



7-1965

An Exploratory Study of Deferred Gratification Patterns of Junior High School and Senior High School Drop-Outs and Part-Time Attenders

Charles T. Woods

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses



Part of the Educational Sociology Commons

Recommended Citation

Woods, Charles T., "An Exploratory Study of Deferred Gratification Patterns of Junior High School and Senior High School Drop-Outs and Part-Time Attenders" (1965). *Master's Theses*. 4080.

https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/4080

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF
DEFERRED GRATIFICATION PATTERNS OF
JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND SENIOR HIGH
SCHOOL DROP-OUTS AND PART-TIME ATTENDERS

by
Charles T. Woods

A Thesis submitted to the
Faculty of the School of Graduate
Studies in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Master of Arts

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
July 1965

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The investigator expresses his gratitude and indebtedness to his wife and daughters, whose understanding and indulgence made it possible for him to pursue his education on the graduate level. (May their deferred gratifications be fulfilled). The writer also expresses his appreciation to his faculty advisors, Dr. J. Ross Eshelman and Dr. Chester A. Hunt, and to other faculty members including Dr. Milton J. Brawer, Dr. Jerome G. Manis, and Dr. Helenan Lewis, for their aid and advice given during the preparation of this paper.

Special mention is due Mr. Ron Williams, Director of Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., to whom the writer is grateful for his assistance and cooperation. Also, appreciation is expressed to the staff of Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., for their assistance and to the forty young men who are the subject of this thesis.

Charles T. Woods

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I INTRODUCTION	1
The Sample	8
The Problem.	10
Hypotheses	10
Related Sub-Hypotheses	10
Purpose of Study	15
Operational Definitions.	15
Background on Drop-outs and Part-time Students.	16
II METHODOLOGY.	24
Sample and Development of the Research .	24
Structure of the Interview Schedule. . .	26
Administration of the Interview Schedule	28
Analysis of the Data	29
III THE SAMPLE AND BEHAVIORAL DEFERRED GRATIFICATION PATTERNS	33
Characteristics of the Sample.	33
The Hypotheses and Findings.	37
Affiliation DGP.	37
Aggression DGP	42
Spontaneous Independence DGP.	48
Consumption DGP.	52
Sex DGP	56
Summary.	63

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV	NORMATIVE DEFERRED GRATIFICATION PATTERNS. . 65
	Affiliation DGP 65
	Aggression DGP 68
	Economic Independence DGP. 70
	Consumption DGP. 71
	Sex DGP 75
	Summary. 79
V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. 81
	Study Limitations. 83
	Verification of Hypotheses 84
	Implications for Further Research. 90
	BIBLIOGRAPHY. 93
	APPENDIX I. 97
	APPENDIX II 105
	APPENDIX III. 109

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I Characteristics of Sample.	35
II Behavioral Affiliation DGP Scale	38
III Total Behavioral Affiliation DGP Scores. . .	39
IV Behavioral Aggression DGP Scale.	44
V Total Behavioral Aggression DGP Scores . . .	45
VI Behavioral Exonomic Independence DGP Scale .	48
VII Total Behavioral Exonomic Independence DGP Scores	49
VIII Behavioral Consumption DGP Scale	54
IX Total Behavioral Consumption DGP Scale . . .	55
X Behavioral Sexual DGP Scale.	59
XI Total Behavioral Sex DGP Scores.	60
XII Behavioral DGP Scores.	64
XIII Normative Affiliation DGP Scale.	66
XIV Total Normative Affiliation DGP Scores . . .	67
XV Normative Aggression DGP Scale	69
XVI Total Normative Aggression DGP Scores. . . .	70
XVII Normative Economic Independence DGP Scale. .	72
XVIII Total Normative Economic Independence DGP Scores	74
XIX Normative Consumption DGP Scale.	74
XX Total Normative Consumption DGP Scores . . .	75
XXI Normative Sexual DGP Scale	76
XXII Total Normative Sex DGP Scores	78

List of Tables, continued

TABLE		PAGE
XXIII	Normative DGP Scores.	80
XXIV	Drop-outs Normative & Behavioral Matrix .	90
XXV	Part-time Students Normative & Behavioral Matrix	90

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The concept of Deferred Gratification refers to the practice of postponing immediate satisfactions so that future goals may be gained. Today's activities are viewed in the light of their consequences for tomorrow. For example, renouncing emotional impulses will permit eventual emotional satisfaction. Education is viewed as an investment in the future prospects. Saving money is done for future satisfactions. Putting off marriage until one has a good job is perceived as the means to greater mobility.

The utility of Deferred Gratification Patterns (DGP) is in its relationship to social class and social mobility. This is seen in that some realize that social mobility, upward or downward, is a probability in their life. This same group expresses in their actions and attitudes the realization that DGP affects their chances for upward mobility. Those who aspire to be socially mobile must also be aware of their social class level. It, therefore, follows that upward social mobility is a function of DGP in that mobility is partially dependent upon a willingness to defer gratifications.

There are controversial views surrounding the validity and usefulness of the DGP concept. The first question

concerning the utility of DGP is, is it deferment of gratification or is it merely a different form of gratification. In a review and evaluation of what has been done in research of the working class, Miller and Riessman¹ propose a new view. In so doing, they reject the use of DGP as an appropriate subject of research of the working class, for they state:²

"It may very well be that the whole issue of deferred gratification does not have special relevance to workers' lives. The concept might stem from a sociocentric point of view, where the middle class observer, in a sense says, 'If I were in the workers' boots, I wouldn't postpone gratification: I would enjoy myself while I could in the present and worry about a future which is pretty vague and hopeless anyway'. This thinking does not arise out of the context in which workers' behavior takes place, but rather is imposed upon it. In other words, the entire concept of deferred gratification may be inappropriate to understanding the essence of workers' lives."

Miller and Riessman do not offer any research to substantiate their claim, but offer their view as a possibility of DGP. The basic views of Miller and Riessman is that the importance of the internal life of man has overshadowed the significance of the more manifest aspects of

¹S. M. Miller and Frank Riessman, "The Working Class Subculture: A New View", Social Problems, (Summer 1961), pp.86-97.

²loc. cit., p.87

his life. The nature of conditions of working class life (including jobs, opportunities and family structure) affects behavior more than has usually been realized.

Beilin takes a similar³ stand. He studied graduating high school seniors of lower socio-economic status with I.Q.'s of 110 or over. The sample was composed of 43 college bound students and 17 non-college bound students. One conclusion he made in his⁴ study was:

"....it would appear that postponing is a phenomenon the observer introduces to explain apparent differences in behavior although the actors themselves do not perceive they are behaving in this manner. To the college youth from the lower socio-economic classes going to college involves the gratification of values he had developed rather than a relinquishing of valued behaviors."

No conclusive evidence has been shown in answering the question as to whether the DGP phenomena is a deferment of gratification or only a different type of gratification. An attempt will be made in this study to discover how the respondents view the various gratifications. Do they view gratifications in terms of the future or do they view them in terms of the immediate situation? If the respondents view gratifications in terms of the

³Harry Beilin, "The Pattern of Postponability and Its Relation to Social Class Mobility", Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 44, 1956, pp.33-48.

⁴op. cit., p.46

latter it will be concluded that the DGP concept is not relevant to their behavior. If they view gratifications in terms of the future, it will be concluded that the DGP concept has some validity in explaining their behavior.

A second question is presented by some researchers who say that DGP is a behavior of the middle class and that it is not applicable to the lower class. This was stated by Schneider and Lysgaard⁵ who based their research on a sample of 2500 high school students drawn from a nation wide sample of 15,000. It does not include out of school teenagers. These researchers state:

"It (DGP) may be contended that it does indeed fall into a pattern characteristic of the so-called 'middle-class', members of which tend to delay achievement of economic independence through a relatively elaborate process of education, tend to defer sexual gratification through intercourse, show a relatively marked tendency to save money, and the like.. The deferred gratification pattern appears to be closely associated with 'impulse renunciation'. Thus, some of the pertinent current literature emphasizes, by way of example, middle-class renunciation of impulses toward violence. A more important point is the normative character of the DGP. Middle-class persons feel that they should save, postpone, and renounce a variety of gratifications. There

⁵Louis Schneider and Sverre Lysgaard, "The Deferred Gratification Pattern: A Preliminary Study", American Sociological Review, (April 1953), pp.142-143.

are very probably also normative elements in the 'lower-class' pattern of non-deferment."

The areas that Schneider and Lysgaard investigated were; physical violence, free sexuality, marked pursuit of education, high aspiration level, identification of social class of playmates by parents, being well-mannered and obedient, and prolonged dependence on parents. Their research findings generally gave strength to their notion of DGP as stated above.

Not all sociologists agree that DGP is strictly a middle class behavior. A more recent study done by Straus⁶ states:

"The hypotheses of positive correlation between socio-economic status and DGP was not supported."

In explaining these findings, Straus⁷ adds:

"These negative results are probably at least in part, a function of the attenuated SES composition of the sample and the fact that the sample excludes those who have dropped out of school....almost all of the significant associations between SES and need deferment items reported by Hollingshead and Schneider and Lysgaard fall into the category here labeled

⁶Murray A. Straus, "Deferred Gratification, Social Class and the Achievement Syndrome", American Sociological Review, (June 1962), p.326.

⁷loc. cit., p.332

Economic Independence. The present study also find that Economic Independence is related to SES."

These two contrasting views, that DGP is a behavior of only the middle class as opposed to the view that DGP is not strictly a middle class behavior, are an additional reason for this study. The sample will be composed of lower-class young people, half of whom have dropped out of school and half of whom are in school. If the lower classes do not defer gratification there should be no differences in DGP scores between these two groups.

A third view of DGP takes the stand that DGP is a function of achievement. In studying 338 male high school students Straus⁸ states:

"Learning to defer need gratification seems to be associated with achievement at all levels of the status hierarchy represented in this sample, and hence can probably best be interpreted as one of the personality prerequisites for achievement roles in contemporary American society."

No contradictory evidence is presented to this interpretation and it is anticipated that it will be supported in this study. Those in school appear to be more achievement oriented than those who have dropped out. It therefore is concluded that those in school will

⁸op. cit., p.335

defer more gratifications than will the drop-outs.

A fourth question concerning the utility of whether the behavior characterized as DGP is a unified pattern, or a chance combination of essentially unrelated responses. Schneider and Lysgaard⁹ stated:

"It (DGP) may be contended that it does indeed fall into a pattern...."

Although these researchers leave little doubt as to DGP being a pattern, Straus¹⁰ does not agree completely. He states:¹¹

"The hypothesis of a deferred gratification pattern received some support from the fact that scales with reproducibilities from .92 to .96 were developed for deferment on five adolescent needs (affiliation, aggression, consumption, economic independence and sex); and by the intercorrelations of these scales."

Straus qualifies this statement by saying:¹²

"Correlations between the five scales, although low, suggest two rather than one 'deferred gratification pattern': The Affiliation, Aggression, and Sex scales form one cluster, indicative of tendencies to defer interpersonal needs. The Consumption and Economic Independence scales form a second cluster, representing tendencies to defer material needs. At the same time,

⁹op. cit., p.142

¹⁰op. cit.

¹¹op. cit., p.326

¹²op. cit., p.335

the specific need deferment scales were found to constitute a general Deferred Gratification Scale, with a reproducibility of .92. The hypothesis of a deferred gratification pattern was therefore judged to be supported by these data, but with important qualifications."

These two views present an interesting question. Does an individual defer gratification in an "all or none" sense? Or, does one, as Straus suggests, defer gratifications in the interpersonal needs and not in the material needs or vice-versa? This research will attempt to discover if a pattern exists.

These four positions about DGP lead to four hypotheses. (1) DGP is deferment of gratifications and not merely a different form of gratification. (2) DGP is applicable to the middle and lower class population. (3) DGP is a function of achievement. (4) DGP is not a unified pattern.

The sample

Forty young white males between the ages of 16 and 19, inclusive of lower-socio-economic status are included in this study. Twenty have dropped out of school and twenty are attending school on a part-time basis. These part-time students are attending school but carrying less than a normal load of hours and working fifteen hours or more a week. It is believed that these part-time

students are achievement oriented and will defer gratifications. On the other hand, the drop-outs are not achievement oriented and it is doubtful they will defer gratifications as do the part-time students.

The sample was taken from the rolls of Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc. It is a non-profit corporation to help school drop-outs and other youths to become employable; to aid schools in keeping potential drop-outs; to give counseling and guidance to any youth desiring it. There are two phases in the program. First, the Employment Training Center program offers; 1, interviews and testing to determine vocational potential, extent of basic education, and need for training to overcome educational, social, and vocational handicaps; 2, approximately 45 weeks of employment and job training; 3, after the training program, help in obtaining additional education, vocational training, and employment. Secondly, Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., here after referred to as Y.O.U., in conjunction with the Kalamazoo Valley Intermediate School District, sponsors a Work Education Program for motivating potential drop-outs to remain in school. The students are referred by the school guidance counselors. Y.O.U. assumes the responsibility of interviewing and placing students in part-time jobs. Y.O.U. coordinates the school work curriculum, and makes periodic

reports to the school concerning students' job programs.

The problem

The preceeding lays the groundwork for the presentation of the problem which may be stated as questions. Do deferred gratification patterns constitute deferment or are they really different forms of gratification? Does deferred gratification exist among the "lower-class"? If DGP is found, is it related to achievement? Is DGP a pattern? This study will attempt to answer these questions.

In reviewing what research has been done on DGP, the following hypothesis appears relevant to this theory. Also, the above questions may be answered in investigating this hypothesis.

Hypothesis

I. Drop-outs will be less willing to defer gratifications than part-time students.

Related sub-hypotheses

(1) Peer-group affiliation - Drop-outs will be less concerned with the "socially acceptable" behavior of their friends than will the part-time students.

(2) Aggression - Drop-outs will be more willing to, and more often do, become involved in physical violence,

fight, etc., than will the part-time students.

(3) Economic Independence - Drop-outs will be more concerned with obtaining a "good" job that will give them independence than will the part-time students.

(4) Consumption - Drop-outs will be less concerned with saving money and goods than will the part-time students.

(5) Sexual Participation - Drop-outs will be less willing to postpone sexual gratification than will the part-time students.

These five research hypotheses are tailored after others' research. The development of a scale of DGP by Straus¹³ for instance, was accomplished by the composition of five scales. He states:

"Five adolescent needs were chosen for study; the need for affiliation, aggression, consumption, economic independence, and sexual expression. For each of these needs, four items designed to indicate deferment of the need were included in the questionnaire."

Straus footnotes this by stating:

"Ideally, these should represent universal human needs, or as a second best, needs that are known to be general in the society studied. Clearly, the sexual and affiliative need categories meet the universality criteria."

Admittedly, these five dimensions of DGP are a rough

¹³loc. cit., p.143

listing and leave us far from a thorough specification of the deferred gratification pattern. Some of the items may appear equivocal. For example, affiliation, (peer selection) does not carry on the face of it the reason for its inclusion. But it is plausible that such selection implies a concern for certain standards and a fear they will be jeopardized by "unfortunate" friendships.

But Ellis and Lane¹⁴ state:

"Even though high school peers do not directly exercise the influence that, for example, high school teachers do, they may nevertheless have a latent function in the mobility process: Either, as Kahl has emphasized, by providing reinforcement for the mobility goals held by the lower-class youth or by providing informal training in the varied motives attitudes and social skills needed to make the shift to a middle-class reference group a behavioral reality." (*Italics are this writer's*).

Although Ellis and Lane are researching mobility, Deferred Gratification Patterns are a part of mobility as stated earlier in this study. This "latent function" of friends is what is being deferred or not being deferred by the informants and is the dimension this research will attempt to measure.

¹⁴Robert Ellis and W. Clayton Lane, "Structural Support for Upward Mobility", American Sociological Review, (October 1963), p.754.

The second interpersonal need that Straus included (and is included in this study) is Aggression - physical violence. This plays an important part of "impulse renunciation" or the deferment of gratifications.

Schneider and Lysgaard¹⁵ report:

".....the students who identify themselves with the 'working class' report in a slightly higher proportion than those who identify themselves with the 'middle class' that they have had one or more fights recently, that they have seen adults fight recently, and that they prefer to 'settle' matters right away, rather than 'let their temper quiet down' first."

Also, Miller and Riessman¹⁶ state:

"He (lower class worker) is stubborn in his ways, concerned with his strength, and ruggedness, interested in mechanics, materialistic, superstitious, holds an 'eye for an eye' psychology, and is largely uninterested in politics."

The third interpersonal need Straus mentioned (and is included in this study) is sex, the physical relationship between young men and women. This, too, plays an important part of "impulse renunciation", or the deferment of gratifications.

Heal researched the values held by 34 lower SES and 42 middle SES eleventh grade home economics students.

¹⁵op. cit., p.145

¹⁶S. M. Miller and Frank Riessman, "The Working Class Subculture: A New View", Social Problems, (Summer 1961), p.87.

Although she was not researching DGP, their statements are revealing as to what they regard as a gratification not to be deferred. Heal¹⁷ reports:

"Love to the lower socio-economic group, meant sex. Most of the students in this group felt that one should not conceal one's emotions and that being asked to have sexual affairs and having them were more flattering than disgraceful and had no effect on one's reputation. To the middle class group love meant a feeling of strong personal attachment, such as ardent affection for one of the opposite sex."

Turning to the material needs, two factors that reveal DGP are Consumption and Economic Independence. These factors are interrelated. In discussing the working class, Miller and Riessman¹⁸ point out:

"....(A) component in worker's lives is the appreciation of excitement of moving out of the humdrum. New gossip, new gadgets, sports, are consequently very attractive to workers. To some extent, the consumership of workers - the desire to have new goods, whether television sets or cars - is part of this excitement dimension.

It is worth noting that different subgroups within the working class may favor one theme rather than another."

¹⁷Florence L. D. Heal, "Values in a Group of Lower Socio-economic Students", Marriage and Family Living, (November 1960), p.370.

¹⁸op. cit., p.94

These two dimensions are more easily seen in there measurement of DGP. If one is willing to postpone consumption of commodities and willing to postpone economic independence he is more likely to be socially mobile.

Purpose of study

There are two major reasons for doing this study. Perhaps the most important factor will be that this study will contribute to the theory of Deferred Gratification Patterns. There is some question as to the existence of DGP among the "lower classes". Secondly, the patterns of deferment found in drop-outs as compared to part-time students may give indications to counseling programs for these students. That is to say, some drop-outs may be counseled into part-time student programs by pointing out specific gratifications that may be obtained.

Operational definitions

Deferred Gratification Patterns - the attitude and behavior patterns of postponing satisfactions in five dimensions; Affiliation, Aggression, Economic Independence, Consumption, and Sex, in order that a later satisfaction may be received.

Affiliation - peer-group affiliation, to selectively or non-selectively associate oneself with others,

i.e., friends, gangs, or cliques.

Aggression - the willingness to use and the use of physical force such as fighting.

Economic Independence - the desire and degree of sufficiency of self means for a livelihood.

Consumption - the spending (and/or saving) of money on such goods as alcoholic beverages, tobacco, entertainment, and other goods.

Sex - the relationship with the opposite sex in terms of necking, petting, and sexual intercourse.

Drop-out - one who has left Junior High School or Senior High School without receiving a high school diploma or certificate of completion.

Part-time student - one who is attending Junior High School or Senior High School, but carrying less than a normal load of hours, (5 or 6 is normal), and working 15 hours or more a week.

"Socially acceptable" behavior - as perceived by middle class values, to avoid fights, petty crime, and having a police record.

Background on drop-outs and part-time students

What are some of the characteristics of drop-outs? The President's Committee on Youth Employment¹⁹ makes

¹⁹U.S. President's Committee on Youth Employment, The Challenge of Jobless Youth, Washington, D. C., 1963, p.2.

some general statements. During the school months of 1962, between 600,000 to 800,000 young people between 16 and 21 years of age were out of school and looking for jobs in the U.S.A. Coupled with this, school drop-outs suffer most from unemployment and have greater difficulty in finding work.

Employment is a problem for these youth but intelligence is not, for the U.S. Department of Labor states²⁰ that those who drop-out of school 63% are of normal intelligence, 7% are in the superior I.Q. groups and 30% are classified as slow learners.

In addition to employment and intelligence, other factors are important in discussing young people. Penty²¹ reports four conditions which could be said to be regularly associated with early school leaving. These are; (1) feelings of inferiority, (2) financial problems, (3) lack of home security and encouragement, and (4) family history of early school leaving.

Hollingshead²² found similar things to be true of

²⁰Bureau of Labor Statistics, School and Early Employment experiences of Youth, U.S. Dept. of Labor, Washington, D.C., Bulletin 1277, (August 1960), p.14.

²¹Ruth Penty, Reading Ability and High School Drop-Outs, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956, p.52

²²A. B. Hollingshead, Elmtown's Youth, John Wiley and Sons, 1961, pp.331-359.

drop-outs. He learned that many young people of low social class families began leaving school as early as age 12. Between 64% and 75% before reaching age 16 had left school. Boys were more likely to leave than girls. 92% completed the eighth grade, but only 46% went to high school. Nearly one-half of all withdrawals left school between the end of one school year and the beginning of the next, and 34% of the drop-outs repeated one or more grades. The adolescents' own reasons for leaving school were grouped into three main headings; (1) economic need, (2) peer isolation and discrimination, and (3) mistreatment by teachers. A close connection existed between the position a family occupies in the class structure and whether an adolescent is in or out of school. Nine out of 10 middle-class youth were in school, but almost 9 out of 10 lower class youth had withdrawn. The lower class child learned very early that he must have money to do things, and in a lower class family money is scarce. An essential factor in his childhood is the desire to grow up and get a job. This means, for all practical purposes, withdrawal from school.

In 1960, the Michigan Youth Commission²³ reported

²³Michigan Youth Commission, Children and Youth in Michigan, 1960, pp.C-20-C-21.

similar information. One in three students drop out of school before completing 12 years and earning a diploma in Michigan. This report goes on to state:

"Studies have shown that the average drop-out stays in school almost as long as graduates do, but because he usually retained in one or more grades, he has not had the full benefit of a high school education.....the first major drop occurs between the ninth and the tenth grade, when many pupils are making the transition between the junior and senior high school. Another significant drop occurs between the tenth and eleventh grades, when many of the pupils have tried the secondary school and found it wanting. It has also been found that pupils who drop out from the eighth, ninth, and tenth grades, most often do so for reasons closely related to their school experience, such as grades retardation, academic difficulties, and failure to participate in pupil activities. Drop-outs from the latter grades, however, are chiefly accounted for by other well-defined reasons, such as marriage or the need for work."

Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc.²⁴ in summarizing evidences of poverty in Kalamazoo County, Michigan, reports:

"In a recent study for the school year 1962-63 conducted by the Michigan Department of Public Instruction, 699 Youth dropped out of school in Kalamazoo County. Of the total number, 379 were

²⁴Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., Unpublished Proposal for a Work-Training Program for Out-of-School Youth in Kalamazoo County, (January 1965), pp.10-13.

male and 320 female. The Kalamazoo Public Schools report that there were 363 school drop-outs for grades ten, eleven, and twelve during the 1963-64 school year, a total of 10.2 per cent. These figures do not reflect the five Kalamazoo Public Junior High Schools.

Lieutenant Colonel Lundquist, Staff Specialist, Operations Divisions of the Selective Service System, Lansing, Michigan, reported in a letter dated December 28, 1964, that from January 1, 1964, through November 30, 1964, 510 registrants from Kalamazoo County were given pre-induction examinations for entering the Armed Forces. Of the total number of registrants given examinations 271 qualified for the service or 53.1 percent; 239 were rejected or 46.9 percent. The reasons for rejection were: Failure of mental test, 100 registrants or 41.8 per cent; failure of mental and physical test, 7 registrants or 2.0 per cent; failure of physical test only, 132 registrants or 55.3 per cent. Many youth leave school to enter military service, but are rejected. As a result of this rejection, many of these young people come to Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., seeking assistance.

An analysis of our records indicated that of the total number of out-of-school students enrolled from July 1, 1963, to January 15, 1965, in the Employment Training Center, 48.3 per cent of the enrollees had police or court records. These figures do not reflect traffic violations and trancies from school. Our records also indicate that the average reading grade level of our students is 6.3. Also, 33.7 per cent of our students are reading on the fifth grade level or below."

A study was done on the 30 drop-outs at Youth

Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., by Jalving²⁵ and he reported in summary:

"The hypothesis that a drop-out develops a dislike of school because of unsatisfactory family group influences is partially supported... The hypothesis which concerns possible adverse influences of the peer friendship group in a respondent's decision to leave school, seems to receive support... The hypothesis which concerns possible feelings of not belonging in school because of unsatisfactory progress and dislike of much of the work, is only partially verified..... The hypothesis which concerns dissatisfaction with many of the jobs which are available to these boys, is supported by the data.. The hypothesis which concerns the failure of the average drop-out in availing himself of opportunities to improve his position in the labor market by taking courses, is generally supported by the data."

Jalving²⁶ states that:

"The respondents manifested a general irresponsibility regarding the future. They were preoccupied with immediate interest and problems which, in many respects, influenced their thinking about the future. Most of them stated that they did a lot of daydreaming about lots of things, but, were primarily, interested in cars and having a good time. As one who articulated well, expressed it. 'I didn't think about any job in particular which I would like to do in the future. I thought about a lot

²⁵Jacob Jalving, "Social Factors Influencing Drop-Outs in the Kalamazoo, Michigan, Public School System, Thesis, Western Michigan University, (May 1963, pp.86-88.

²⁶loc. cit., p.74

of things, but thought about cars most of the time. I was interested in having a good time and I didn't give much thought to the future."

Jalving²⁷ included the following statements from interviews:

"I felt it (school) was a waste of time and wanted to have fun rather than do schoolwork."

"All I thought about was going to work so I could be my own boss, and so I could have my own money to do things with; I wanted to go to work rather than go to school."

"I didn't mind school too much. I just got lazy and would rather have fun than study."

"If I had used as much energy doing my schoolwork as I did running around, everything would have been O.K."

"I wanted to get out and make my own money."

The above findings about drop-outs tends to indicate a general lack of DGP. These young people may not be aware of their social class and the possibility of upward mobility. Perhaps they do not care to change their social situation. Perhaps they have given up social mobility as a possibility in their lives.

Turning to part-time students, little or no research has been done, consequently, little can be said.

²⁷loc. cit., pp.65-70

Generally, teachers and counselors regard most part-time students as potential drop-outs. Drop-outs and part-time students are similar in many respects. In reviewing the part-time students in Y.O.U., it was found that most are from below middle class families, some have repeated a grade or more, and many find they need to work.

What is the sociological difference between drop-outs and part-time students that makes this study researchable? The answer is found in that part-time students, being in school, are potentially socially mobile. Generally, these two groups are basically sociologically the same, except for the educational pursuit of the part-time students.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Sample and development of the research

The present study is an analysis of deferred gratification patterns. The DGP of drop-outs and part-time students is measured and compared. The sample was taken from the rolls of Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., which includes both drop-outs and part-time students. The sample, a "chunk"²⁸ is composed of 20 drop-outs and 20 part-time students. The size of the sample is sufficient for analysis and to obtain a larger number was nearly impossible. These young people are very mobile. In an effort to find drop-outs who were in Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., it was found they were: no longer at their previous address with no forwarding address, they were in jail or other institutions, their parents were not willing or unable to state where they could be found, or they said they would participate, however, would not appear for the appointed interview.

²⁸Matilda White Riley, Sociological Research, Harcourt Brace and World, Inc., New York, 1963, p.296. Her term for a sample selected on the basis of convenience and small enough to permit intensive analysis.

The contact the writer has had with drop-outs and part-time students (as instructor in class room for drop-outs at Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc.) leads to the hypothesis that most of the drop-outs and part-time students are of lower social class. A pretest was given to determine factors which would limit the selection of informants. These include: (1) members of the Caucasian race, (2) male, (3) 16 through 19 years of age, (4) recent drop-outs, (between 1962 and 1964 inclusive) or current part-time students, and (5) low (working) class.

To establish the social class of the informants, two methods were employed. First, an opinion of the informants' social class was obtained from a school counselor and/or staff at Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc. Secondly, the North Hatt rating was employed on the fathers' or step-fathers' occupation.

The selection of the sample was based on those who could be found. An effort was made to obtain active enrollees of Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., but at the time of interviewing only eleven drop-outs fitted the above qualifications. Therefore, drop-outs recently (within past 6 months) active in Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., were included.

Structure of the interview schedule

There are three basic parts to the schedule (see Appendix I). The first part is the personal data which includes family, religious, court, and educational data. The second part is composed of a semi-structured interview guide to learn the behavioral patterns of the informants in regards to Affiliation, Aggression, Consumption, Economic Independence, and Sex. The third phase of the interview is composed of structured questions intended to provide information on the respondents' normative behavior in regards to the five phenomena mentioned.

Behavior and attitude in regards to these five dimensions of DGP were researched by others, including Straus and Schneider and Lysgaard (which is discussed in Chapter II). It is believed that to discover the DGP of these youth one should research their needs. It is the position of this researcher that Affiliation, Aggression, Consumption, Economic Independence, and Sex are needs of these youth. There are other needs of youth, but DGP has been found to exist using these dimensions.

In researching Affiliation, the questions are designed to discover if the respondent's friends will assist him in upward social mobility. For example, a

young person's friends may drink and fight often, or his friends may never be involved in either drinking or fighting. The former will not assist whereas the latter may assist in upward social mobility.

Aggression is included to measure the tendency of the respondent to become involved in physical violence. If the informant is not willing to fight, and avoids it as much as he can, he is deferring that gratification.

Sexual deferment of gratifications is similar to Aggression and Affiliation in that it is an interpersonal need. The respondent is being questioned to see if he is willing to defer the gratifications of sexual intercourse.

In questioning the DGP of Economic Independence and Consumption of the respondent, the researcher is looking at the material needs. These two areas appear quite similar but there is a basic difference. In Consumption, the researcher is looking at the desire to save and not consume, whereas in Economic Independence the researcher is looking at the desire to become financially independent from parents.

Administration of the interview schedule

The personal data was obtained from files on the informants at Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., prior to interviewing the informants. Parts II and III of the schedule were completed by interviewing each person privately. All interviews were recorded on tape. Each informant was told that he should feel free to say what he thought and that what he said was strictly confidential. The respondents were told that the tape recordings would be erased and that all personal aspects of the interview would be lost in compiling the data. At the request of the Director of Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., each informant was told that if he would rather not answer a particular question, or that he did not know, he need not answer.

The semi-structured interview guide (Part II) was used in an effort to obtain unstructured answers; it was generally free, open discussion of the behavior in regards to the five research areas of gratification. It was the belief of the researcher that the way to discover the behavior of these young people was through a discussion with them. It was felt that a structured questionnaire would limit the kinds of information received and that perhaps the answers would be in terms of norms and not in terms of behavior.

The structured schedule, Part III, was used to obtain the norms of the informants. This part was explained to them in that a statement would be read and they were to state if they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. They were given a card with these four answers written on it. If the informant could not decide or did not know, this was accepted.

This study was done by interview for several reasons. First, as stated earlier, many of these young people were barely able to read. Among the drop-outs at Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., the average grade reading level was 6.3. Second, many were illegible writers and poor spellers. Third, the problem of vocabulary would have presented a problem to some respondents. For example, the interviewer was asked many times to explain what was meant by a particular word or question.

After the interview, the recordings were transcribed to the interview schedule and coded. (See Appendix II).

Analysis of the data

The personal data was used to compare drop-outs with part-time students. This data permitted a cross check of welfare, court records, last grade in school

attended, age, with whom informant is living, and number of brothers and sisters.

The semi-structured interview guide (Part II) was used to measure behavioral deferment of gratifications. Each informant was given a "1" for deferment of a gratification or a "0" for non-deferment. These values were then added from the five or six separate items used to measure DGP in each of the five research areas, Affiliation, Aggression, Economic Independence, Consumption, and Sex. For example, in giving a DGP score for Affiliation to a particular informant, his answers were coded, "0" or "1". There are six code questions upon which he could receive a "0" or a "1". His possible behavioral affiliation DGP score could range from "0" to "6". This is likewise true for the four remaining areas. Means and medians were figured on these scores and used as a comparison between drop-outs and part-time students.

A total score for behavioral DGP was computed by adding the individual scores for Affiliation, Aggression, Economic Independence, Consumption, and Sex. This gave each individual a total behavioral DGP score. The total scores for both drop-outs and part-time students were placed together and a median score for the entire sample

was established. A non-parametric "Z" test²⁹ of proportions was computed to test for a significant difference.

The structured schedule (Part III) was used to measure the normative deferment of gratification. A similar process was used to score the normative measures as was used with the behavioral measures. That is, each question had a possible value of "1" through "5". The higher the numerical value, the more the informant perceived the normative deferment of gratifications. For example, there were seven questions measuring the normative DGP of affiliation. The informant could receive a possible normative affiliation DGP score of "7" through "35". Means and medians were also computed on these scores and used as comparison between the two groups. Also, a "Z" test of proportions was computed for the Normative DGP.

The main value of the research is in determining whether or not the major hypothesis is supported. Drop-outs will be less willing to defer gratification than part-time students. This is expected to be found true in normative and behavior aspects of the five dimensions,

²⁹Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Social Statistics, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1960, p.178.

(Affiliation, Aggression, Consumption, Economic Independence, and Sex) under study. The findings are expected to indicate if a relationship exists which is worthy of further research. As Riley³⁰ states, "They (samples of 30-50) may be productive of hypotheses, even if not proof."

³⁰op. cit.

CHAPTER III

THE SAMPLE AND BEHAVIORAL DEFERRED GRATIFICATION PATTERNS

Characteristics of the sample

All respondents were male and taken from the rolls of Y.O.U. There was a total of twenty drop-outs and twenty part-time students included in the sample. All twenty part-time students and twelve of the drop-outs were currently active in the Y.O.U. program. The other eight drop-outs had been active at Y.O.U. within the previous six months. Their reasons for leaving varied. Two were placed on jobs at Y.O.U. Another was active at the direction of his probation officer, and when his probation ended he terminated at Y.O.U. At the time of interview he was unemployed and hoping to join Job Corps. The other five left Y.O.U. for they felt they could earn more money elsewhere. At the time of the interview four out of five were employed and one was unemployed.

The respondents were not selected on the basis of social status but those that are in the sample were all of lower socio-economic status. The fathers' occupations,

using the North Hatt ratings of occupation³¹ range from carpenter to janitor. The fathers of ten part-time students and of seven drop-outs were factory workers. The fathers of two part-time students and of three drop-outs were employed as janitors. Other occupations of the fathers of part-time students included, a mechanic, a post-office employee, and a railroad ticket agent. One part-time student's father was disabled and was supported by liability insurance from the accident. Another father was a mental patient and the mother did odd jobs. Two students' fathers were deceased and their mothers were employed as house-keepers. Jobs held by other drop-outs' fathers included, a barber, two truck drivers, a boiler fireman, a farm worker, a television repairman, a service station attendant, a house painter, and one was unemployed. One drop-out's father was deceased and his mother drove a bus.

The similarities of the respondents can be seen in Table I. The age range was from sixteen through nineteen. There was similarity in religious preference of drop-outs and part-time students. Three families in each group received welfare. Family size was generally

³¹Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology, Row-Peterson and Company, Evanston, Illinois, 1959, p.187.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

A) Age	Drop-outs	Part-time Students
16	3	5
17	8	8
18	9	4
19	0	3
B) Religious Preference		
Protestants	13	11
Catholic	3	2
None	4	7
C) Police Record (Other than traffic violations)		
None	8	14
Fined and/or arrested only	5	3
Probation	5	2
Jailed or Juvenile Home	1	1
Boys Industrial School	1	0
More than one offense	6	2
D) Family Welfare Recipient		
None	17	17
Some	3	3
E) Living with		
Biological parents	10	14
One step, one biological parent	1	2
One biological parent	4	3
Step parents, relatives, friends	5	1
F) Number of brothers and sisters		
One to three	7	9
Four to six	7	8
Seven or more	6	3
G) Last grade or present grade in school		
Twelfth	0	6
Eleventh	1	6
Tenth	7	8
Ninth	5	0
Eighth	4	0
Seventh	2	0
Sixth	1	0

large for both groups in that more than half of the respondents had four or more brothers and sisters. One drop-out had nine brothers and eight sisters.

In looking at the differences between the two groups, we see that six part-time students and twelve drop-outs had police records. Also, two part-time students as compared to six drop-outs had more than one offense. Another difference is that more part-time students than drop-outs were living with one or more of their biological parents. A more obvious difference is that the part-time students were currently senior high school students whereas twelve of the drop-outs left school before reaching the senior high level.

It must be realized that this sample is not necessarily representative of drop-outs or part-time students in Kalamazoo County. All those included in this study have received aid in the form of counseling and/or job placement and/or instruction by Y.O.U. There are many other drop-outs who have not requested assistance from Y.O.U. (nearly 700 drop-outs in Kalamazoo County during the 1963-64 school year) and have not been included in this study. Also, other students may be working and carrying less than a normal scholastic load and are not involved in Y.O.U.

THE HYPOTHESES AND FINDINGS

The major hypotheses is that drop-outs will be less willing to defer gratifications than part-time students. This is generally supported in the behavioral measure of DGP. This can best be discussed in the five research hypotheses.

The five areas determined to measure DGP are: Affiliation, Aggression, Economic Independence, Consumption, and Sex. These areas were chosen for they appear to be needs of these young people. If deferment is to occur it is believed that it will occur in these needs.

Affiliation DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his reply to the code questions as seen in TABLE II. A respondent's score could range from a low DGP of "0" to a high DGP of "G", as seen in TABLE III.

The first research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be less concerned with the "socially acceptable" behavior of their friends than will the part-time students. Only slight support for this is found in Behavioral Measure of DGP (see TABLE III). Part-time students' mean scores were slightly higher, 0.25, than drop-outs.

An explanation for this difference may be seen in the response to the code question. "Are your friends

drop-outs?" Sixteen drop-outs as compared to eight part-time students said that their friends were drop-outs. Other questions in regards to Affiliation were answered in a similar manner by both drop-outs and part-time students (see TABLE II).

TABLE II
BEHAVIORAL AFFILIATION
DGP SCALE

Code	Question	Code	No. of drop-outs	No. of part-time students
1)	Are your friends drop-outs?			
	Yes	0	16	8
	No	1	4	12
2)	Are your friends part-time students?			
	Yes	0	5	8
	No	1	15	12
3)	Are your friends loud in public?			
	Yes	0	12	11
	No	1	8	9
4)	Do your friends drink?			
	Yes	0	13	14
	No	1	7	6
5)	Do your friends pay their own way?			
	Yes	1	20	20
	No	0	0	0
6)	Do your friends fight?			
	Yes	0	10	11
	No	1	10	9

A typical response by drop-outs to these questions can be seen in the following:

"All of my friends dropped out of school. I suppose it wasn't wise... I don't have any friends who are going to school part-time, but I suppose that is better than not going at all. We are all alike, we quit school 'cause we all goofed off.I don't like them to get loud and rowdy. If they do when they're in my car I tell them to shut up or get out. They drink a lot and drink most anything, beer, wine, gin, everything... but I don't drink with them... They usually pay their own way when we go to a show or something. But I help them out if they don't have any money and they do the same for me..I'd guess they get into fights every other weekend."

TABLE III

TOTAL BEHAVIORAL AFFILIATION
DGP SCORES

Scores	No. of Drop-outs who scored	No. of Part- time students who scored
0	0	0
1	0	0
2	7	4
3	6	8
4	4	4
5	2	3
6	1	1
Mean	3.2	3.45
Median	3.0	3.0

Another drop-out attaches much importance to his friends and their behavior. He says:

"All my friends have quit school and it's their business.. Sometimes they're loud and noisy and sometimes I mind, sometimes I don't. When we get some juice (beer) in us

we get noisy and they feel good, you know. We'll start to get on someone who doesn't talk English right or something. ...yeah, they'll usually pay their own way. We'll go buy a six pack or two and split the cost. If they don't have the money, I'll pay and they'll do the same for me. I'm better off than most of them.. We don't go out of our group, we stay in our own little group of kids. We don't associate with everybody....we sort of stick together. We are all interested in drinkin' and girls and fightin'."

Part-time students had a different view of their friends. One said:

"No, I don't have any friends that have left school. But a few are going part-time, same as I am. It's a good deal. It gives some opportunities, a chance to get out and learn more than what school teaches. I don't like them too loud and noisy, but sometimes they are. They are just trying to have everyone see them.... They drink beer and liquor but don't know how often, but I don't drink with them....they usually pay their own way, I help them out if they're out of money and they do the same for me. No, they never fight."

Another part-time student responded much differently than the others. He said:

"All my friends are in school full time.I don't like it if they're noisy but they never are anyway.... No, they don't drink nor do I... They usually pay their own way. If I have money I'll help them out and they do the same for me. No, they don't fight."

From these responses it can be seen that some of the

young people's friends are likely to be negative influences whereas others are likely to be positive influences. In other words, some friends may facilitate upward mobility whereas others may not. The last respondent's friends probably are a positive influence whereas the second drop-out's friends are probably a negative influence.

The respondents, both the drop-outs and part-time students, replied to the question, "Who are your friends?" Five drop-outs said that their friends lived in another town, even though they had not seen them for a relatively long time. One drop-out who has been living in the Fort Custer State Home for two years said:

"My friends don't live around here. They are all back in my home town."

He did not refer to any young people in the State Home or Y.O.U. as his friends. He goes on to say:

"Most of my friends have dropped out of school and been in trouble with the police for shop-lifting, breaking and entering, and stealing cars."

Most drop-outs referred to young people a few years older than themselves as their friends and only six regarded any of the other students at Y.O.U. as their friends. A typical comment is:

"The kids here at I.O.U. are my friends and some at Otsego and Martin. Quite a few drop-out of school. Most of my friends at Martin are a little older."

Most part-time students did not refer to other part-time students, but they would not necessarily know each other. All the part-time students are attending large high schools and few work at the same place.

In reply to the question "Do your friends pay their own way?", all forty respondents said that their friends usually do. This was the only question to which all respondents gave complete accord.

Another factor is the number who said their friends were loud and noisy in public. In both groups combined, twenty-three said their friends were noisy and seven-teen said they were not. Also, the combined number who said their friends drank alcoholic beverages was twenty-seven out of the forty.

Aggression DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his response to the code questions seen in TABLE IV. A respondent's score could range from low DGP of "0" to a high DGP of "6", as seen in TABLE V.

The second research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be more willing to and more often do become

involved in physical violence, fights, etc., than will the part-time students. This is supported in the Behavioral measure of DGP. The part-time student's mean score was 1.2 higher (see TABLE III).

It should be pointed out that question number five, "From arguments you have had, do you win by avoiding fights?" was asked, "From arguments you have had, how do you win?" (See Questionnaire, Appendix I). It was felt on the part of the investigator that the latter would give a more reliable answer and coding was done on the basis of the former question.

Perhaps an explanation for this difference in scores is found in the response to the question, "Have you been in a fight within the last year?", fifteen part-time students compared to eight drop-outs said they had not. Another possibility is in response to the question, "Have you ever been picked up by the police?". Fourteen drop-outs as compared to eight part-time students said they had been. In reply to, "Have you seen adults fight?", sixteen drop-outs compared to eleven part-time students said they had seen adults fight.

Other code questions received similar responses as seen in TABLE IV.

An aggressive drop-out's reply was:

"Yeah, I've been in fights, about a month ago up in Grand Rapids, I've

TABLE IV
BEHAVIORAL AGGRESSION
DGP SCALE

Code	Question	Code	No. of drop-outs answered	No. of part-time students answered
1)	Have you been in a fight within a year?	Yes 0 No 1	12 8	5 15
2)	Is there something you would fight over?	Yes 0 No 1	16 4	14 6
3)	After a fight, are you glad you fought or feel good about it?	Yes 0 No 1	14 6	10 10
4)	Have you seen adults fight?	Yes 0 No 1	16 4	11 9
5)	From arguments you have had do you win by avoiding fights?	Yes 1 No 0	18 2	18 2
6)	Have you ever been picked up by the police? Other than traffic.	Yes 0 No 1	13 7	7 13

TABLE V
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL AGGRESSION
DGP SCORES

Scores	No. of drop-outs who scored	No. of part-time students who scored
0	1	1
1	8	1
2	1	2
3	5	6
4	4	4
5	1	4
6	0	2
Mean	2.3	3.5
Median	2.5	3.5

had lots of them. Everybody does... Sure, I'd fight if anybody said anything against my parents, or brothers, or sisters, or my girl... I feel good after a fight if I don't like the kid. Win or lose, it don't make no difference. I still feel good. The only thing fightin' shows you is when your fightin', one might have more strength than you. Yeah, I seen adults fight mostly at Taverns. When I have an argument, I wouldn't fight it out, I'd try to talk it out... Yeah, I've been picked up by the police. One time for having money a guy stole'd, another time I was with a kid that stole some gas, and we just got out of jail in December. Another time they took me in for trying to rape a girl, but she was lying and they gave her a hard time."

A less aggressive drop-out expressed this:

"Yeah, I've been in fights. The last one I had was about two years ago. I don't remember what it was about. I guess I had quite a few before that. About girls and stuff.... I'd fight if someone said something about my

parents. But I can get along with anybody. I don't go looking for it. If somebody forced me, I'd fight. .. how do I feel after a fight? I hate it. I'd feel lousy, win or lose, fightin' is a waste of time. I seen my dad fight. Somebody called him a bad name. He was in one of his bad moods. I win arguments with strategy, I talk 'em into it. Yeah, I've been picked up by the police three times for running away from home."

Part-time students were generally less aggressive.

But one sixteen year old showed a high degree of aggressive behavior. He said:

"I got into a fight about a month ago. It (the fight) was at school in the john. This guy was trying to give another kid a lit cigarette and the principal walked in. The second kid, the one who was to take the cigarette, if he had fought and been caught, he would have landed in jail. So I fought for him. Yeah, I'd fight over a job or help someone else out, if more than one was picking on another. I feel pretty good after a fight if I win or lose... Yeah, I saw some adults fight, Friday night at a tavern. One guy was worried about another taking out his wife... I tell the truth in arguments, if he doesn't want to believe me, I smack him in the mouth.. I've been picked up by the police, a year ago for fighting in school and before that for throwing rocks through windows."

A less aggressive and more typical answer by part-time students can be seen in this individual's response:

"No, I've never been in a fight. I'd fight if my twin brother was in trouble. After a fight, I'd wonder if it was worth it, win or lose, I'd wonder.... No, I haven't seen adults fight. In

arguments, of...I don't know, a different way each time. Just by not yelling, I guess. No, I've never been picked up by the police."

Most of the informants said they had been in a fight at some time. Only two part-time students said they had never been in a fight, although six drop-outs and twelve part-time students had not been in fights within the last year. Their reasons for fighting varied:

"I was just protecting my brother."

"It was over a girl."

"He called my mother a big fat_____."

Eighteen drop-outs and sixteen part-time students said they had seen adults fight. Two drop-outs and one part-time student said they had seen their parents fighting. Most said they saw drunks fight in taverns. It should be noted that all the informants were minors and to be in taverns is illegal.

Slightly more than half of the informants, fourteen drop-outs and eight part-time students, had been arrested by the police. Their reasons varied from breaking and entering to shop-lifting, vagrancy, vandalism, drinking, running away from home, stealing gas, and assault and battery. One drop-out said he was picked up, but not prosecuted for attempted rape.

Economic Independence DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his replies to the code questions as seen in TABLE VI. A respondent's score could range from a low DGP of "0" to a high DGP of "5", as seen in TABLE VII.

TABLE VI

BEHAVIORAL ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE DGP SCALE

Code Question	Code	No. of drop-outs answered	No. of part-time students answered
1) Do you feel you will be on your own within a year?			
	Yes 0	13	4
	No 1	7	16
2) Are your friends out on their own?			
	Yes 0	8	10
	No 1	12	10
3) Do you have plans for schooling?			
	Yes 1	9	20
	No 0	11	0
4) Do those you live with pay for things you need other than room and board?			
	Yes 1	13	11
	No 0	7	9
5) Do you occasionally pay for things that those you live with need?			
	Yes 0	13	11
	No 1	7	9

The third research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be more concerned with obtaining a good job that

will give them earlier independence than will part-time students. This is supported in the Behavioral Measure of DGP. Part-time students mean scores were 1.0 higher than drop-outs. (See TABLE VII).

TABLE VII
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE
DGP SCORES

Scores	No. of drop-outs who scored	No. of part-time students who scored
0	1	0
1	3	1
2	5	3
3	5	4
4	3	6
5	3	6
Mean	2.5	3.5
Median	3.0	4.0

An explanation for these differences in scores may be found in the reply to the code question, "Do you feel you will be out on your own within a year?" Thirteen drop-outs as compared to four part-time students felt that they would be. These were four of the six seniors in this study. Another question which yielded a different response was, "Do you have plans for schooling?" Nine drop-outs compared to twenty part-time students said they had plans. Other code questions received similar responses. (See TABLE VI).

One drop-out, who scored low on DGP of Economic Independence left the program at Y.O.U. shortly after

the interview. He moved to New England to live with his brother who promised he could find a job for him.

His response was:

"I'll be out on my own as soon as I can: When I get a good job. I don't know when that will be.... I don't have many friends, but one of them is working in a factory. I have no plans whatsoever for schooling... I pay for everything except room and board. Oh, sometimes the old man brings a pack of cigarettes if he's in a good mood."

Another drop-out who was placed on a job by Y.O.U.

said:

"I am out on my own now and pay for everything, room, board, car, clothes, everything... No I don't have any friends out on their own like me... No, I don't have any plans for schooling.. My parents buy clothes and they helped me buy a car."

An eighteen year old drop-out, whose mother receives Aid to Dependent Children, said:

"I want to be out on my own now. When ya' get this age, ya' run around and parents don't like it, best to get out. None of my friends are out on their own. Yeah, I plan to go back to school and learn to read better. My mother buys some clothes for me and gives me some spending money. Sometimes I help buy groceries when I have money."

Part-time students gave generally more indication of postponing economic independence. A typical response is as follows:

"I'll be out on my own 18 months from

now. When I get out of school. I plan to go into Navy electronics and make a career out of it. My folks pay for room and board and buy most of my clothes. I pay for most everything else I need."

Another typical response by a part-time student is:

"I'll be out on my own in 2 years, when I get out of school. No, none of my friends are out on their own.. My parents pay for most everything, clothes, car, room and board, once in awhile they'll give me spending money when I need it. Sometimes I help pay for the groceries, too."

The replies varied as to when they felt they would be on their own, i.e. living on their own income. Five drop-outs and one part-time student said they were on their own at the time of the interview. Most part-time students said they would not be on their own until they were out of school. But most drop-outs wanted to be independent as soon as possible. Some drop-outs said:

"I'll be out on my own when I get a good job, soon as they (Y.O.U.) get me a job."

"I'll be out on my own when I'm 18, a year from now. That's when they stop paying A.D.C. (Aid to Dependent Children).

"When I get off probation, in 1967, I'll be out on my own."

Some of the part-time students comments were:

"I'll be out on my own when I get out of school, two years from now."

"I'll be out on my own in 1967 when

I join the Army. No one will be tellin' me what to do or when."

"I'm kinda on my own now. I hlep Ma out with the groceries and stuff. Sometimes my girl's folks need some money and I help them out, too."

Consumption DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his replies to the code questions seen in TABLE VIII. A respondent's score could range from a low DGP of "0" to a high DGP of "6" as seen in TABLE IX.

The fourth research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be less concerned with saving money and goods than will part-time students. That is to say, the utilization of money will be less future oriented by drop-outs than by part-time students. Support for this is found in the Behavioral Measure of DGP. Part-time students' mean behavioral scores were 0.4 higher than drop-outs. (See TABLE IX).

The slight difference in behavioral scores cannot be explained by the presence or lack of savings. In response to the question "Do you have any money in savings?", eight drop-outs and ten part-time students said they did. Perhaps the differences in mean scores is explainable in the answers to the question "Do you have any debts?". Twelve drop-outs compared to seven

part-time students said they did. Other questions asked, which gave slight differences in response, were, "Do you spend \$6 or more a week on dates?", "Do you loan or give friends more than \$1 at a time?", "Do you buy any beer or liquor?", "Do you have a car of your own?" (see TABLE VIII). Some typical answers by drop-outs are seen in the following cases:

"No, I don't have any savings... I owe my dad for my car... Sure, I loan friends money. Sometimes a dollar, sometimes more.. I guess about once a week someone asks me for a loan.. About twice a week, we go buy some beer or something."

Another drop-out responded:

"Yeah, I've got a little bit in savings at home. Yeah, I do owe some people money. I put my foot through a big glass window at the _____ Roller Rink. I guess I spend \$15 - \$17 a week on dates. Sure, I loan money to friends, 'bout once a week someone asks me for \$1 or \$2. No, I don't have a car, when I go on a date, we walk or she don't go."

Another response given by a part-time student was:

"I've got a little money saved at home. No, no debts. ...I don't date much, once every two weeks and I'll spend \$3, I guess... Maybe once a month, I'll loan a guy \$1 or \$2... I get others to buy some beer for me. Maybe once in 2 weeks. We get a 6 pack. No, I don't have a car."

Another part-time student said:

"Yes, I've got money in savings.. I owe the bank for my car... I spend

maybe \$2 a week on dates.. I loan money if I know they'll give it back. I haven't got money to loan much. No, I've never drank any beer or liquor."

TABLE VIII

BEHAVIORAL CONSUMPTION
DGP SCALE

Code	Question	Code	No. of drop-outs answered	No. of Part-time students answered
1)	Do you have any money in savings?	Yes 1 No 0	8 12	10 10
2)	Do you have any debts?	Yes 0 No 1	12 8	7 13
3)	Do you spend \$6 or more a week on dates?	Yes 0 No 1	8 12	4 16
4)	Do you loan or give friends more than \$1 at a time?	Yes 0 No 1	13 7	16 4
5)	Do you buy any beer or liquor?	Yes 0 No 1	7 13	4 16
6)	Do you have a car of your own?	Yes 0 No 1	7 13	10 10

TABLE IX
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL CONSUMPTION
DGP SCORES

Scores	No. of drop-outs who scored	No. of part- time students who scored
0	0	0
1	5	2
2	4	3
3	2	3
4	6	6
5	1	6
6	2	0
Mean	3.1	3.5
Median	3.0	4.0

All the informants had loaned or given money to friends in amounts which ranged from 50 cents to no maximum amount by others. Some of the informants said they would only loan money to particular friends they knew who would pay it back. Others did not qualify who or on what basis they would give or loan money.

Nearly a third of the informants, twelve, said they drank beer or liquor. All of the informants were under the minimum age for legal drinking. Those that did drink gave different answers as to how much they drank. Some part-time students said:

"I've had a little wine with Mom, but that's not very often."

"Oh, we go out every weekend and get a case or couple of six packs. It depends on how much money we've got."

A drop-out said:

"I use to go out with the guys once a week and drink it up, but I don't any more. My girl, she wouldn't like it."

Various responses were given to the questions,

"What do your friends spend their money on?", and

"Would you do the same if you were in their shoes?".

Typical answers given by drop-outs are:

"Oh, they buy cigarettes, clothes, go roller skating.. Yeah, I would do the same thing."

"They spend their money on women and booze. I go along with the women part, but I don't go for throwing it away on booze. I'd rather buy parts for my car."

Three part-time students said:

"One of my friends spent \$300 on a Hi-Fi and records. What a waste! I could think of better things. He needs clothes and should buy some."

"Their money goes for girls and cigarettes and stuff like that. I wouldn't do the same, I'd save some so I'd have something to rely on."

"They spend their money on pizza, bowling, pop, and goofin' off in general. We all do the same thing."

Sex DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his replies to the code questions seen in TABLE X. A

respondent's score could range from a low DGP of "0" to a high DGP of "6" (see TABLE XI).

The fifth research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be less willing to postpone sexual gratifications than will part-time students. Support for this was found in the behavioral measure. Part-time students' mean behavior score was 1.2 higher than drop-outs.

The differences in the behavioral score may be explained in that five drop-outs compared to eleven part-time students answered "no" to the code question, "Have you gone further than holding a girl's hand or kissing a girl, not including sexual intercourse?". Also, the question "Have you had sexual intercourse?" was answered yes by eight drop-outs compared to four part-time students.

Other code questions, which yielded slight differences in response, (See TABLE X) were, "Have you been on a date within the last week?", "Are you going steady or engaged?", "Should you be at least twenty before you marry?" (See TABLE X). Responses to these particular questions were varied. Two drop-outs, ages 17 and 18, had never been out with a girl. One said that he had held a girl's hand and had kissed a girl, but the other said he had not done either. More typical of the drop-outs, is the following kind of response of

a 17 year old:

"The last time I was on a date was Saturday. We went to the show, but I see her every night. We're going steady and plan to get married a year from now. But we're having a little trouble, she's missed a couple of periods so it will probably be sooner. Our folks don't know it... A guy should be 18 before he gets married."

Another drop-out gave the following reply:

"The last time I was on a date was a month or so ago. A bunch of us went to a dance. I don't date too often, maybe once a month or so. No, I'm not going steady, or engaged... I'd want to be at least twenty before I got married. Yes, I've rubbed a girl's breasts, but I've never gone any further."

All part-time students had dated and been out with girls, but only half as many part-time students as drop-outs had sexual intercourse. The typical answer was:

"I was on a date two days ago. We went alone to a drive-in-movie. I date about twice a week. I'm going steady. I'd want to be 23-24 before I got married. When asked if he had petted with a girl or rubbed a girl's breasts he said, 'I'd better not answer that.' He said that he had not had sexual intercourse."

Another part-time student said:

"I was on a date about 2 weeks ago. It was a double date. We went to a drive-in-movie. I date once a week. If I see too much of a girl, we argue more and it puts an end to things... No, I'm not going steady, I might when I get out of high school."

...I'd like to be 20, 21 before I get married." He said he had held a girl's hand and kissed a girl, but had done nothing else.

TABLE X
BEHAVIORAL SEXUAL
DGP SCALE

Code	Question	Code	No. of drop-outs answered	No. of part-time students answered
1)	Have you been on a date within the last week?			
	Yes 0		12	10
	No 1		8	10
2)	Do you date more than twice a week?			
	Yes 0		7	3
	No 1		13	17
3)	Are you going steady or engaged?			
	Yes 0		7	6
	No 1		13	14
4)	Should you be at least 20 before you marry?			
	Yes 1		11	17
	No 0		9	3
5)	Have you gone further than holding a girl's hand or kissing her, not including sexual intercourse?			
	Yes 0		15	9
	No 1		5	11
6)	Have you had sexual intercourse?			
	Yes 0		8	4
	No 1		12	16

TABLE XI
TOTAL BEHAVIORAL SEX
DGP SCORES

Scores	No. of drop- outs who scored	No. of part- time students who scored
0	3	0
1	3	1
2	2	1
3	3	6
4	3	3
5	2	2
6	4	7
Mean	3.1	4.3
Median	3.0	4.0

In studying the sex life of american males, Kinsey comes to the conclusion that coition was a routine part of growing up for lower-class males, but a violation of the mores for higher class males. He concluded that a lower class boy who had not had sex relations before he was sixteen years old was either physically or mentally defective or he had picked up middle-class values. If he has picked up the middle class values, he is potentially socially upward mobile.

As Kinsey³² implies, he is marked for moving out of his community and going on to college.

This subject is one area where the researcher believes the weakest reliability falls. When asking one

³²Alfred C. Kinsey, W. B. Pomeroy and C. E. Martin, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. W. B. Sanders Company, Philadelphia, 1948, p.381.

informant about his behavior he gave an answer and then added, "You ought to ask 'so and so' about that." He inferred that this particular person had had sexual intercourse. It so happened that this person was also included in the study, but had said that he had not had sexual intercourse. Two possibilities that exist are that he was either making up stories to his friend, or not telling all to the researcher.

Nearly one-third of the informants, twelve, said that they had had sexual intercourse. A similar number, ten, said it was all right to have sexual intercourse after dating awhile, or when going steady or when engaged.

When asked "What does 'too far' mean to you?" three said, sexual intercourse. Others said petting, parking, or necking for an hour was "too far". Also, eleven respondents qualified when "too far" applies. As two drop-outs said:

"All the way is not "too far" all the time. Sometimes it depends on the girl. If she wants you to go all the way, you want to get out! She might want to get pregnant."

"Depends on the girl. Usually go as far as you can get... I like this one girl bad! And I don't touch. If a guy really likes her, he shouldn't mess around."

Margaret Mead³³ makes comments about the changing attitudes toward sex of late adolescents and young adults which reflects this same attitude.

"A sexual code had developed in which young men protect their own girls but regard all other girls as fair game, and in which girls, who have to protect themselves against the irresponsible advances of all casually met males, relax within the confines of a trusted and settled relationship."

The places that these respondents take their dates include, roller skating, drive-in-movies, for rides, drive-in restaurants, drag-races, and dances. The informants dated as little as once every few months or as often as every night.

The questions "Have your friends told you about sexual intercourse they have had?", and "Were you ever with them when they did?" were means of introducing the subject of their personal sexual behavior. Twenty-five respondents said that their friends had told them about sexual intercourse in which they had participated. Some respondents said they were not too certain of the truth of their "stories". But five respondents stated that they were with friends, either in a house or parked in a woods when their friends had sexual intercourse.

³³Margaret Mead, "Problems of the Late Adolescent and Young Adult", Children and Youth in the 1960's, by the Committee on Studies for the Golden Anniversary White House Conference of Children and Youth, Inc., 1960, p.6.

Four of these five said they have had sexual intercourse.

Summary

Each scale yielded a higher score for part-time students than for drop-outs: Affiliation, 0.25; Aggression, 1.2; Economic Independence, 1.0; Consumption, 0.4; and Sex, 1.2. This leads to the conclusion that part-time students defer more gratifications in their behavior than do drop-outs.

A total behavioral score was computed for each respondent by adding each of the five scale scores together. (See TABLE I, Appendix III for variation in response of scores). None of the scales were consistently low or high in scores and very few respondents were consistently low or high in their scores.

A "Z" test³⁴ of proportions was computed by ranking the total behavioral scores for each respondent, drop-outs and part-time students combined, and testing the proportion below the median score. A significant difference was obtained at the .001 level. It is concluded that there is a significant difference with respect to behavioral deferment of gratification between the drop-outs and the part-time students. In other words, fifteen drop-outs scored in the lower half

³⁴op.cit., p.178

of the behavioral scale range whereas fifteen part-time students scored in the upper half of the behavioral scale range. The median behavioral DGP score for drop-outs was 14.5 but was 19.0 for the part-time students. (See TABLE XII).

TABLE XII
BEHAVIORAL DGP SCORES

Mean scores					
	Drop-outs	Part-time students	Difference	Possible range	Actual range
Affiliation	3.20	3.45	0.25	0-6	2-6
Aggression	2.3	3.5	1.2	0-6	0-6
Economic Independence	2.5	3.5	1.0	0-5	0-5
Consumption	3.1	3.5	0.4	0-6	1-6
Sex	3.1	4.3	1.2	0-6	0-6
<hr/>					
Median Scores	14.5	19.0	4.5	0-29	6-23

CHAPTER IV

NORMATIVE DEFERRED GRATIFICATION PATTERNS

The major hypothesis is that drop-outs will be less willing to defer gratification than part-time students. This is generally not supported in the normative measure of DGP and there are some slightly negative findings. This can be discussed in the five research hypotheses. These areas measured are; Affiliation, aggression, Economic Independence, Consumption, and Sex. As stated in the preceeding chapter, these subjects are believed to be needs of young people and if deferment is to occur it is believed that it will occur in these needs.

Measurement of the normative DGP was similar to the measurement of the behavioral DGP. However, the normative measure was a structured schedule (See Appendix I) and consequently does not lend itself to as thorough an analysis as the behavioral measure.

Affiliation DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his replies to the questions in TABLE XIII. A respondents score could range from a low DGP of "7" to a high DGP of "35".

TABLE XIII
NORMATIVE AFFILIATION
DGP SCALE

When choosing friends, a guy should find friends that:

1. Are able to fight for themselves.

(Strongly agree) (Agree) (Don't know) (Disagree)
SA A DK D
(Strongly disagreed)
SD

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	1	13	0	6	0
No. of Part-time	1	14	0	5	0

2. Hold their liquor.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	3	9	0	7	1
No. of Part-time					

3. Pay their own way.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	3	14	0	3	0
No. of Part-time	0	16	0	4	0

4. Come from good families.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	1	10	2	7	0
No. of Part-time	1	9	0	9	1

5. Chet doesn't care what his friends do when he is with them. His friends have gone under fences to get into Fairs, stolen water melons and gas, drank a lot of beer, and it seems like they are always in fights. These should be Chet's friends.

TABLE XIII continued

Answer	SA	A	DA	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	3	2	8	7
No. of Part-time	0	2	0	12	6

6. Ross does not go around with guys that fight, or drink or are loud and noisy in public places. This is the way Ross should choose friends.

Answer	SA	A	DA	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	3	14	0	3	0
No. of Part-time	1	12	0	6	1

7. Teenagers have to be careful about the behavior of friends they go with. Do you.

Answer	SA	A	DA	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	14	13	0	3	0
No. of Part-time	2	17	0	1	0

The first research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be less concerned with the "socially acceptable" behavior of their friends than will the part-time students. A negative relationship for this was found. The part-time students' mean scores were slightly lower, 0.8 than drop-outs' mean score. (See TABLE XIV).

TABLE XIV
TOTAL NORMATIVE AFFILIATION
DGP SCORES

Score Range	Drop-outs	Part-time students
15-20	3	4
21-25	10	11
26-30	7	5
Mean	24.1	23.3
Median	25	24.4

For all practical purposes the drop-outs and the part-time students perceive the DGP norms about friends to be the same. This will be seen again in the measures of normative DGP of Aggression, Economic Independence, and Consumption. There is a difference in the perceived normative DGP of Sex.

Both groups basically agree that friends should be able to fight for themselves; fourteen drop-outs and fifteen part-time students agreed that friends should pay their own way. Both groups were divided when asked if friends should come from good families. Eleven drop-outs and ten part-time students agreed. All other respondents disagreed. Also, all but three drop-outs and one part-time student agreed that teenagers have to be careful about the behavior of their friends.

Aggression DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his replies to the questions in TABLE XV. A respondent's score could range from a low DGP of "6" to a high DGP of "30".

The second research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be more willing to, and more often do, become involved in physical violence than will part time students. This is not supported in the normative measure of DGP.

TABLE XV
NORMATIVE AGGRESSION
DGP SCALE

1. The best way for adults to settle arguments is to fight it out.

Answer	SA	A	DA	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	1	0	12	7
No. of Part-time	0	1	0	13	6

2. The guy that wins in settling an argument should be the guy that is a tougher, better fighter.

Answer	SA	A	DA	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	1	2	12	5
No. of Part-time	0	2	0	16	2

3. One should never fight unless he is forced to.

Answer	SA	A	DA	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	3	15	0	2	0
No. of Part-time	3	14	0	2	1

4. When a person gets mad at someone, he should fight it out with him. Do you.

Answer	SA	A	DA	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	3	0	17	0
No. of Part-time	0	0	1	17	2

5. Chet is able to disagree with someone and not fight, but he does a lot of talking. Chet says this is the way to settle an argument. Do you.

Answer	SA	A	DA	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	0	17	0	2	1
No. of Part-time	1	14	0	4	1

6. Ross has broken a few laws and been caught. But he never has gone to court. He says it is bad to have a police record. Do you.

Answer	SA	A	DA	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	5	13	0	2	0
No. of Part-time	5	14	1	0	0

Both groups received the same mean scores. (See TABLE XVI).

TABLE XVI
TOTAL NORMATIVE AGGRESSION
DGP SCORES

Score Range	Drop-outs	Part-time students
17-20	2	3
21-24	11	10
25-28	7	7
Mean	23.5	23.5
Median	24.0	24.0

Nineteen drop-outs and nineteen part-time students agree that adults should not fight to settle arguments. Most disagree that the guy who wins in settling an argument should be the guy who is a tougher, better fighter. Seventeen drop-outs and seventeen part-time students agreed that one should never fight unless forced to do so. This question indicated the most violation in their behavior compared to their attitude, for twelve drop-outs and five part-time students had been in fights within the last year. Also, most respondents disagreed that when a person gets mad at someone, he should fight it out with him. Seventeen drop-outs and nineteen part-time students disagreed.

Economic Independence DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his

replies to the questions in TABLE XVII. A respondent's score could range from a low DGP of "5" to a high DGP of "25".

The third research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be more concerned with obtaining a good job that will give them independence sooner than will part-time students. A slightly negative finding was obtained in this measure of DGP. The part-time students mean score was 0.4 lower than the drop-outs. (See TABLE XVIII).

Again there was considerable similarity between responses to questions. Eighteen drop-outs and eighteen part-time students agreed that one should not leave school for a good job. But most of the drop-outs stated earlier that they were looking for good jobs. Thirteen drop-outs and twelve part-time students disagreed with a person receiving financial help from his parents as long as he can. Twelve drop-outs and thirteen part-time students felt a young man should be out on his own by the time he is nineteen. Twelve drop-outs and twelve part-time students agreed that a person should get out on his own as soon as he is able.

Consumption DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his replies to the questions in TABLE XIX. A respondent's

TABLE XVII
NORMATIVE
ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE DGP SCALE

1. If a guy can get a good job, when he leaves school or graduates from high school, he should not do any more schooling in trade school or college.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	2	0	18	0
No. of Part-time	0	2	0	15	3

2. Ross plans to get as much financial help from his parents as he can before he gets out on his own. He says that's what he should do.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	2	5	0	11	2
No. of Part-time	2	6	0	11	1

3. Many people say different ages as to when a young man should be out on his own. At what age do you think a person should be out on his own.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	1	11	8	0	0
No. of Part-time	0	13	6	1	0

4. Chet says that a guy should get out on his own as soon as he is able. Do you.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	12	0	8	0
No. of Part-time	1	11	2	6	0

5. Parents should expect to pay for things their son needs until he is married and out on his own.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	0	7	0	11	2
No. of Part-time	0	2	1	16	1

score could range from a low DGP of "5" to a high DGP of "25".

The fourth research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be less concerned with saving money and goods than will part-time students. That is to say, the utilization of money by drop-outs will be less future oriented than by part-time students. A slightly negative relationship for this was found. Part-time students' mean score was 0.8 lower than the drop-outs'. (See TABLE XX).

Here again there was near unanimity among the drop-outs and the part-time students. Nineteen drop-outs and eighteen part-time students agreed that the money one saves should give at least as good a feeling as the things bought (but only approximately half as many in both groups had savings). Fourteen drop-outs and sixteen part-time students agreed that one should loan or give money to a friend who doesn't have money. Seventeen drop-outs and eighteen part-time students disagreed with, "there is no point in saving money if you can buy what you want on credit." Twenty drop-outs and eighteen part-time students agreed that the way to get things one wants is to save for them. Eighteen drop-outs and nineteen part-time students disagreed that one shouldn't save.

TABLE XVIII

TOTAL NORMATIVE ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE
DGP SCORES

Score Range	Drop-outs	Part-time students
11-13	10	11
14-16	5	6
17-19	5	3
Mean	14.1	13.7
Median	13.0	13.0

TABLE XIX

NORMATIVE CONSUMPTION
DGP SCALE

1. The money you save should give you at least as good a feeling as the things you buy.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	2	17	0	1	0
No. of Part-time	0	18	0	2	0

2. When a friend does not have money, you should give or loan him some.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	14	0	5	1
No. of Part-time	0	16	1	3	0

3. There is no point in saving money if you can buy what you want on credit.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	3	0	16	1
No. of Part-time	0	2	0	18	0

4. Ross works part-time in a grocery store and has some of his pay deducted for a savings. Ross says the way to get things he wants is to save for them.

TABLE XIX continued

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	5	15	0	0	0
No. of Part-time	2	16	0	2	0

5. Chet works full time at a paper company where he makes \$1.73 an hour. Chet says he should not save.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	1	0	18	1
No. of Part-time	0	1	0	19	0

TABLE XX

NORMATIVE CONSUMPTION
DGP SCORES

Score Range	Drop-outs	Part-time students
14-16	4	4
17-19	9	13
20-22	7	3
Mean	18.3	17.5
Median	18.0	18.0

Sex DGP

Each respondent was scored on the basis of his replies to the questions in TABLE XXI. A respondent's score could range from a low DGP of "8" to a high DGP of "40".

The fifth research hypothesis is that drop-outs will be less willing to postpone sexual gratification than will part-time students. Support for this was found in the normative measure. Part-time students'

TABLE XXI

NORMATIVE SEXUAL
DGP SCALE

1. Ross and Rose have been engaged for a year and can't get married for another year. They have had sexual intercourse. Rose says it's all right because they plan to get married. Do you _____ with Rose?

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	5	1	13	1
No. of Part-time	0	2	0	15	3

2. Chet and Charlette have been engaged for a year and Chet wants to have sexual intercourse before they get married, 3 months from now, but Charlette says they should wait until they are married. Do you _____ with Charlette.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	1	18	1	0	0
No. of Part-time	5	13	0	2	0

3. Dan dates a lot of girls and he goes out just for sexual intercourse. Dan says it is what women are for and this is how a real man should be. Do you

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	0	0	0	14	6
No. of Part-time	0	0	0	16	4

4. Pete says that a young man should be as careful as a girl in seeing that necking doesn't go too far, that is, kissing and hugging and no further. Do you

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	2	15	1	2	0
No. of Part-time	2	14	1	3	0

5. It is all right for a guy to date girls that are known to have sexual intercourse with other boys.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Drop-outs	1	8	1	9	1
No. of Part-time	0	8	1	10	1

TABLE XXI continued

6. A young man should have as much responsibility as a girl in seeing that necking doesn't go too far.

Answer	SA	A	DK	D	SD
Code	5	4	3	2	1
No. of Drop-outs	2	14	0	3	1
No. of Part-time	1	16	1	2	0

7. What does "too far" mean to you?

	Code	Drop-out	Part-time
Answer: Kiss and hug	5	1	0
Park	4	4	5
Rub breasts	3	0	6
Rub genital	2	13	8
Sex intercourse	1	2	1

8. How far should a guy go:
 On first date?;
 After dated for awhile?;
 When going steady?;
 When engaged?

Answer for the above four:

Kiss and hug	5	1	1
Rub breasts	3	2	4
Park	4	7	6
Rub genital	2	4	5
Sex intercourse	1	6	4

(If willing to put off sexual intercourse 'til after marriage, high DGP).

mean normative score was 1.5 higher than drop-outs'.
(See TABLE XXII).

The difference in the normative scores may be found in that fifteen part-time students compared to nine drop-outs felt that kissing, hugging, and parking were as far as one should go on a date. In response to the question "What does too far mean to you?", one part-time student replied, "Petting, it's too easy to go too far after that." Another part-time student said, "A guy shouldn't go out of bounds. Puttin' your arm around her and kissin' and huggin' are O.K." One drop-out said, "When a guy starts feeling her up, that's too far." Another drop-out said, "Depends on the girl, if a girl wants to - how can one resist?" A talkative drop-out said, "Sexual intercourse is not too far all the time. Ya shouldn't do it if your're too young, something could happen. The first time I went I was 12, you know for something like that, she was 18."

TABLE XXII

TOTAL NORMATIVE SEX
DGP SCORES

Score Range	Drop- outs	Part-time students
18-24	4	2
25-30	13	14
31-35	3	4
Mean	26.3	27.8
Median	26.5	29.5

Summary

The scales for normative DGP did not give support to the hypothesis that part-time students would defer more gratification than drop-outs. Negative findings were obtained in Affiliation, Economic Independence, and Consumption DGP. An equal mean score was obtained in Aggression DGP and a positive finding was obtained in Sex DGP. These findings lead to the conclusion that part-time students and drop-outs normatively defer gratifications equally.

A total normative score was computed for each respondent by adding each of the five scale scores together as was done for behavioral scores (See TABLE II, Appendix III). None of the scales were consistently low or high in scores. Although Economic Independence and Consumption look lower, the range possible is ten or fifteen points lower. Also, very few respondents were consistently low in their scores.

A "Z" test of proportions was completed, on the normative measure, with a significant difference between drop-outs and part-time students at the .10 level. It is concluded that there is not a significant difference with respect to normative deferment of gratification between the drop-outs and the part-time students. The median Normative DGP score for the part-time students

was 105.5 and for the drop-outs 107.0, a difference of 1.5 (See TABLE XXIII).

TABLE XXIII
NORMATIVE DGP SCORES

Mean Scores					
	Drop- outs	Part-time students	Differ- ence	Possible range	Actual range
Affili- ation	24.1	23.3	0.8	7-35	15-30
Aggres- sion	23.5	23.5	0.0	6-30	17-28
Economic Independ- ence	14.1	13.7	0.4	5-25	11-19
Consump- tion	18.3	17.5	0.8	5-25	14-22
Sex	26.3	27.8	1.5	8-40	18-35
<hr/>					
Median of total	107.0	105.0	1.5	31-155	91-120

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Deferred gratification refers to the practice of postponing immediate satisfactions so that future goals may be gained. Today's activities are viewed in light of their consequences for tomorrow. One who realizes his social status, and that mobility is a probability in his life becomes interested in upward mobility. Part of the means to this end is through the deferment of immediate satisfactions.

As stated earlier, some researchers question the utility of DGP. Miller and Riessman³⁵ and Beilin³⁶ believe that, rather than deferment of gratification, there are different gratifications. In reviewing the responses of some of the respondents, there is an indication that this may not be true. For example, a drop-out in stating what his friends did with their money said:

"Their money goes for girls and cigarettes and stuff like that. I wouldn't do the same, I'd save some so I'd have something to rely on."

³⁵op.cit.

³⁶op. cit.

Several part-time students in talking about whether their friends are in or out of school said:

"No, I don't have any friends that have left school. But a few are going part-time, same as I am. It's a good deal. It gives some opportunities, a chance to get out and learn more than what school teaches..."

"R. R. dropped out of school. He'll have to graduate to get anywhere."

"D. S. quit school. He made a mistake. He'll never get anywhere without finishing school."

These kinds of statements lead to the conclusion that some of these young people do think in terms of the future and are deferring gratifications.

Schneider and Lysgaard³⁷ believe that DGP is a characteristic of only the middle class and not applicable to other socio-economic levels. But Straus³⁸ did not find a positive correlation between socio-economic status and DGP.

Parallel to Straus, DGP was found in the present study. In a sample of lower socio-economic level young people, a positive correlation on behavioral dimension between part-time students and drop-outs was found. Part-time students defer more gratification

³⁷op. cit.

³⁸op. cit.

than drop-outs (See TABLE XII, Chapter III).

Straus³⁹ presented another view in that DGP is a function of achievement. Support for this is found in this study. Part-time students are achievement oriented in that they are attending school and planning on completion of high school. Very few drop-outs plan to return to school and none planned to finish high school. The behavioral DGP scores were parallel to their achievement orientation as stated above.

A fourth view concerns the question of DGP being a unitary pattern. Schneider and Lysgaard⁴⁰ contend that it does fall into a pattern. Straus⁴¹ believes that DGP falls into two patterns, one in interpersonal needs and another in material needs. The sample size in this exploratory study was not large enough to research this position.

Study limitations

Interview data was obtained from a sample of twenty drop-outs and twenty part-time students at Y.O.U. There were nearly 700 young people who had dropped out of school during the current academic year, but their names:

39op. cit.

40op. cit.

41op. cit.

are not available. The school systems would not release information about them for this kind of research. Therefore, a sample was taken from the rolls of Y.O.U. some of which were actively enrolled at the time of interview.

In an effort to keep the respondents similar in respect to the institution of which they were active, the part-time students as well as the school drop-outs were taken from the Y.O.U. rolls. Although there are approximately 250 to 300 students going to school part-time about forty of them are active in the Y.O.U. program. With the elimination of females and non-whites from the sample, nearly all those active at Y.O.U. were included in the sample.

Although these findings are not necessarily applicable to all drop-outs and part-time students, it may provide leads to some additional study. An exploratory study of this nature is intended to lead to more extensive study, as is suggested in the section dealing with implications for further research.

Verification of hypotheses

The major hypothesis stated that drop-outs will be less willing to defer gratifications than part-time students. This was supported in the behavioral measure of DGP at the .001 level. But support was not found in

the normative measure of DGP, at the .01 level (A non-parametric "Z" test of proportions is used). This can be described in the five research hypotheses.

The first research hypothesis stated that drop-outs will be less concerned with the "socially acceptable" behavior of their friends than will the part-time students. That is to say, drop-outs will not be as concerned with the perceived middle class values of "acceptable" behavior, including avoiding fights and petty crime as the part-time students. Support for this is found in the behavioral measure of DGP and none at all in the normative measure of DGP. Part-time students' mean scores were slightly higher, 0.25, but the normative mean scores were lower, 0.8, than the drop-outs.

The second research hypothesis stated that drop-outs will be more willing to, and more often do, become involved in physical violence than will part-time students. This is supported in the behavioral aspect but not in the normative aspect. Part-time students' mean score was 1.2 higher than drop-outs' in behavioral DGP, but both groups obtained the same mean score for normative aggression.

The third research hypothesis stated that drop-outs will be more concerned with obtaining a "good"

job that will give them independence sooner than will part-time students. This is supported in regard to behavioral, but not in the perceived normative. Part-time students' mean scores were 1.0 higher than drop-outs in behavioral, but 0.4 lower in the normative DGP.

The fourth research hypotheses stated that drop-outs will be less concerned with saving money than will the part-time student. Support for this is found in the behavioral, but lacking in the normative. Part-time students' mean behavioral scores were 0.4 higher, but 0.8 lower on the normative DGP than the drop-outs.

The fifth research hypothesis states that drop-outs will be less willing to postpone sexual gratifications than will part-time students. Support for this was found in both behavioral and the normative. Part-time students' mean behavioral score was 1.2 higher than drop-outs, and likewise, mean normative score was 1.5 higher.

A theoretical explanation is needed in understanding why drop-outs and part-time students perceive the norms of DGP the same but the part-time students defer more behavioral gratifications than drop-outs.

Both groups being of lower socio-economic status it would be expected that both groups would behaviorally and normatively defer gratifications equally.

But this is not the case. A solution may be found in that both groups fail to live up to the norms and that the part-time students behave more in line with the normative than do the drop-outs.

Research has found that one's attitude and behavior are not necessarily the same. DeFleur and Westie ⁴² found this to be true in their study of verbal attitudes and overt acts.

In their study, they investigate what one says he does in relation with Negroes and what he overtly does. DeFleur and Westie⁴³ also cite an earlier study done by La Piere:

"....in company with a couple from China, La Piere made an extensive tour of the Pacific Coast and transcontinental United States during which they were accommodated by over 250 restaurants, hotels, and similar establishments. Refusal of service by virtue of the racial characteristics of the Chinese occurred only once. But when La Piere sent each establishment a letter of its policy regarding accommodating Chinese clients, over 90 per cent of the replies noted that they adhered to a policy of non-acceptance of such minority members."

⁴²Melvin L. DeFleur and Frank R. Westie, "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Acts: An Experiment on the Salience of Attitudes", American Sociological Review, (December 1958) pp.666-673.

⁴³op. cit., p.668

Not only does man behave differently than what he says in relationship to other races but also in many other aspects of his life. For example, Williams⁴⁴ lists ten examples of "patterned evasion" of our formally approved norms:

1. Prohibition versus the bootlegging and speak-easy industry prior to repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment.
2. Impersonal, disinterested governmental services versus political graft, "fixing", "status justice".
3. Family mores versus prostitution.
4. Classroom honesty versus accepted patterns of "cribbing".
5. Promotion by technical competence versus nepotism, racial discrimination, etc.
6. Universalistic legal justice versus white-collar crime, the public defender system, bias in jury selection.
7. Prescribed patterns of sexual behavior versus the patterns revealed by the Kinsey reports.
8. Legal rules regarding divorce versus actual court practice ("void" divorces, the "alimony racket").
9. Professional codes versus such practices as fee-splitting among doctors, ambulance chasing lawyers.
10. Ethical concepts of truth versus some advertising, financial transactions, etc., (business is business").

⁴⁴Robin M. Williams, Jr., American Society, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1960, p.382.

These diverse items illustrate how very different factors are generally condemned yet widely practical. It is logical to conclude that the same is true for DGP, that is, many perceive it as the norm but do not behave in a similar manner consistent with their normative statements.

An additional comparison between drop-outs and part-time students may be seen in TABLES XXIV and XXV. In these matrices the two groups were combined and divided at the median score.

This scheme presents four possible types. (1) Those scoring in the upper half of both the normative and the behavioral scales perceive the norms and state their behavior to be similar to these norms of DGP. There are four drop-outs and seven part-time students in this category. (2) Those scoring in the lower half of the normative and the upper half of the behavioral do not perceive the norms but state their behavior to be deferment of gratifications. There are seven drop-outs and two part-time students in this category. (3) Those scoring in the upper half of the normative but in the lower half of the behavioral perceive the norms but state their behavior to be non-deferment of gratifications. There is one drop-out and eight part-time students in this category. (4) Those scoring in

the lower half of both the normative and the behavioral scales do not perceive the norms and state their behavior to be non-deferment of gratifications. There are eight drop-outs and three part-time students in this category.

TABLE XXIV

DROP-OUTS NORMATIVE AND BEHAVIORAL MATRIX
NORMATIVE DGP

		Scored in upper half	Scored in lower half
BEHAVIORAL DGP	Scored in upper half	4	7
	Scored in lower half	1	8

TABLE XXV

PART-TIME STUDENTS NORMATIVE AND BEHAVIORAL MATRIX
NORMATIVE DGP

		Scored in upper half	Scored in lower half
BEHAVIORAL DGP	Scored in upper half	7	2
	Scored in lower half	8	3

Implications for further research

A longitudinal study might yield interesting findings. Young people could be given a similar kind of interview at the time of admission to Youth Opportunities

Unlimited. At completion of their training at Y.O.U., the interview could be given again to test for any change in behavior or attitude. This would give an evaluation of what effect the program had upon the respondent in relation to DGP.

Another way this study could be broadened is by including females and non-whites. There are nearly as many females who withdraw from school as males and a proportionate amount of non-whites. This would give an indication of how true these findings are of others who leave school.

Further study may want to include the influence of the family upon the respondent. Does the family value a job or education in the respondent? What effect does this have on the respondents' attitudes and behavior? These factors may yield interesting relationships.

Another possible sample which might yield comparable results would be middle class high school graduates who were expected by parents and teachers to go on to college and did go to college, as compared to the same kind of young person that did not go to college.

Lower class and middle class full time students might have been included in this study. This would have permitted a comparison of four groups; drop-outs, part-time students, full time students (all of lower socio-

economic class) and middle class students. This might have given strength to the present findings.

Further study will need to develop a means of delineating between those who are futuristic in their gratification and those who may not be. The interviewer may be able to discover this by probing.

A future study may also want to include a definite measure of achievement and thereby obtain more conclusive evidence of the relationship of achievement and DGP.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books and Leaflets

Blalock, Hubert M., Social Statistics, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1960

Bureau of Labor Statistics, School and Early Employment Experiences of Youth, U. S. Dept. of Labor, Washington, D. C., Bulletin 1277, August 1960.

Broom, Leonard and Selznick, Philip, Sociology, Row, Peterson and Co., Evanston, Illinois, 1959.

Committee on Studis for White House Conference on Children and Youth, Inc., Children and Youth in 1960's, 1960

Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's Youth, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1961.

Horton, Paul B., Hunt, Chester L., Sociology, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1964.

Jalving, Jacob, Social Factors Influencing Drop-outs in the Kalamazoo, Michigan Public School System, Thesis, Western Michigan University, May 1963.

Kinsey, Alfred, Sexual Behavior in the Human Male, W. B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, 1948.

Michigan Youth Commission, Children and Youth in Michigan, 1960.

Penty, Ruth, Reading ability and High School Drop-outs, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

Presidents Committee on Youth Employment, The Challenge of Jobless Youth, 1963.

Riley, Matilda White, Sociological Research, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Drop-outs, Selected References U. S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

Veness, Thelma, School Leavers, Methuen and Co., Ltd., London, 1962.

Williams, Robin A., Jr., American Society, A. Knopf, New York, 1960.

Youmans, E. Grant, The Rural School Drop-out, Bulletin of the Bureau of School Service, University of Kentucky, Lexington, 1963.

Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc., Unpublished Proposal for a Work-Training Program for Out-of-School Youth in Kalamazoo County, (January 1965)

Part II. Periodicals

Beilin, Harry, "The Pattern of Postponability and Its Relation to Social Class Mobility", Journal of Social Psychology, Volume 44, 1956, pp.38-48.

Clark, John P. and Wenninger, Eugene P., "Socio-Economic Class and Area as Correlates of Illegal Behavior Among Juveniles", American Sociological Review, (December 1962) Volume 27: pp.826-824.

DeFleur, Melvin L., and Westie, Frank R., "Verbal Attitudes and Overt Acts: An Experiment on Salience of Attitudes", American Sociological Review, (December 1958), pp. 666-673.

Dyer, William G., "A Comparison of Families of High and Low Job Satisfaction", Marriage and Family Living, (February 1956), Volume 18: pp.58-60.

Ehermann, Winston, W., "Influence of Comparative Social Class of Companion Upon Premarital Hetrosexual Behavior", Marriage and Family Living, (February 1955), 17:48-53.

Ellis, Robert A., and Lane, W. Clayton, "Structural Supports for Upward Mobility", American Sociological Review, (October 1963), 28:pp.743-756.

Empey, LaMar T., "Social Class and Occupational Aspirations: A Comparison of Absolute and Relative Measurement", American Sociological Review, (December 1956), pp.703-709.

Heal, Florence L. D., "Values in A Group of Lower Socio-Economic Students", Marriage and Family Living, (November 1960), Volume 22: pp.370-371.

Kanin, Eugene J., "Premarital Sex Adjustments, Social Class, and Associated Behaviors", Marriage and Family Living, (August 1960), Volume 22: pp.258-262.

Kluckhohn, Florence Rockwood, "Dominant and Substitute Profiles of Cultural Orientation: Their Significance for the analysis of Social Stratification", Social Forces, Volume 25, (May 1950), pp.376-393.

Kohn, Melvin L., "Social Class and the Exercise of Parental Authority", American Sociological Review, (June 1959), Volume 24: pp.352-366.

Latham, A. J., "Job Appropriateness: A One Year Follow-up of High School Graduates", Journal of Social Psychology, 1951, pp.55-68

Lindenfeld, Frank, "A Note of Social Mobility, Religiosity, and Students Attitudes Towards Premarital Sexual Relations", American Sociological Review, (February 1960), Volume 25: pp.81-84

Miller, S. M. and Riessman, Frank, "The Working Class Subculture: A New View", Social Problems, (Summer 1961), Volume 9: Number 1, pp.86-97.

Muir, Donald E. and Weinstein, Eugene A., "The Social Debt: An Investigation of Lower-Class and Middle-Class Norms of Social Obligations", American Sociological Review, (August 1962), Volume 27: pp.532-539.

Neisser, Edith, G., "Emotional and Social Values Attached to Money", Marriage and Family Living, 1960, Volume 22, pp.132-138.

Rodman, Hyman, "The Achievement Syndrome and Negro American", American Sociological Review, (October 1959), pp.691-692.

Rosen, Bernard C., "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psychocultural Dimension of Social Stratification", American Sociological Review, (February 1956), Volume 21: pp.203-211.

Rosen, Bernard C., "Race, Ethnicity, and the Achievement Syndrome", American Sociological Review, (February 1959), Volume 24: pp.47-60.

Schneider, Louis and Lysgaard, Sverre, "The Deferred Gratification Pattern: A Preliminary Study", American Sociological Review, (April 1953), 18:142-149.

Sewell, William H., Haller, Archie O., and Straus, Murray, "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspirations", American Sociological Review, (February 1957), Volume 22: pp.67-73.

Straus, Murray A., "Deferred Gratification, Social Class, and the Achievement Syndrome", American Sociological Review, (June 1962), Volume 27, pp.326-335

Wilson, Alan B., "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys", American Sociological Review, (December 1959), Volume 24: pp.836-845.

APPENDIX I
INFORMANT DATA & INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Part I

*NAME _____ DROP-OUT _____
Last First Middle PART-TIME _____

ADDRESS _____
No. Street City

BIRTHDATE _____ AGE _____ PHONE _____

AGENCY REFERRED BY _____

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE _____ RACE _____

COURT RECORD _____

WELFARE ADC _____ VETS _____
DPW _____ S.S. _____

FATHER'S NAME _____
Occupation _____

STEPPFATHER'S NAME _____
Occupation _____

MOTHER'S NAME _____
Occupation _____

STEPMOTHER'S NAME _____
Occupation _____

LIVING WITH _____

FAMILY DATA Brothers older _____ Sisters older _____
" younger _____ " younger _____

LAST SCHOOL ATTENDED _____

LAST GRADE _____

DATE LEFT _____

REASON FOR LEAVING _____

WORK EXPERIENCE _____

MAJOR INTERESTS _____

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION _____

*Note - information on this page was taken from files
at Youth Opportunities Unlimited, Inc.

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Part II

Date Interview Made _____

Warm-up questions (to get informant used to tape recorder)

- a) What are some of the things you like to do?
Where? When? How?
- b) What T.V. shows do you like?
- c) If you could do anything you wanted, what
would it be?

AFFILIATION

- (1) Who are your friends? Have they dropped out
of school? Are you going to school part-time?
What do you think of them?
- (2) How are your friends the same as you or not
the same as you? In school, family, work
interest?
- (3) Do you care if your friends are loud and noisy
in public? Yes___ No___

Are your friends loud and noisy in public?
Yes___ No___ Can you give an example?
- (4) Do your friends drink beer or liquor? Yes___
NO___ What do they drink?_____ Do you
drink with them? Yes___ No___ How often?
- (5) Do your friends pay their own way? Always___
Usually___ Sometimes___ Not very often___
Do you help them out if they are out of money?
Yes___ No___ Do they do the same for you?
Yes___ No___
- (6) Do your friends fight? Yes___ No___ How often?

AGGRESSION

- (7) Have you been in a fight? Where? Who with?
Why? When? How? How often do you get into
fights?

- (8) Is there something you would fight over if it ever happened? What? Yes____ No____
- (9) How do you feel after a fight? If win? If lose? (Or think you would feel).
- (10) Have you seen adults fight? Yes____No____ Where? When? Why? How? Etc.?
- (11) From arguments that you've had, how do you win? By doing what?
- (12) Have you ever been picked up by the police? Yes____ No____ What for? Any other time?

ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

- (13) When do you feel you will be paying for everything, room, board, car, clothes, etc.? Why?
- (14) Are any of your friends out on their own? If so, how old are they, where do they work, are they married, etc.?
- (15) Do you have plans for your schooling? Yes____ No____ What are they?____How much____
- (16) Do your parents or those you live with pay for some things for you? Yes____No____ What?
Room____Board____Clothes____Spending money____
Car____Dates____(other)

CONSUMPTION

- (17) What do your friends spend their money on? Would you do the same if you were in their shoes? Why?
- (18) Do you have any money in savings? Yes____ NO____
- (19) Do you have any debts? Yes____No____ Approximately how much?____ Is it borrowed?____ Charge accounts?____ Or what?____
- (20) Do you spend money on dates? How much? Where?

- (21) Do you loan or give money to friends if they don't have any money? Yes___No___ How often? How much?
- (22) Do you buy any liquor or beer? Yes___NO___ How often? How much?
- (23) What other things do you do with your money? Own car___Clothes___Food___Other___

SEX

- (24) When was the last time you were on a date? Was it a double date or were you alone with the girl? What did you do? Did you go in a car or walk?
- (25) How often do you date? Would you like to date more or less? Why?
- (26) How often do your friends date?
- (27) Are you going steady or engaged to be married? Yes___No___ Do you plan to get married soon? Yes___No___ When?
- (28) If you met the right girl, at what age would you marry her?
- (29) Have your friends told you about sexual intercourse they have had? Were you ever with them when they did? Yes___No___
- (30) Have you: 1. Held a girl's hand Yes___No___
2. Kissed a girl Yes___No___
3. Ever parked w/a girl Yes___No___
4. Ever petted w/a girl Yes___No___
5. Had sexual intercourse Yes___No___

Part III

AFFILIATION

- (31) When choosing friends, a guy should find friends that:
Are able to fight for themselves.
SA A DK D SD

(32) Hold their liquor.

SA A DK D SD

(33) Pay their own way.

SA A DK D SD

(34) Come from good families.

SA A DK D SD

(35) Chet doesn't care what his friends do when he is with them. His friends have gone under fences to get into Fairs, stolen water melons and gas, drank a lot of beer, and it seems like they are always in fights. These should be Chet's friends.

SA A DK D SD

(36) Ross does not go around with guys that fight, or drink or are loud and noisy in public places. This is the way Ross should choose friends.

SA A DK D SD

(37) Teenagers have to be careful about the behavior of the friends they go with. Do you

SA A DK D SD

AGGRESSION

(38) The best way for adults to settle arguments is to fight it out.

SA A DK D SD

(39) The guy that wins in settling an argument should be the guy that is a tougher, better fighter.

SA A DK D SD

(40) One should never fight unless he is forced to.

SA A DK D SD

(41) When a person gets mad at someone, he should fight it out with him. Do you

SA A DK D SD

- (42) Chet is able to disagree with someone and not fight, but he does a lot of talking. Chet says this is the way to settle an argument. Do you

SA A DK D SD

- (43) Ross has broken a few laws and been caught. But he never has gone to court. He says it is bad to have a police record. Do you

SA A DK D SD

ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

- (44) If a guy can get a good job, when he leaves school or graduates from high school, he should not do any more schooling in trade school or college. Do you

SA A DK D SD

- (45) Ross plans to get as much financial help from his parents as he can before he gets out on his own. He says that's what he should do.

SA A DK D SD

- (46) Many people say different ages as to when a young man should be out on his own. At what age do you think a person should be out on his own.

16-17 18-19 20-21 22-23 24+

- (47) Chet says that a guy should get out on his own as soon as he is able. Do you

SA A DK D SD

- (48) Parents should expect to pay for things their son needs until he is married and out on his own.

SA A DK D SD

CONSUMPTION

- (49) The money you save should give you at least as good a feeling as the things you buy. Do you

SA A DK D SD

- (50) When a friend does not have money, you should give or loan him some. Do you

SA A DK D SD

- (51) There is no point in saving money if you can buy what you want on credit.

SA A DK D SD

- (52) Ross works part-time in a grocery store and has some of his pay deducted for a savings. Ross says the way to get things he wants is to save for them. Do you

SA A DK D SD

- (53) Chet works full time at a paper company where he makes \$1.73 an hour. Chet says he should not save.

SA A DK D SD

SEX

- (54) Ross and Rose have been engaged for a year and can't get married for another year. They have had sexual intercours. Rose says it's all right because they plan to get married. Do you _____

SA A DK D SD

- (55) Chet and Charlette have been engaged for a year and Chet wants to have sexual intercourse before they get married, 3 months from now, but Charlette says they should wait until they are married. Do you _____ with Charlette.

SA A DK D SD

- (56) Dan dates a lot of girls and he goes out just for sexual intercourse. Dan says it is what women are for and this is how a real man should be. Do you

SA A DK D SD

- (57) Pete says that a young man should be as careful as a girl in seeing that necking doesn't go too far, that is, kissing and hugging and no further. Do you

SA A DK D SD

- (58) It is all right for a guy to date girls that are known to have sexual intercourse with other guys.

SA A DK D SD

- (59) A young man should have as much responsibility as a girl in seeing that necking doesn't go too far.

SA A DK D SD

- (60) What does "too far" mean to you?

- (61) How far should a guy go:

On first date_____

After dated for awhile_____

When going steady_____

When engaged_____

(If willing to put off sexual intercourse 'till after marriage, high DGP).

APPENDIX II

CODE AND NUMBER WHO ANSWERED

Behavioral Affiliation DGP

		Code	No. of drop-outs answered	No. of part- time students answered
Are your friends drop-outs?	Yes	0	16	8
	No	1	4	12
Are your friends part-time stu- dents?	Yes	0	5	8
	No	1	15	12
Are your friends loud in public?	Yes	0	12	11
	No	1	8	9
Do your friends drink?	Yes	0	13	14
	No	1	7	6
Do your friends pay their own way?	Yes	1	20	20
	No	0	0	0
Do your friends fight?	Yes	0	10	11
	No	1	10	9

Behavioral Aggression DGP

Have you been in a fight within a year?	Yes	0	12	5
	No	1	8	15

	Code	No. of drop-outs answered	No. of part- time students answered
Is there something you would fight over?			
Yes	0	16	14
No	1	4	6
After a fight, are you glad you fought or feel good about it?			
Yes	0	14	10
No	1	6	10
Have you seen adults fight?			
Yes	0	16	11
No	1	4	9
From arguments you have had do you win by avoiding fights?			
Yes	1	18	18
No	0	2	2
Have you ever been picked up by the police? Other than traffic.			
Yes	0	13	7
No	1	7	13

Behavioral Economic Independence DGP

Do you feel you will be out on your own within a year?			
Yes	0	13	4
No	1	7	16
Are your friends out on their own?			
Yes	0	8	10
No	1	12	10

	Code	No. of drop-outs answered	No. of part- time students answered
Do you have plans for schooling?			
Yes	1	9	20
No	0	11	0

Do those you live with pay for things you need other than room and board?	Yes	1	13	11
	No	0	7	9

Do you occasionally pay for things that those you live with need?	Yes	0	13	11
	No	1	7	9

Behavioral Consumption DGP

Do you have any money in savings?	Yes	1	8	10
	No	0	12	10

Do you have any debts?	Yes	0	12	7
	No	1	8	13

Do you spend \$6 or more a week on dates?	Yes	0	8	4
	No	1	12	16

Do you loan or give friends more than \$1 at a time?	Yes	0	13	16
	No	1	7	4

Do you buy any beer or liquor?	Yes	0	7	4
	No	1	13	16

	Code	No. of drop-outs answered	No. of part- time students answered
Do you have a car of your own?			
Yes	0	7	10
No	1	13	10

Behavioral Sexual DGP

Have you been on a
date within the last
week?

Yes	0	12	10
No	1	8	10

Do you date more than
twice a week?

Yes	0	7	3
No	1	13	17

Are you going steady
or engaged?

Yes	0	7	6
No	1	13	14

Should you be at
least twenty before
you marry?

Yes	1	11	17
No	0	9	3

Have you gone further
than holding a girl's
hand or kissing her, not
including sexual inter-
course?

Yes	0	15	9
No	1	5	11

Have you had sexual
intercourse?

Yes	0	8	4
No	1	12	16

APPENDIX III

TABLE I

BEHAVIORAL DGP SCORES

Possible Range	Affiliation 0-6	Aggression 0-6	Economic In- dependence 0-5	Consump- tion 0-6	Sex 0-6	Total 0-29
Respond- ent No*	\bar{X} 3.325	\bar{X} 2.90	\bar{X} 3.20	\bar{X} 3.250	\bar{X} 3.575	
53	2	0	2	4	3	11
59	2	2	3	2	3	12
67	4	3	1	1	4	13
56	4	3	2	2	3	14
66	3	3	3	4	3	16
51	4	5	5	1	2	17
52	6	4	4	2	1	17
57	4	1	4	5	3	17
60	3	2	3	5	4	17
63	3	3	5	3	3	17
62	3	4	4	4	4	19
69	3	3	5	5	5	21
68	3	4	4	4	6	21
55	5	5	3	5	3	21
50	3	5	5	3	6	22
58	5	6	2	3	6	22
61	3	4	5	4	6	22
65	5	3	4	4	6	22
64	2	6	4	5	6	23
54	2	5	5	5	6	23
15	2	3	0	1	0	6
02	2	1	2	1	1	7
04	2	1	3	2	0	8

Continued

*Numbers 50 through 69 are part-time students and numbers 01 through 20 are drop-outs.

TABLE I continued

10	3	0	2	1	2	8
01	3	1	2	4	0	10
20	2	3	1	3	3	12
09	2	1	4	2	3	12
06	4	1	3	4	0	12
05	4	1	4	3	2	14
19	5	3	1	2	3	14
03	3	4	3	2	3	15
07	5	3	2	4	1	15
12	3	1	4	1	6	15
14	2	3	1	4	6	16
13	4	2	5	1	4	16
11	3	1	5	4	5	18
08	4	3	3	3	5	18
16	2	4	2	6	6	20
18	3	4	5	5	4	21
17	6	5	3	6	6	26

TABLE II

NORMATIVE DGP SCORES

Possible Range	Affiliation 7-35	Aggression 6-30	Economic Independence 5-25	Consumption 5-25	Sex 8-40	Total 31-155
Respondent No*	\bar{X} 23.775	\bar{X} 23.375	\bar{X} 13.925	\bar{X} 18.050	\bar{X} 27.425	
53	19	18	17	19	18	91
59	22	22	14	16	18	92
62	20	19	13	18	26	96
63	24	19	12	14	30	99
50	18	26	14	18	26	104
51	23	22	13	14	32	104
65	24	22	12	20	26	104
55	24	24	13	18	25	104
67	19	25	15	18	28	105
61	24	22	12	18	30	106
68	28	21	11	18	28	106
64	25	24	12	18	30	109
66	24	27	13	18	29	111
58	26	22	17	16	30	111
69	26	25	14	18	30	113
57	24	25	13	19	32	113
54	22	27	13	17	35	113
56	27	24	14	20	29	114
60	27	24	14	20	30	115
52	24	28	12	19	32	115
03	16	22	19	14	21	92
16	22	18	13	18	23	94
12	22	21	15	14	25	97
15	20	25	12	18	23	98

Continued

*Numbers 50 through 69 are part-time students and numbers 01 through 20 are drop-outs.

TABLE II continued

10	21	26	12	14	25	98
09	24	17	17	18	25	101
14	20	22	12	18	29	101
06	23	24	11	21	25	104
01	28	23	14	20	22	107
02	22	24	15	20	26	107
04	25	25	11	20	26	107
07	26	24	12	18	28	108
08	23	24	15	18	28	108
05	25	24	11	20	25	109
13	26	25	12	18	30	111
11	27	26	14	16	31	114
20	27	23	20	20	27	117
17	30	23	18	19	28	118
18	29	27	19	22	32	119
19	25	26	17	19	32	119