096	.082	.356	.311

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

Table 43. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Marijuana Use on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resources and Composite Strain/Mastery Interaction (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White		Black	
Age	.001	.005	-.022	-.040
	(.002)	(.005)	(-.022)	(-.039)
Gender	***-.530	***-.574	*-.820	*-.958
	(-.185)	(-.201)	(-.285)	(-.333)
Income	.066	.074	-.140	-.130
	(.054)	(.061)	(-.146)	(-.135)
Composite	-.552	-.508	-1.27	-1.22
	(-.608)	(-.561)	(-.1.68)	(-1.61)
Self Est	*-.058	*-.066	.181	.163
	(-.111)	(-.129)	(.324)	(.292)
Soc Spt	.027	.027	*.225	*.206
	(.034)	(.035)	(.404)	(.370)
Mastery	-.001	.004	-.363	-.416
	(.-002)	(.006)	(-.450)	(-.515)
Anger	*.097		.164	
	(.117)		(.237)	
Depress		-.030		-.046
		(-.036)		(-.058)
Mast Int.	.043	.043	.096	.097
	(.667)	(.658)	(1.65)	(1.67)
R-square	.099	.086	.373	.331

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

Table 42. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Marijuana Use on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resources and Composite Strain/Self Esteem Interaction (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White		Black	
Age	.011	.013	-.023	-.037
	(.010)	(.013)	(-.022)	(-.036)
Gender	***-.516	***-.562	-.771	*-.936
	(-.180)	(-.196)	(-.268)	(-.325)
Income	.064	.072	-.116	-.109
	(.053)	(.060)	(-.121)	(-.114)
Composite	-.242	-.129	-.326	-.278
	(-.266)	(-.143)	(-.430)	(-.366)
Self Est	-.099	-.097	.135	.107
	(-.190)	(-.186)	(.242)	(.191)
Soc Spt	.016	.018	*.223	*.196
	(.020)	(.024)	(.400)	(.353)
Mastery	**.128	**.131	-.067	-.129
	(.156)	(.160)	(-.083)	(-.160)
Anger	*.095		.170	
	(.115)		(.247)	
Depress		-.026		-.081
		(-.030)		(-.102)
Se Int.	.012	.008	.015	.016
	(.267)	(.185)	(.391)	(.417)
R-square	.094	.080	.339	.297

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

Table 41. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Marijuana Use on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, and Personal Resources (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White		Black	
Age	.008	.012	-.022	-.036
	(.009)	(.012)	(-.021)	(-.035)
Gender	***-.519	*-.563	-.788	*-.952
	(-.181)	(-.197)	(-.274)	(-.331)
Income	.064	.072	-.116	-.108
	(.053)	(.060)	(-.121)	(-.113)
Composite	.015	.048	.001	.071
	(.017)	(.054)	(.002)	(.094)
Self Est	*-.065	*-.073	.189	.165
	(-.125)	(-.141)	(.338)	(.295)
Soc Spt	.021	.022	*.221	*.195
	(.027)	(.028)	(.397)	(.350)
Mastery	**.124	**.128	-.073	-.135
	(.152)	(.157)	(-.090)	(-.167)
Anger	*.093		.170	
	(.112)		(.246)	
Depress		-.027		-.079
		(-.032)		(-.099)
R-square	.092	.079	.338	.295

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

Table 40. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Marijuana Use on Strain, Negative Affect Variables, and Personal Resources, (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White		Black	
Age	-.013	-.009	-.003	.004
	(-.013)	(-.010)	(-.004)	(.005)
Gender	*-.547	***-.596	-.695	-.793
	(-.191)	(-.208)	(-.241)	(-.275)
Income	.046	.054	-.040	-.010
	(.038)	(.045)	(-.042)	(-.011)
Goals	.045	.046	.024	.009
	(.075)	(.076)	(.038)	(.016)
Negevnts	.007	.011	-.016	.005
	(.017)	(.028)	(-.040)	(.014)
Famli T	.011	.017	.016	-.003
	(.028)	(.044)	(.041)	(-.009)
Ppunitive	.025	.031	-.058	-.052
	(.048)	(.060)	(-.134)	(-.119)
Fin Strain	-.070	-.064	.193	.231
	(-.087)	(-.081)	(.258)	(.308)
Abuse	.121	.136	.199	.231
	(.080)	(.091)	(.154)	(.178)
Attract	-.067	-.063	-.237	-.235
	(-.086)	(-.080)	(-.284)	(-.280)
Anger	*.085		.130	
	(.102)		(.188)	
Depress		-.016		-.004
		(-.019)		(-.006)
Self Est	*-.063	*-.071	.160	.141
	(-.122)	(-.137)	(.286)	(.253)
Soc Spt	.034	.039	**.300	*.291
	(.043)	(.049)	(.539)	(.522)
Mastery	**.116	**.117	-.031	-.061
	(.141)	(.143)	(-.039)	(-.076)
R-square	.113	.101	.433	.408

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

Table 39. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Marijuana Use on Strain and Negative Affect Variables (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White			Black		
Age	-.022	-.018	-.022	-.064	-.059	-.054
	(-.022)	(-.018)	(-.022)	(-.061)	(-.057)	(-.052)
Gender	***-.502	***-.557	***-.492	*-.914	*-.959	-.906
	(-.175)	(-.195)	(-.172)	(-.317)	(-.333)	(-.315)
Income	.044	.052	.042	.137	.153	.118
	(.036)	(.043)	(.035)	(.143)	(.159)	(.124)
Goals	*.068	*.070	*.065	-.031	-.008	-.001
	(.113)	(.116)	(.109)	(-.050)	(-.014)	(-.002)
Negevnts	.012	.017	.011	.019	.042	.018
	(.029)	(.041)	(.028)	(.047)	(.103)	(.045)
Famli T	.008	.016	.008	.008	-.0005	.014
	(.022)	(.042)	(.023)	(.021)	(-.001)	(.037)
Ppunitive	.023	.028	.023	-.133	-.129	-.132
	(.044)	(.054)	(.044)	(-.303)	(-.292)	(-.301)
Fin Strain	-.062	-.059	-.060	.066	.110	.072
	(-.078)	(-.074)	(-.076)	(.088)	(.147)	(.097)
Abuse	.150	*.165	.149	.025	.051	.013
	(.099)	(.108)	(.098)	(.019)	(.040)	(.010)
Attract	-.049	-.048	-.050	-.177	-.161	-.162
	(-.063)	(-.062)	(-.064)	(-.212)	(-.192)	(-.194)
Anger	*.103		*.106	.109		.121
	(.123)		(.127)	(.157)		(.174)
Depress		.009	.002		-.073	-.097
		(.011)	(.003)		(-.092)	(-.122)
R-square	.089	.074	.088	.276	.263	.285

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

Table 38. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Delinquency on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resources and Composite Strain/Social Support Interaction (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White		Black	
Age	-.074	-.066	-.169	-.174
	(-.089)	(-.080)	(-.152)	(-.156)
Gender	***-.897	-.980	**-1.04	***-1.39
	(-.375)	(-.408)	(-.341)	(-.456)
Income	.013	.024	.032	.037
	(.014)	(.024)	(.032)	(.037)
Composite	.207	.296	.251	.191
	(.273)	(.390)	(.312)	(.238)
Self Est	-.030	-.035	***.466	***.398
	(-.069)	(-.082)	(.785)	(.671)
Soc Spt	.049	.076	-.054	-.194
	(.074)	(.114)	(-.091)	(-.328)
Mastery	.030	.036	-.179	*-.332
	(.045)	(.053)	(-.208)	(-.387)
Anger	***.121		***.310	
	(.175)		(.423)	
Depress		.021		*-.252
		(.030)		(-.296)
Sspt Int.	-.012	-.018	.019	.037
	(-.161)	(-.244)	(.251)	(.491)
R-square	.211	.185	.633	.541

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

Table 37. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Delinquency on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resources and Composite Strain/Mastery Interaction (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White		Black	
Age	-.072	-.063	-.177	-.191
	(-.086)	(-.076)	(-.159)	(-.172)
Gender	***-.884	***-.962	**-1.06	***-1.42
	(-.369)	(-.401)	(-.349)	(-.466)
Income	.012	.022	.028	.034
	(.012)	(.022)	(.028)	(.034)
Composite	.176	.270	.390	.667
	(.233)	(.356)	(.485)	(.829)
Self Est	-.032	-.039	***.471	***.412
	(-.074)	(-.091)	(.794)	(.695)
Soc Spt	.010	.016	.018	-.049
	(.015)	(.025)	(.031)	(-.084)
Mastery	.054	.076	-.190	-.302
	(.079)	(.111)	(-.222)	(-.352)
Anger	***.122		***.309	
	(.177)		(.422)	
Depress		.023		-.236
		(.033)		(-.278)
Mast Int	-.073	-.012	.005	-.005
	(-.134)	(-.231)	(.083)	(-.088)
R-square	.210	.183	.632	.535

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

Table 36. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Delinquency on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, Personal Resources and Composite Strain/Self Esteem Interaction (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White		Black	
Age	-.073	-.065	-.184	-.198
	(-.088)	(-.079)	(-.166)	(-.178)
Gender	***-.886	***-.996	**-.950	***-1.31
	(-.370)	(-.403)	(-.311)	(-.430)
Income	.012	.022	.026	.029
	(.012)	(.022)	(.026)	(.029)
Composite	.073	.153	-1.77	-1.71
	(.097)	(.202)	(-2.20)	(-2.13)
Self Est	-.032	-.031	.103	.028
	(-.074)	(-.072)	(.173)	(.048)
Soc Spt	.011	.019	.029	-.040
	(.017)	(.029)	(.049)	(-.068)
Mastery	.033	.039	-.134	*-.279
	(.048)	(.057)	(-.156)	(-.326)
Anger	***.123		***.311	
	(.178)		(.424)	
Depress		.022		*-.246
		(.031)		(-.289)
Se Int	.0003	-.023	*.103	*.107
	(.010)	(-.058)	(2.50)	(2.59)
R-square	.210	.183	.683	.590

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

Table 35. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Delinquency on Composite Strain, Negative Affect, and Personal Resources (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White		Black	
Age	-.073	-.065	-.177	-.192
	(-.088)	(-.078)	(-.159)	(-.172)
Gender	***-.886	***-.965	**-1.06	***-1.42
	(-.370)	(-.403)	(-.348)	(-.466)
Income	.012	.022	.029	.033
	(.012)	(.022)	(.029)	(.033)
Composite	*.081	**.106	***.458	***.594
	(.107)	(.140)	(.570)	(.739)
Self Est	-.031	-.037	***.471	***.412
	(-.071)	(-.086)	(.794)	(.695)
Social Spt	.011	.018	.017	-.049
	(.017)	(.028)	(.030)	(-.083)
Mastery	.033	.040	-.175	*-.318
	(.048)	(.058)	(-.204)	(-.370)
Anger	***.123		***.310	
	(.178)		(.422)	
Depress		.022		-.234
		(.031)		(-.276)
R-square	.210	.183	.632	.535

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

Table 34. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Delinquency on Strain, Negative Affect Variables, and Personal Resources

	White		Black	
Age	*-.081	-.074	-.164	-.118
	(-.098)	(-.089)	(-.147)	(-.106)
Gender	***-.881	***-.969	*-.974	**-1.32
	(-.368)	(-.404)	(-.319)	(-.432)
Income	.012	.021	-.101	-.029
	(.012)	(.021)	(-.099)	(-.030)
Goals	.036	.038	-.090	-.096
	(.072)	(.075)	(-.134)	(-.141)
Negevnt	.022	.026	.011	.055
	(.064)	(.076)	(-.026)	(.127)
Famli T	.020	.027	.074	.021
	(.063)	(.085)	(.175)	(.050)
Ppun	.025	.033	*.168	*.186
	(.058)	(.076)	(.361)	(.399)
FinStra	.012	.011	.173	*.281
	(.019)	(.017)	(.217)	(.354)
Abuse	-.030	-.013	.122	.174
	(-.024)	(-.011)	(.089)	(.126)
Attract	-.042	.049	.012	.053
	(-.065)	(-.075)	(.014)	(.060)
Mastery	.034	.038	-.121	-.259
	(.050)	(.057)	(-.141)	(-.303)
Self Est	-.037	-.044	***.403	**.333
	(-.086)	(-.102)	(.679)	(.561)
Soc Spt	.012	.023	.106	.040
	(.018)	(.036)	(.179)	(.068)
Anger	***.120		***.368	
	(.174)		(.502)	
Depress		.034		-.195
		(.048)		(-.230)
R-square	.220	.195	.647	.498

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

Table 33. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Delinquency on Strain and Negative Affect Variables (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	White			Black		
Age	-.085	-.078	*-.082	-.064	-.050	-.037
	(-.100)	(-.092)	(-.097)	(-.058)	(-.046)	(-.033)
Gender	***-.855	***-.946	***-.863	**-1.252	**-1.38	**-1.23
	(-.350)	(-.387)	(-.353)	(-.410)	(-.452)	(-.403)
Income	.019	.030	.015	-.098	-.056	-.154
	(.019)	(.029)	(.015)	(-.097)	(-.056)	(-.152)
Goals	*.051	*.055	*.048	*-.236	-.168	-.147
	(.100)	(.107)	(.094)	(-.347)	(-.247)	(-.215)
Negevnt	.020	.025	.019	-.057	.068	-.060
	(.057)	(.072)	(.053)	(-.132)	(.016)	(-.139)
Famli T	.023	.032	.023	.024	-.078	.043
	(.072)	(.098)	(.071)	(.058)	(-.002)	(.101)
Ppun	.032	.038	.031	.152	.165	*.155
	(.073)	(.085)	(.069)	(.327)	(.354)	(.332)
FinStra	.026	.022	.020	.131	.256	.150
	(.039)	(.034)	(.031)	(.165)	(.322)	(.189)
Abuse	-.026	-.095	-.033	.015	.090	-.018
	(-.20)	(-.007)	(-.026)	(.012)	(.065)	(-.014)
Attract	.-.044	-.054	-.056	-.058	-.010	-.015
	(-.066)	(-.081)	(-.083)	(-.066)	(-.012)	(-.017)
Anger	***.137		***.135	**.306		***.341
	(.194)		(.191)	(.418)		(.465)
Depress		.052	.044		-.216	-.283
		(.072)	(.061)		(-.254)	(-.33)
Rsquare	.222	.193	.225	.459	.367	.527

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

Table 32. Unstandardized OLS Regression of Negative Affect Variables on Strain and Personal Resources Variables (Standardized coefficients in parentheses)

	Anger				Depress			
		White		Black		White		Black
Age	0.03	0.04	-0.022	0.06	-0.047	-0.036	0.09	0.122
	(0.029)	(0.041)	(-0.015)	(0.04)	(-0.4)	(-0.031)	(0.071)	(0.093)
Gender	***-.574	***-0.655	-0.435	-0.743	0.157	0.147	0.02	-0.378
	(0.166)	(-0.19)	(-0.104)	(-0.178)	(0.047)	(0.044)	(0.006)	(-0.105)
Income	0.109	0.1	0.253	0.236	0.102	0.097	-0.164	-0.082
	(0.074)	(0.068)	(0.182)	(0.17)	(0.072)	(0.069)	(-0.137)	(-0.069)
Goals	0.05	0.02	-0.0009	-0.118	*0.072	0.048	*0.315	0.197
	(0.072)	(0.032)	(-0.001)	(-0.128)	(0.103)	(0.068)	(0.393)	(0.245)
Negevnt	*0.05	0.04	0.201	0.172	0.034	0.039	0.013	0.018
	(0.106)	(0.096)	(0.338)	(0.289)	(0.07)	(0.081)	(0.027)	(0.037)
Famli T	**0.06	*0.06	-0.119	-0.155	0.013	0.009	0.05	0.019
	(0.137)	(0.128)	(-0.205)	(-0.267)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.101)	(0.04)
Ppun	0.05	*0.069	0.03	0.04	0.042	0.031	0.012	-0.016
	(0.087)	(0.109)	(0.052)	(0.078)	(0.068)	(0.05)	(0.023)	(-0.003)
FinStra	0.02	0.02	0.332	0.291	**0.12	*0.103	0.107	0.006
	(0.024)	(0.023)	(0.306)	(0.268)	(0.13)	(0.11)	(0.115)	(0.007)
Abuse	*0.191	0.179	0.303	0.248	*0.167	0.128	-0.086	-0.204
	(0.104)	(0.099)	(0.161)	(0.132)	(0.095)	(0.074)	(-0.053)	(-0.126)
Attract	0.026	0.004	0.045	0.01	***0.263	***0.232	0.159	0.184
	(0.028)	(0.005)	(0.037)	(0.012)	(0.287)	(0.252)	(0.152)	(0.176)
Self est.		*-0.083		-0.139		*-0.076		-0.098
		(-0.132)		(-0.172)		(-0.125)		(-0.141)
Mastery		0.04		-0.217		0.045		-0.301
		(0.041)		(-0.186)		(0.048)		(-0.298)
Support		0.076		-0.06		-0.045		-0.208
		(0.79)		(-0.083)		(-0.049)		(-0.299)
R-square	0.112	0.127	0.243	0.298	0.19	0.207	0.337	0.479

* p≤.05 **p≤.01 ***p≤.001