SUBCULTURAL THEORY, DRIFT AND PUBLICITY: HOW A CONTEMPORARY CULTURE OF ADOLESCENCE RELATES TO DELINQUENCY

A dissertation presented

by

Adam Monroe Stearn

to

The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the field of

Criminology and Criminal Justice

Northeastern University

Boston, Massachusetts

January, 2012

SUBCULTURAL THEORY, DRIFT AND PUBLICITY: HOW A CONTEMPORARY CULTURE OF ADOLESCENCE RELATES TO DELINQUENCY

by

Adam Monroe Stearn

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Criminology and Criminal Justice in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Northeastern University, January, 2012

Abstract

In order to understand adolescents, criminologists have looked to cultural theories of adolescence. These cultural theories emphasize adolescent norms and values and draw on the term subcultural to denote how delinquency can be explained among segments of youths. They tend to focus either on impoverished inner-city youths or youths without any class affiliation. Few studies have examined the extent to which adolescent subcultures exist in the middle-class and what these subcultures might look like. The subcultural study of adolescence has also shifted from criminology to the realm of sociology resulting in the role of delinquency all but being ignored. Thus, theorists are left to wonder: The extent to which middle-class subcultures exist, and what role delinquency plays in them? The current research addressed this question by focusing on both qualitative (content of personal webpages) and quantitative (survey questions) data. The website postings come from a current social networking site and provide the researcher with personal descriptions, written interactions with other youth, and descriptions of delinquency. The survey questions stem from a survey conducted among adolescents in a largely affluent community. Both data sets were drawn upon to relate adolescent subcultural identities. In addition, the analyses examined self-reported delinquency and the relationship between identity, delinquency, and experiences within the various life domains, such as the family unit, peer groups, and school. The results of these analyses suggest that the average adolescent residing in a middle-class neighborhood identifies with multiple subcultures while at the same time stressing his or her individuality. In addition, the adolescent drifts in and out of these subcultural identities based on the life domain he or she is in. Finally, deviance—most commonly the consumption of alcohol and marijuana—is communicated by the subcultures' members as was demonstrated by the behavior's publicity.

Dedication

For Jenna. You have done more for me than I could ever hope to give back. Thank you.

Acknowledgements

There are many people without whom this research would not have been possible. First, I must thank my advisor, Simon Singer, for providing me with support, encouragement, and guidance over the past seven years. Simon first introduced me to the work of David Matza, which much of this work is built upon. I would also like to thank Donna Bishop and Marc Swatt for their time, assistance and support. Together, you three have encouraged me to stretch my criminological imagination, which has led to a dissertation that I can be truly proud of. To say that your guidance has been invaluable does not begin to do justice to what I owe you. Thank you.

I would also like to thank Jack McDevitt and the College of Criminal Justice faculty for providing me with the support and encouragement necessary to conduct this research. There are too many people to list here. However, I would be remiss if I did not give special thanks to Laurie Mastone. Without your support, encouragement and thoughtful nagging this work would never have been completed.

To my fellow graduate students – this journey has created a bond that can never be broken. It was a time of hard work and stress, but more importantly, it was a time of laughter and friendship. No matter where our lives and careers take we will always have these experiences to look back on.

This work would not have been possible with the support of my family. Mom and dad, you always support my crazy ideas (this just being the latest) and in doing so taught me to reach past what I thought were my limits. Dawn-Marie, you always encouraged me to be myself, and for that I am eternally gratefully. Memphis, you are one of the smartest people I know. I hope your thirst for knowledge never leaves you. London, I've only just met you, but I know that you are destined for great things.

I must thank my friends. Amanda, Jenna, Kelly, Mike and Shelley, thank you for always asking how the dissertation was going, but more importantly, for knowing when not

to ask. The next hundred rounds, or so, are on me. Finally, because of the topic of this work it seems appropriate to thank all the musicians over the years that have made me think "Wait, you're allowed to do that with music". There are far too many to list, so, all I can say, is thank you for providing the soundtrack for my life and this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Ab | stract | 2 |
|----|---|-----|
| De | Dedication | |
| Ac | Acknowledgements | |
| Та | Table of Contents | |
| 1. | Introduction | 8 |
| 2. | Literature Review | 10 |
| 3. | Qualitative Methods, Analysis and Findings | 32 |
| 4. | Quantitative Methods, Analysis and Findings | 57 |
| 5. | Discussion | 106 |
| 6. | Conclusion | 116 |
| 7. | Bibliography | 124 |

1 Introduction

I don't have a liking of being stereotyped and classified into these social clichés we have nowadays, so I don't consider myself gothic, prep, emo, redneck, grunge, any of that overused excrement, and you shouldn't either, unless, that is if you just happen to be one of those stereotypical peons that make up the majority of our poor society today.

The above quote was provided by John—a 16-year-old boy from a middle-class neighborhood who was asked to provide a short description of himself on a personal webpage. He was not asked his opinion on subcultures, identities, labels, cliques, stereotypes, etc. The only guidance he received was a blank space entitled "About Me" in which to write, and an expectation to provide some basic description of how he sees himself. His comments suggest that he rejects the terms that are commonly applied to youths of his generation. Note that he is not denying the existence of these adolescent groups—just asserting his independence from being categorized as a part of these varying groups.

In order to understand adolescents like John, criminologists have looked to cultural theories of adolescence. These cultural theories emphasize adolescent norms and values and draw on the term subcultural to denote how delinquency can be explained among segments of youths. They tend to focus either on impoverished inner-city youths (e,g, Cloward & Ohlin 1960; Cohen 1955; Miller 1958; etc.) or youths without any class affiliation (e.g. Muggleton 2000; Redhead 1990; Thornton 1995; etc). Few studies have examined the extent to which adolescent subcultures exist in the middle-class and what these subcultures might look like. The subcultural study of adolescence has also shifted from criminology to the realm of sociology (e.g. Bennett 1999; Chaney 2004; Hodkinson & Dicke 2005; Jenks 2004; Maffesoli 1996; Miles 2000; Muggleton 2000; Polhemus 1996; Redhead 1990; Reimer 1995; Thornton 1995; etc), resulting in the role of delinquency all but being ignored. Thus, theorists are left to wonder: The extent to which middle-class subcultures

exist, and what role delinquency plays in them? The current research will address the question as to the extent of which there are middle-class delinquent subcultures by focusing on two sets of analyses. First, the research will critically assess the subcultural literature to relate how class and delinquency may be related to one another. Second, the research will examine the extent to which subcultural identities are tightly coupled with adolescent identities. In other words, are subcultural identities all-encompassing such that they are expressed across all life domains (i.e., the family, peer network, and school system) (as argued by such theorists as Cloward & Ohlin 1960; Cohen 1955; Miller 1958; Whyte 1955; Wolfgang & Ferrecuti 1967; etc) or, do adolescents drift in and out of these identities as they move back and forth between life domains (as suggested by theorists such as Anderson 2000; Hagan 1991, Matza 1964, Thornton 1995 etc.)?

The questions above will be addressed by analyzing both qualitative (content of personal webpages) and quantitative (survey questions) data. The website postings come from a current social networking site and provide the researcher with personal descriptions, written interactions with other youth, and descriptions of delinquency. The survey questions stem from a survey conducted among adolescents in a largely affluent community. Both data sets will be drawn upon to relate adolescent subcultural identities. In addition, the analyses will examine self-reported delinquency and the relationship between identity, delinquency, and experiences within the various life domains, such as the family unit, peer groups, and school.

Based upon the following review of the literature, the expectation is that subcultural identities will indeed be found to exist among middle-class adolescents. Furthermore, the expectation is that adolescents will be found to drift between and among these subcultural identities and, finally, that delinquency plays an important role in adolescent identity.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction:

Criminologists have long been interested in understanding the relationship between identity and offending. This is perhaps most apparent in theories that deal with adolescents. Adolescence, as a bridge between childhood and adulthood, can be seen as a time when youth are attempting to develop their social identity as may be defined by their on-going affiliations. These identities are tested in a variety of settings, none more important than the peer group. Therefore, an examination of the development of identities among adolescents is closely related to adolescent peer group affiliations. As the current research will suggest, subcultural theory provides a framework for understanding these group affiliations and the reason for why they depart for the larger culture. The formation of these groups may be deemed an adolescent solution to a general cultural problem (e.g. Cloward & Ohlin 1960; Cohen 1955; Miller 1958; etc.). In forming these groups, adolescents not only address the problem but they also gain an identity through their status and position within the group.

At its base, subcultural theory argues that there is a direct connection between group membership and personal identity. However, depending upon the conceptualization of identity, subcultural theories vary widely on how group and individual identity are linked to one another. The major points of contention within subcultural theory can be grouped into three areas. First, there is a debate as to whether subcultural membership represents a loose or tight connection to the adolescent's identity. Those theorists that believe in loosely structured subcultural identities (e.g. Hagan 1991; Matza 1964; Muggleton 2000; Thornton 1995; etc.) suggest that adolescents drift between several subcultures at various points in time, and that membership status is situationally dependent. On the other end of this debate are those who argue that subcultural membership is tight (e.g. Cloward & Ohlin

1960; Cohen 1955; Miller 1958; etc.). These theorists believe that adolescents gain their identity from subcultural membership. In addition, these theorists argue that subcultural memberships are impermeable; the adolescent can only belong to a single subculture at a single point in time. This point of contention is closely related to whether the theorist is examining the adolescent's identity from the individual's perspective or the group's.

Specifically, those theorists who analyze adolescents' self-identification of subcultural membership (e.g. Hebdige 1984; Muggletone, 2000; Polhemus 1996; Thornton 1995; etc.) have found that the adolescent's identity is only loosely connected to the subcultural group. Conversely, those theorists who operationalize subcultural membership through certain structural characteristics, such as class and race (e.g. Cloward & Ohlin 1960; Cohen 1955; Miller 1958; Wolfgang and Ferracuti 1967; etc.), have found that the adolescent's identity is tightly connected to subcultural membership. These theorists argue that subcultural membership is absolute and thus the individual's identity all but disappears into the group's identity. Thus, when examining subcultural membership an analysis of individual identity would be redundant

The second major area of contention among subcultural theories concerns delinquency. In the past few decades, the concept of adolescent subcultures has moved into the realm of sociology. This had led to fascinating studies of group dynamics and the position of adolescents within society (see Hebdige 1984; Jenks 2004; Maffesoli 1996; Muggleton 2000; Thornton 1995; and Ueno 2003). However, the role of delinquency has been largely ignored (e.g. Muggleton 2000; Redhead 1990; Thornton 1995; etc.). In contrast to these sociological studies, the criminological study of subcultures sees delinquency as a means towards group status (e.g. Cloward & Ohlin 1960; Cohen 1955; Matza 1964; etc.). The focus of the current research will be on the criminological, with a goal to further the understanding of how delinquency and subcultural identity are related to one another.

The third major point of contention within subcultural theory concerns the role that social class plays in the development of subcultural identities. Some theorists (e.g. Cloward & Ohlin 1960; Cohen 1955; Miller 1958; Whyte 1955; etc.) believe that subcultures are a unique phenomenon within the lower- and working-class, while others (e.g. Muggleton 2000; Redhead 1990; Thornton 1995; etc.) argue that subcultures are a classless social phenomenon. The latter group suggests that social class has very little to do with the development of a subculture in the first place. In both of these perspectives, the possibility of uniquely middle-class subcultures is rarely considered.

To understand these three debates, the current discussion examines the development of the concept of 'subculture' over time by focusing on how various theorists have conceptualized subcultures. Specifically the focus of this discussion is on the boundaries of subcultures (i.e., porous versus fixed) in relating delinquency and social class.

2.2 The History of Subcultural Theory:

2.2.1 The Early Stages of Subcultural Theory:

It is difficult to clearly establish the origin of the term *subculture*. However, the start of its prevalence can be traced back to the early stages of the Chicago school, where theorists focused on youth gangs within the inner cities. The use of this term within the Chicago school is implicitly contained in the work of Thrasher (1927) and Whyte (1947). Due to the focus of these authors' works, the term *subculture* became associated with gangs specifically, and delinquency more generally. Additionally, during this early 20th century, the term *subculture* was used liberally, without focus on the clarification of the concept. These works spoke of groups of youths with similar value systems and norms, without an examination of the individual members' identities. The ideas of group and subculture were used interchangeably and, as such, the boundaries of the adolescent subculture were also left undefined.

In 1947 Gordon presented the first clear definition of subculture. He defined a subculture as: "A sub-division of national culture, composed of a combination of factorable social situations such as class status, ethnic background, regional and rural or urban residences, and religious affiliation, but forming in their combination a functioning unity which has an integrated impact on the participating individual" (p. 40). Gordon's (1947) definition directed attention to the structural characteristics of the individual. While he did acknowledge that a specific subculture can have an effect on the individual member, he was less than clear about what this effect might be.

Gordon's (1947) definition associates structural characteristics with the boundaries of a subculture. For example, if one were to argue that all African-American males from urban, lower-class backgrounds who are between the ages of 14 and 19 comprise a single subculture, then, by definition, anyone with characteristics that differ from these must belong to a different subculture. Thus, it is clear that the first attempt to clarify the concept of subculture led to a conceptualization of a subculture as a tightly bound, structurally defined social unit. Similar to the early work of the Chicago school, no consideration was given to the individual members' identities.

2.2.2 The Mertonian School: A Delinquent Subculture

Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960) specifically related the reasons for delinquency to a delinquent subculture. They based their subcultural theories upon Merton's (1938) theory of anomie, which argues that the strain originating from the disconnect between the societally prescribed goals and individual means to achieve these goals leads to crime. Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960) expanded on this concept by arguing that delinquency is a subcultural solution to these strains experienced by lower-class youth. Specifically, these theorists focused on the disconnect between larger societal goals and the available means of lower-class youths in achieving those goals. The solution for their adolescent problems resided in a type of delinquent subculture. The types of delinquent

subcultures exist because of the need for status, which can be obtained through the formation of delinquent groups that replace dominant middle-class objectives with more achievable ones. These groups, according to Mertonian theorists, create their own norms, different from, but not in complete opposition to those of middle-class society. Once they belong to these groups, delinquent youths feel less of a need for conforming to the values of the larger society.

In his book, *Delinquent Boys*, Cohen (1955) identified the characteristics of a delinquent subculture. He argued that the major identifying characteristic of the delinquent subculture is how it responds to the middle class: "The delinquent subculture... permits no ambiguity of the status of the delinquent relative to that of anybody else" (p. 131). This suggests that once subcultural affiliation begins that it remains integral to an adolescent's identity. Like Gordon's conceptualization of subcultural boundaries based on structural characteristics such as race, Cohen's analysis demarcates subcultural affiliation based on fixed characteristic, status frustration and delinquency. These are not likely to change for the lower-class youth.

Three years later, Cohen and Short (1958) expanded upon the ideas presented in *Delinquent Boys* (Cohen, 1955) by arguing that there are, in fact, several adolescent subcultures. While a discussion of the specific distinctions between these subcultures is not relevant to the current analysis, it is important to acknowledge that Cohen and Short were attempting to create a more complete typology of adolescent subcultures. Still, they asserted that subcultures were fixed affiliations demarcated around structural characteristics and that lower-class adolescents could only belong to one subculture at a time.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) expanded upon Cohen's (1955, 1958) work by arguing that in areas with high rates of delinquency there is a duality of norms. In these neighborhoods, there is a competition between criminal and conventional value systems.

The relative strength of each of the value systems dictates which adolescent subcultures will form. Regardless of the subculture that forms within each neighborhood, Cloward and Ohlin, like Cohen (1955, 1958) and Whtye (1947) before them, argued that these subculture are tight formations that do not easily allow adolescents to drift between identities. In addition, these theorists operationalize subcultures as being based on societal expectations and the inability of certain groups to meet those expectations, without consideration of the individual identities of the group's members.

2.2.3 Matza's Critique: A Subculture of Delinquency:

There are several critiques of the Mertonian school of thought, the majority of which rest on a single issue: how closely an adolescent subculture is connected to the norms of the middle-class. While those in the Mertonian school did not believe it was possible for adolescents to form a true oppositional subculture, they did see the members of these subcultures as forming because of an inability to reach the prescribed goals of society. Kornhauser (1978) brings this issue to light when she states: "One begins to wonder how children from such vastly different subcultures could even belong to the same society. How can, working-class children come to internalize universalistic achievement values, which are so alien to all their subcultural values?" (p. 153). Matza (1955, 1964) directly addresses this question by further questioning delinquency as a requirement of subcultural membership. He states, if a subculture exists, "involvement in delinquency would be more permanent and less transient, more pervasive and less intermittent than is apparently the case" (1964, p. 22). Matza further suggests that theories of subculture produce "an embarrassment of riches" (p. 21). Similarly, he argues these theories fail to explain why the majority of youth desist from their delinquent behavior when they reach adulthood, and why the majority of these youth also believe in conventional values. According to Matza, delinquents are not committed to a delinquent subculture. Instead, Matza (1964) states that "delinquents intermittently play both delinquent and conventional roles" (p. 26). His loose subcultural

conceptualization of a subculture is the first to appear in the criminological literature. In arguing that adolescents take on either delinquent or conventional identities depending upon the situation, Matza emphasizes the duality of conventional and non-conventional identities. He describes the "typical" delinquent as

"[A]n actor neither compelled nor committed to deeds nor freely choosing them; neither different in any simple or fundamental sense from the law abiding, nor the same; conforming to certain traditions in American life while partially unreceptive to other more conventional traditions (p. 28)

In order to explain how these seemingly contrary characteristics can exist within the same individual, Matza introduces the concept of *drift*. He argues that adolescents "exist in a limbo between convention and crime, responding in turn to the demands of each, flirting now with one, now with the other, but postponing commitment, evading decision" (p.28). Depending on the situation, the adolescent may experience an "episodic release from moral constraint" (p. 69). This release is what Matza refers to as drift. Drift means that in certain situations he or she is *free* to commit a delinquent act. The assumption, then, is that the adolescent's default is to conform -- but occasionally this conforming behavior is loosened and allows for some delinquent acts.

The question that remains is why are some adolescents committed to their delinquent acts when they are in a state of drift while others are not? Matza introduces the idea of a subculture of delinquency to explain this phenomenon. He states that "the values and norms implicit in the subculture of delinquency are obviously related to delinquencies, and these values and norms obviously depart in some manner from the conventional society" (p. 37). However, this subculture is not formed because of its members' inability to meet society expectations. In fact, a subculture of delinquency receives its motivation *from* the conventional culture. Specifically, Matza and Sykes (1961) believe that conventional societies include many contradictory values that adolescents learn and use to justify

contradictions in their own behavior. Matza refers to these contradictory values as subterranean values:

Subterranean values [are] values... which are in conflict or in competition with other deeply held values but which are still recognized and accepted by many. [However] These contradictions... are not necessarily the opposing viewpoints of two different groups. They may also exist within a single individual and give rise to profound feelings of ambivalence in many areas of life. (p. 716)

Subterranean values suggest that delinquency is acceptable in certain situations—and it is in these situations that adolescents drift between conventional and delinquent identities.

The boundaries of a subculture in Matza's conceptualization differ from the Mertonian school in two significant ways. First, Matza argues for a loose conceptualization of subcultures, suggesting that there is no delinquent subculture per se, only a subculture of delinquency to which youths subscribe from time to time, drifting between conventional and non-conventional identities. Adolescent identity is not based fully on his or her membership in the subculture. Second, Matza argues that although delinquency may be an important part of adolescence, it is not a defining characteristic. However, it cannot be said that Matza's conceptualization of adolescent subculture is completely porous, as he is suggesting that adolescents must take on one of two identities at various moments of their lives—either as a conforming member of society or as a member of the subculture of delinquency. In addition, he says little about the possibility of subcultural identities that are less loosely configured than that which is applied by the term subculture of delinquency.

2.2.4 The British Response:

British sociologists have attempted to explain the emergence of dynamic youth subcultures in a Post-World War II Britain. Contrary to their American counterparts, British sociologists were less interested in examining delinquency, and more interested in analyzing the dynamics of youth subcultures and how they interacted with the dominant middle-class culture. Cagle's (1989) description on the "common" adolescent subculture in Britain reflects most of the findings of the major theorists within this paradigm:

Youth subcultures... are highly public; they dramatize style by parading it in our faces. Youth subcultures make their presence known by extending the elements of style to 'illogical,' shocking limits. In these ways subcultural styles exist as empowering forces in the lives of youth, providing both personal and collective identities, while setting up codes that inform onlookers that potential threats are at hand. (p. 303)

The relationship between the adolescent subcultures and mainstream culture is adversarial and, at times, appears to reflect class warfare. For example, in his seminal work *Learning to Labor*, Willis (1977) spoke of a group of adolescents from the working-class, or "the lads" as they identified themselves, who formed a distinctive "counter-school subcultural grouping" characterized by its opposition to the values and norms perpetuated throughout the school. This group felt superior to conformist pupils (usually from the middle-class) and teachers (seen as agents of the middle-class). They also showed little interest in academic work, preferring instead to amuse themselves as best they could through various forms of deviant behavior ("having a laff" became the main objective of the school day). They did not value academic work and their main objective in school was to disrupt lessons and 'get away' with whatever they could.

Willis's (1977) depiction of a subculture is distinctly different from the perspectives of Cohen and Matza. Cohen (1955) spoke of a delinquent subculture that forms as an inability to meet societal expectations but, once formed, does little to challenge society directly apart

from acting out through their delinquency. Meanwhile, Matza (1964) introduced the concept of an adolescent subculture that drifts between the conventional and the delinquent, at times existing in both worlds. The British perspective, on the other hand, describes adolescent subcultures that exist in *direct* and *explicit* opposition to the mainstream culture. Willis presents another example of a subculture with tight boundaries based on structural characteristics. There is not only little movement between subcultures, but also outright hostilities between the two groups. While the British perspective focused on the general behaviors of subcultural members, a new school of the American perspective was developing that focused specifically on violence and delinquency. This subculture of violence will be discussed in detail in the following section.

2.2.5 The Subculture of Violence:

Wolfgang and Ferracuti (1967) developed their theory of the subculture of violence to explain why certain subsets of the American population are more likely than others to resort to violence. Their theory differs from the previous formations discussed because it focuses on explaining violence among young impoverished urban black males. The authors argue that due to historical and cultural experiences, this disadvantaged group is overrepresented in homicide statistics. Members of a subculture of violence have a "counter-norm" of nonviolence" (p. 158). Through socialization, subcultural adherents learn to resort to violence when faced with a perceived threat. The subculture of violence reproduces itself generation after generation. Compared to the theories put forth by Cohen (1955), Matza (1964) and the British school, Wolfgang and Ferracuti's theory is an aggregate theory of violence. It is based on the incidence of violence among disadvantaged groups in certain geographical areas.

Anderson (2000) introduced a nuanced and focused version of the subculture of violence, drawing on his observations of an impoverished inner-city neighborhood. He draws on the term *code of the streets* to distinguish *street* from *decent* families and youths. Like

Wolfgang and Ferracutti's (1967) conceptualization, street youths internalize the norm of responding to conflict with violence. In contrast, decent youths can be code switchers, traversing from one set of norms to the next. Code switching is similar to Matza's conceptualization of drift. Depending on the circumstances, street youths are those who drift between conventional and less conventional societal values.

2.2.6 Post-Subcultural Theory

Sociologists interested in subcultures have reached back to concepts first presented by Matza and developed a perspective that Redhead (1990) refers to post-subcultural theory. Post-subcultural theorists argue that subcultures "must be based upon an interpretation of the subjectively held meanings, values and beliefs of the subculturalists themselves" (Muggleton, 2000, p. 10). To locate the behaviors and motivations of adolescents in subcultures, the subjectively experienced place of youths must be understood. In other words, this method examines the subculture from within the group; these theorists attempt to operationalize adolescent subcultures through the selfidentification of the subculture's members. However, finding a common theoretical conceptualization of youth subcultures among post-subcultural theories is not a simple task. For example, many post-subculturalists disagree as to whether the term "subculture" is even appropriate. Terms such as 'taste cultures' (e.g. Thornton, 1995), 'Neo-tribes' (e.g. Bennett, 1999; Maffesoli, 1996; Ueno, 2003), and 'lifestyles' (e.g. Chaney, 2004; Miles, 2000; Reimer, 1995) have been used interchangeably to describe modern youth groups. Still others argue that the idea of a subculture is redundant since modernity has led to the complete fragmentation of culture (Chaney, 2004), and that this fragmentation has led to the creation of limitless groups—and that these groups do not differ significantly enough in their values and norms to be labeled as subcultures.

However, some post-subcultural theorists maintain a connection, albeit a rather loose one, with more traditional subcultural theory. This connection is apparent in

Thornton's (1995) concept of *subcultural capital*. Thornton (and other post subculturalists) suggests that the problem that requires a subcultural solution appears to be adolescence itself. "Young people... often refuse the responsibilities and identities of the work world, choosing to invest their attention, time and money in leisure" (Thornton, 1995, p. 241). Therefore, adolescents create their own groups with new status hierarchies. Subcultural capital within these new hierarchies allows the members to move up and down the social ladder in a way they cannot in the adult culture.

When the discussion returns to the concept of identity, however, a rather large disconnect between Mertonian and post-subcultural conceptualizations of subculture becomes apparent. Drawing on Brubaker and Cooper (2000)'s discussion of the term identity, two of their conceptualizations are relevant to the current discussion. In one conceptualization, the authors argue that identity is sometimes "[u]nderstood as a specifically collective phenomenon" which "denotes a fundamental and consequential sameness among members of a group or category" and that "[t]his sameness is expected to manifest itself in solidarity, in shared dispositions or consciousness, or in collective action" (p. 7). Thus individual identity nearly disappears in favor of an overarching group identity. Therefore, group membership can be seen as interchangeable with individual identity. Yet, according to Brubaker and Cooper (2000) identity can also be "understood as the evanescent product of multiple and competing discourses", and that "'identity' is invoked to highlight the unstable, multiple, fluctuating, and fragmented nature of the contemporary 'self" (p. 8). This conceptualization is in line with the post-subcultural theorists' approach of defining subcultures from the individual members' perspective. Thus, while Mertonian subcultural theories are rooted in structural characteristics of the group and the group's relationship to societal expectations, post-subculturalists envision adolescents "style surfing" (Polhemus, 1996) from one loosely bounded subculture to another and only gaining part of their identity from group membership. Both conceptualizations, however, see adolescents

encountering a specific problem that requires a group solution and therefore, both can be seen as theories of subculture. The key difference between post-subcultural and Mertonian schools, then, is whether the subculture is examined from the perspective of the member or from outside the group. For Mertonian theorists, subcultures are operationalized as groups that form due to an inability of its members to meet societal expectations, while for post-subculturalists, subcultures are operationalized as a loose group formed by adolescents who are seeking part of their identity from group membership.

The previous discussion has related the general theoretical orientation of subcultural theories. In the next section, the discussion first focuses on the importance that social class has played in subcultural literature. Next, the discussion considers how variation in delinquency and deviance —the dependent variable to be examined in the current research—relates to subcultural and post-subcultural theories.

2.3 Subcultures and the Middle Class:

2.3.1 Middle Class Subcultural Theory:

In the Mertonian conceptualization, the middle-class question is largely ignored. For instance, Cohen's (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) theories are theories of lower-class, inner-city youth. Similarly the British and subculture of violence perspectives focus on working-class and inner-city youth respectively. In post-subculturalist theories, class disappears altogether. Instead of class, the focus is on the various cultural values and belief systems of youth, suggesting "the possibility of a value convergence across social classes; that youth from different class backgrounds can hold similar values that find their expression in shared membership of a particular subculture" (Muggleton, 2000, p. 31). Post-subcultural theorists argue that the relationship between class and subcultural expression is spurious, caused simply by propinquity: Lower-class youth form subcultural groups with other lower-class youth because they are more likely to interact with youth from the same social class (Bennett and Kahn-Harris 2004; Clarke 1990; Muggleton 2000;

and Thornton 1995). This aspect of post-subcultural theory holds true for Matza's (1964) conceptualization of the subculture of delinquency as well.

Whether focusing on the lower-class, the working-class, or classlessness, these schools rarely address, or even acknowledge, middle-class youth or their connection to subcultures. This is not to say that the topic has been completely ignored—just that work focused on these youth is few and far between and rarely has a noticeable impact on the field. For example, Cohen (1955), one of the founding voices of the Mertonian subcultural school, spends several pages in his significant work, *Delinquent Boys*, theorizing about the formation of youth subcultures in the middle-class. However, this aspect of his theory remains largely unexamined and untested.

When one looks past the Mertonian subcultural school, two themes regarding middle-class youth subcultures begin to appear. First, there is the idea of a counterculture. Popularized by Roszak (1968), a counterculture (or oppositional culture) refers to a group whose norms, by definition, run counter to those of the mainstream. What differentiates a counterculture from a subculture is the former's political nature. Specifically, while a subculture's norms may run counter to those of the mainstream, individual members of that subculture normally do not actively seek to change the norms of society. Conversely, "the diffuseness and articulation of middle-class cultures means that when they are oppositional they tend to be more overtly political and ideological" (Brake, 1985).

The second theme is that of a singular youth culture—the idea that there is a single overarching culture that is unique to youth, regardless of the individual's social class. Berger (1963) verbalizes this when he argues that "what delinquents and bohemians and campus radicals and even some high school hot rodders and college fraternity boys have in common is... their youthfulness, that is, their tendency to behave in patterned ways normatively hedonistic, irresponsible, and expressive" (p. 329). Many theorists argue that while

adolescents may in some ways be unique, their norms and values are the same regardless of the various groups they may belong to (Wattenburg, 1974). These two views of middle-class youth (sub)culture—the counterculture and the classless youth culture—represent two extremes—either a highly organized political machine whose goal is to change the system or a single group of adolescents with little variability. Do all middle-class adolescents fall into one of these extremes, or is there some room in the middle?

Hagan (1991) examines the middle-ground between these two extremes by suggesting that the concept of subculture has a place in the middle-class. He suggests that the major shortcoming of delinquency research is that it treats subcultural identification as a dependent variable and thus ignores what effect it may have on future status attainments. In his research, he examines the adult outcomes of subcultural membership from various socioeconomic positions. Based on his results, he identified two subcultures within the sample, the boundaries of which are based on specific actions common within each group. The first subculture is labeled a *subculture of delinquency* and consists of individuals who commit common forms of delinquency (such as shoplifting, vandalism, and fighting). The other is a *party subculture* whose members, as the name suggests, spend time going to parties, concerts, dating, driving around in cars, and drinking alcohol.

Interestingly, membership in these two groups is not predicted by class status (as measured by parental occupational prestige). However, according to Hagan's (1991) research, class does play a significant role in how membership in these subcultures affects adult outcomes. He finds that "the effects of subcultural drift in establishing adult status trajectories are contingent on class origins" (p. 579). Specifically, the effect of identifying with a subculture of delinquency only affects the adult achievement of sons of working-class fathers. Conversely, identification with the party subculture only affects the adult achievement of sons of non-working-class fathers. For the purposes of the current research, the finding that there exists a form of subculture within the middle-class is extremely important. However, further research is needed to determine whether there are multiple

subcultures within the middle-class, and whether any of these subcultures are associated with delinquency. In addition, a more nuanced examination of subcultures is needed. While Hagan (1991) looked at behavior (in this case, delinquency) to create his subcultural categories, it is important to also consider how the adolescents themselves describe their peer groups and individual identities, since there may be more groupings than just the two this theorist examined.

2.3.2 Lessons Learned -- Middle-Class in Subcultural Theory:

As previously stated, research on adolescent subcultures has focused on adolescents belonging to the lower- or working-class. The post-subcultural theorists who argue that boundaries are no longer demarcated by class or who study 'classless' subcultures (see Thornton, 1995) have almost exclusively examined the 'flashy' adolescent trends of the lower- and working-class (see Muggleton, 2000). Another issue within the 'classless' subcultural research is the fact that it is usually conducted *within* subcultural spaces: dance-clubs (Thornton, 1996), specialty-shops (Muggleton, 2000), etc. These investigations are interesting and tell researchers a great deal about certain, highly-visible subcultures. They also suggest that there is more than a single adolescent subculture—that there may, in fact, be multiple adolescent subcultures. However, they do not allow researchers to speak of the prevalence of subcultural identities among 'average' adolescents—those who are not commonly found within subcultural spaces like dance-clubs. Based on the arguments of Matza (1964) and the post-subculturalists there is every reason to believe that most middle-class adolescents, by sheer virtue of the fact that they are experiencing adolescence, are likely to take on subcultural identities at least on occasion.

In addition to the existence of adolescent subcultures in the middle class, the current sociological literature also suggests that there may be a great deal of fluidity between these subcultures (e.g. Bennett and Kahn-Harris; Hodkinson and Deicke, 2007, Jenks, 2004; and Muggleton, 2000). The origins of this fluidity can be found in Matza's (1964)

conceptualization of drift. However, Matza is only speaking of a single subculture (one of delinquency) and how its members relate to the mainstream culture. Its members drift between the subculture of delinquency and the mainstream culture. There is no discussion of movement between multiple adolescent subcultures. This fluidity, or drift, between multiple adolescent subcultures has been investigated by several theorists within the post-subcultural school (see Polhemus' (1996) use of the concept 'style surfing' for an excellent example).

Another consideration when studying middle-class subcultures is the effect of modernity and technology on subcultural development—particularly the internet boom of the late 1990s and early 2000s. This has mainly taken place within the post-subcultural school. For example, in his examination of online goth communities, Hodkinson (2005) presented the following discussion as the foundation for his null hypothesis:

For those of postmodernist persuasions, the diverse yet fluid nature of the internet accelerates the breakdown of boundaries between established social categories and, hence, the fragmentation of individual identities and stable communities... Such a perspective implies that groupings such as the goth scene would have their distinctiveness, commitment, identity and autonomy thoroughly dissolved by the ability of individuals to move from one virtual affiliation to another on a mouse-click... In line with more general postmodern interpretations of contemporary culture, then, the implication is of the melting if not the evaporating of cultural and subcultural boundaries by a mass medium which offers a taste of everything to everyone. (p. 564)

In order to test this hypothesis, Hodkinson (2005) examined online websites and message boards devoted entirely to the goth subculture. Therefore, it is not surprising that he found evidence of strong subcultural boundaries. There is a selection effect in drawing on a source developed specifically for subcultural members. The current research draws on general social network sites to assess the extent to which middle class youths identify with multiple subcultures at the same time.

Finally, it must be asked if multiple middle-class subcultures with loose boundaries exist and whether subcultural identity is contextual; that is, do adolescents drift in and out of subcultural and mainstream identities based on their situation? A significant proportion of middle-class adolescents may identify with a subculture, and many others may be likely to express their identity apart from these subcultures. Not only is it important to identify these subcultures generally, but also to examine how these loose boundaries behave in the various life domains of middle-class adolescents. For instance, perhaps adolescents are more likely to stress their subcultural identities when it is likely to increase their subcultural capital (Thornton, 1995)—in other words, in situations where they are interacting with other adolescents (within school and peer networks, for example). Conversely, there will be little to gain by stressing subcultural identities in situations where other adolescents are not present (within family networks, for example).

2.4 The Role of Delinquency:

2.4.1 The Use of Delinquency as an Expression of Subcultural Identity:

Thus far, the discussion has revolved around the possible existence of adolescent subcultures in middle-class communities. The next step is to examine the role of delinquency within these subcultures. The first question that needs to be addressed is whether middle-class adolescent subcultures express themselves differently from those of less affluent social classes when relating the incidence of delinquency. This question highlights one of the common critiques leveled against both the Mertonian and post-subcultural schools. Many of the earlier Mertonian theorists such as Whyte (1947), Cohen (1955), and Miller (1955) focused the majority of their attention on the actions of the delinquent subculture—specifically, "non-utilitarian, malicious, and negativistic" (Cohen, 1955 p. 25) delinquency—which serves no purpose other than to provide an outlet for the strain felt by being placed at a disadvantage to middle-class adolescents. These theorists

spend little time discussing the various forms of delinquency, and how they may differ within a subcultural group.

As previously discussed, Matza (1964) critiqued the idea of adolescent delinquency as a defining characteristic of the subculture of delinquency. Matza argued that adolescents seek thrills and excitement that often take the form of delinquency. It is not the delinquency that is important, but the feelings that are derived from it. In other words, if the members of the subculture found a non-delinquent means to achieve the thrills and excitement that are associated with delinquency, then a subculture would still persist but it would be a more general subculture of adolescence, not a subcultural of delinquency.

The closest approximation to a post-subculturalist approach to examining delinquency within subcultures comes from the research of Hagan (1991) which was discussed above. It is important to reiterate that he formed the boundaries of the subcultures he studied on the forms of delinquency selected by the adolescents—leading to somewhat circular results. To address this issue, the current research takes the opposite approach by starting with respondents' subcultural identifications and then determining whether adolescents in different subcultures commit specific forms of delinquency. As had been discussed above, the post-subcultural school was developed as a sociological approach to examining adolescent identity. As such, delinquency was not used as a measure of subcultural membership or expression. What is taken away from this is that there are several ways adolescents could express their subcultural membership, of which delinquency is only one. As such, the current research acknowledges that delinquency will not be a defining characteristic of all subcultures being examined.

2.4.2 Publicizing Delinquency:

The idea that adolescents talk about their delinquency is explicitly examined among British subcultural theorists. Cagle (1989) summarizes the work of the major theorists within the British perspective. He states *semiotics* (Hawkes, 1977) is key in the development of adolescent subcultures. Specifically, semiotics, or a study of symbols, allows "for an explanation of the ways subcultures arrange and display their fashions, art, and music" (Cagle, 1989, p. 305). In other words, semiotics provides meaning to the artifacts found within each subculture. Items and actions can be used to analyze the beliefs and communication patterns within subcultures. Specifically, "this semiotic/textual approach provides a method for analyzing the ideological dimensions of subcultures, the ways in which various stylistic components 'fit' into a pattern by rendering social life to be classifiable, intelligible, meaningful" (p. 305). It is possible that adolescents use delinquency or, more importantly, the *communication of delinquency* to clearly demarcate the boundaries of their subcultural identity.

Matza (1964) sheds some light on the importance of communication among subcultural members with respect to delinquency. Matza suggests that *publicity*—the common knowledge of the commission of delinquent acts—is one of the defining characteristic of the subculture of delinquency. Specifically, the idea of publicity relates to Matza's (1964) notion of drift. The communication of delinquent acts amongst group members allows for the clear demarcation of boundaries by outlining to the adolescent where and when delinquency is appropriate, or even expected. In other words, by sharing stories of delinquent acts and gaging the response of their peers to these stories, the rules of drifting between conventional and delinquent norms are more clearly understood by the adolescent. If this is true, it allows one to investigate a very interesting phenomenon: the methods and manner of publicizing delinquency.

Few adolescents spend time plotting crime sprees or hanging out in clubs. Instead, they demonstrate their ability to be daring, adventurous, exciting and other characteristics that are accepted within the subterranean system. Matza (1964) argues that adolescents have a need to demonstrate their ability to skirt the law while not being seen as truly dangerous. At the time of Matza's writing (the late 1950s and early 60s), communication between adolescents was mostly limited to direct contact. In other words, the only way for the adolescent to brag about his or her daring actions was through a face-to-face discussion with one or more adolescents. However, in the past five decades, the forms of communication available to adolescents have greatly increased. Society has seen the rise in the popularity of direct interaction via telephones and cellular telephones and asynchronous communication via text messages. In addition to these advances, the development of the personal computer and invention of the internet have given adolescents a new realm of communication, particularly through social networking sites. In fact, Boyd (2008) has made the assertion that MySpace is replacing the shopping mall as the place where adolescents hang out and trade stories as fact. Therefore, one can expect MySpace to be ripe with examples of adolescents publicizing their delinquency.

2.5 Hypotheses:

The above advances in subcultural theory lend themselves to several hypotheses to be tested in the current research:

Hypothesis 1 – A large proportion of the sample will identify with at least one subculture.

Hypothesis 2 – A significant proportion of the sample will identify with multiple subcultures at the same time.

Hypothesis 3 – While a significant proportion of the sample will report belonging to a subculture, respondents will also be likely to express their individuality.

Hypothesis 4 – Subcultural identities will be more prominent in the life domains of schools and peers and less so in family life domain.

Hypothesis 5 – The members of the various subcultures identified will express themselves using different forms of delinquency.

Hypothesis 6 – Not all of the members of the various subcultures identified will express themselves using delinquency

Hypothesis 7 – A significant proportion of the adolescents in this sample will publicize their delinquency, which will tend to take the form of relatively minor acts, such as underage drinking and shoplifting.

Hypothesis 8 – Because these minor forms of delinquency are accepted within the subculture, adolescents will speak of these acts in a positive light to other adolescents.

3 Qualitative Methods, Analysis and Findings

3.1 Data Collection:

In order to address the hypotheses presented in the previous chapter, both qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed. For the qualitative analysis, a random selection of about 100 personal webpages constructed by adolescents between the ages of 16 and 18 within various middle-class neighborhoods was analyzed. Social networking websites (e.g., MySpace, Facebook, Friendster, Google+, etc.) allow individuals to create a personal webpage that can be employed for communication with selected peers. Most of these websites allow members to post a great deal of personal information in a number of unique sections (i.e., online photo-books, written biographies, interests, blogs, journals, etc.). More specifically, Boyd and Ellison (2007) define a social network site as a "web-based service that allows individuals to (1) construct a public or semipublic profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection, and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system" (p. 1). The popularity of these sites has skyrocketed in recent years. In fact, it has been estimated that MySpace was the most visited website on the internet in 2006 (Prescott, 2007).

The analysis of online communication in the study of adolescent subcultures is not a novel idea. In fact, it has been employed for nearly a decade in the social sciences. However, this research has, in general, taken on a very narrow focus. Many researchers have employed online message boards (webpages dedicated to the discussion of specific topics) to analyze the interaction of groups. For example, Bury (2003) used a message board dedicated to the discussion of a then-popular television program to examine how gender is expressed online. Similarly, Wilson and Atkinson (2005) analyzed message boards to look at how communication among rave and straightedge subcultures varied on- and off-line. These are important additions to the examination of human interaction. However, for

the purposes of the current research, message board analysis is not appropriate, as it requires the identification of a pre-defined and identified subculture, which limits the researcher's ability to make conclusions in three important ways. First, it does not allow the researcher to determine the prevalence of the subculture in the youth culture. Second, it does not allow the researcher to determine the prevalence of the subcultural identity within the individual. In other words, if the interactions of individuals on a straightedge message board are being examined, it would not be expected to find individual expressions of identity apart from that particular subculture. Finally, it makes it impossible to identify new or emerging subcultures. If the researcher is not aware they exist, then he or she would not know to look for a message board related to them. Therefore, for the purposes of the current research, it was more appropriate to gather a sample of websites that allowed the researcher to determine the prevalence of subcultural identities both within the adolescent population and within the individual. Social networking sites allow for both.

For the purposes of this research, a single social networking website was analyzed: MySpace. MySpace was chosen for a number of reasons. First, Reuters (2006) found that MySpace captures nearly 80% of traffic to social networking websites. Therefore, when these data were first collected in 2008, MySpace was, by far, the most popular social networking website and was most likely to capture members of the population being studied here. Additionally, through a series of telephone interviews, Lenhart and Madden (2007) discovered that 55% of online adolescents (who represent 87% of all adolescents) have created a personal webpage and, of these, 85% did so through MySpace. In other words, in 2007, approximately 41% of adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17 had a personal webpage on MySpace.

Second, MySpace has unique features that simplify research. The URL of each profile begins with the same universal root followed by a unique ID number. Therefore, by using a random number generator, a simple random sample of member profiles was taken. Certain

webpages were not valid for the research (e.g., those outside the age range, musician and band pages, private pages (which will be discussed in greater detail shortly), etc).

Additionally, each personal website provides three unique features that were examined for this analysis. First, members are asked to fill out a section in which they describe themselves and their interests. Second, another section allows members and their friends to post comments on each other's sites. As Thelwall (2008) describes it: "[M]any members have conversations with friends by taking turns to write on each other's comments section" (p. 91). MySpace members also have the option to keep a blog or online journal. Each of these sources of data allows the researcher to conduct an in-depth content analysis of middle-class adolescents' personal webpages.

Finally, the developers of MySpace go to great effort to protect the privacy of the website's members. When creating a webpage, the author has the option to make the page "private," meaning that only those individuals whom he or she designates as "friends" will be allowed to view their personal information, pictures, and posts. Additionally, all members under the age of 16 automatically and permanently have their profiles set to private (until they turn 16). Therefore, by sampling those profiles of members who have not set their profiles to "private," the researcher was confident that the member was implicitly giving consent for viewing by anyone who desires to do so.

However, by sampling only those public webpages, a question arose with respect to how representative the sample was. Specifically, there might be something different about those individuals who decide to make their profiles private versus those who allow the public to view their pages. Private profiles may be created as an alternative method to communicate with a close group of friends. It can be seen as a convenient way to e-mail and instant-message friends without having to utilize multiple sites and programs.

Conversely, it can be argued that adolescents who keep their profile public are simply less

private individuals in general, making them more likely to share their experiences with observers. One would expect their profiles, comments, and blog postings to contain more information. But the fact remains that they are a skewed distribution of the young people who frequent MySpace. The two groups—public and private webpages—may well differ systematically in ways that are unknown. For example, perhaps those who make their profiles private may do so because they have more to hide. In other words, they may engage in delinquent behavior that they do not want outsiders to know about. This, unfortunately, is something that cannot be addressed without access to private pages. Something else to consider is that those individuals who choose to use MySpace may be different from those who use other social networking websites. However, once again, this is something that cannot be addressed in the current research.

In addition, because MySpace does not include a measure of individual socioeconomic status, census data were used to determine whether the individuals selected came from a middle-class area. Specifically, once a case was identified, the median income of the individual's hometown was determined. If it fell within the middle-class range (equal to or above the national average), the case was analyzed. However, it is important to be cognizant that this method only allowed the researcher to identify subjects from a middle-class area. It did not allow the researcher to identify specific middle-class subjects. Therefore, the research plan must be slightly refined to look at subcultures within middle-class areas, rather than specific middle-class adolescents.

There is also another possible limitation that must be addressed. MySpace does not require users to fill in information beyond their username and age. Therefore, during the data collection process, partially incomplete profiles were encountered. If certain pieces of information were not included (such as location), it would not be advisable to include these profiles in the sample, as the researcher would not be able to determine if they were part of the middle-class. The decision was therefore made to exclude these profiles from the

analysis. Additionally, some profiles included the individual's demographic information but lacked information in the personal profile, blog, and message board areas. Again, in these cases, the profiles were not included in the sample simply because they did not provide any data for analysis. However, by excluding these profiles, the generalizability of the findings may be compromised. Therefore, when possible, demographic characteristics were gathered (such as gender, age, and location) on these cases to see if any specific groups of individuals were not providing data.

3.2 Qualitative Sample:

Using the methods described above, an initial sample of 1,966 MySpace webpages was collected. It was decided that webpages of musicians, comedians, and other individuals using MySpace for commercial purposes would not be retained in the sample. Of these 1,966 pages, 5.5% (N = 108) were included in the final sample. In other words, these 108 cases met the selection characteristics of having public pages, being between the ages of 16 and 18, living in the United States, residing in middle-class areas, and including enough information in their profiles for analysis.

The average age of the final sample analyzed (*N*=108) was 17.4. This is almost the exact midpoint of the age-range included in the wider sample (i.e., 16 to 18 year olds). The gender distribution of the final sample was 56% male and 44% female. It is important to examine the characteristics of all 16-to-18-year-old United States residents in the full sample. This consisted of 315 individuals (of which 108 were included in the final sample). Slightly more than half of these individuals (51%) chose to keep their pages public. The average age was 17.2 and the majority was female (54%). In terms of age, there was no significant difference between public and private status. However, males between the ages of 16 and 18 were more likely to keep their pages public (61% versus 44%). Therefore, the final sample analyzed was over-representative of males.

3.3 Qualitative Plan of Analysis:

One of the biggest challenges in qualitative data analysis is the development of a research agenda that is clear, concise, and objective. Indeed, this was a challenge in the current research, as a great deal of information was collected from the MySpace profiles. In order to develop a workable and practical research agenda, an attempt was made to apply Altheide's (1996) ethnographic content analysis (ECA) methodology. This method was originally developed to examine media content; however, it lends itself to the current research.

ECA attempts to "fill a gap in research methods between traditional 'content analysis'... and qualitative methods such as participant observation and focused interviewing" (p. 1-2). Altheide (1996) developed this analysis technique with three core beliefs in mind. First, he argued that social life is built off of various definitions of the situation. Second, he believed that the communicative process is reflexive and that researchers must therefore pay close attention to the words, phrases and responses of the individuals being studied. Finally, Altheide maintained that everything in the social world is in a constant state of production—even those beliefs and values that appear to be stable. These beliefs are closely related to the postmodern movement in the social sciences, as well as the post-subcultural school of thought, in that they all hinge on the notion that researchers cannot take anything for granted, and that researchers have to pay special attention to what occurs outside of the social world.

ECA differs from quantitative content analysis in several important ways. First, it assumes that "the meaning of a message is... reflected in various modes of information exchange, format, rhythm, and style" (Altheide, 1996 p. 16). Therefore, in the current research, it will be important to analyze every section of the authors' MySpace pages for clues of their subcultural identification (e.g., the words of the authors, the pictures presented on the webpages, the content and style of the authors' interaction with other

individuals) and publicity of delinquency. Second, ECA is a methodology that is consistent, but not rigid. In other words, it allows for the fluid nature of research. In the following analysis, it will become apparent that the analysis of MySpace pages evolved over the course of the evaluation. Finally, ECA is first and foremost concerned with concept development. It is critical to allow the analysis to develop naturally by being sensitive to any themes or concepts that emerge during the analysis

The eight hypotheses set forth in the previous chapter center around two major variables. First, there is the independent variable of subcultural identity. Specifically, the researcher is interested in seeing whether subcultural identities exist within middle-class adolescents and whether these identities vary across the various life domains (Hypotheses 1-5). Next, the research attempts to determine how subcultural identity (the independent variable) relates to delinquency (the dependent variable). In particular, it is examined whether the adolescents in the sample publicize their delinquency and, if so, whether it is discussed in a negative, positive, or neutral tone (Hypotheses 7 and 8).

3.4 Qualitative Analysis and Findings:

3.4.1 Hypotheses 1 through 4 – Subcultural Identity:

Hypotheses 1 through 4 stated that a large proportion of the sample will identify with at least one subculture, that a significant proportion of the sample will identify with multiple subcultures at the same time, that while a significant proportion of the sample will identify with a subculture, respondents will also be likely to express their individuality, and that subcultural identities will be more prominent in the life domains of schools and peers and less so in family life domain. In order to test these hypotheses, a way to examine subcultural identity among the individuals in the sample had to be found. This was accomplished by analyzing the "About Me" section of each author's MySpace profile.

Specifically, the researcher looked for self-identification within their self-description (for

example, words like "punk", "goth", "nerd", etc. were searched for). It is important to note that this method follows more closely to the post-subcultural definition of subculture. The researcher examined the self-proclamations of the authors. This assumes that subcultural membership can be analyzed via the individual members' identities. For this reason, the current research uses the term subcultural *identity* rather than *membership* to acknowledge its differences from Mertonian thinking. One of the weaknesses of this method, however, is that it did not allow the current research to examine whether these groups are forming due to the groups inability to meet societal expectation.

Additionally, the authors' "Interests" section (music, movie, television programs, etc.) were analyzed to determine if subcultural identity could be assigned based on 'virtual artifacts' (i.e. a discussion of their tastes and preferences regarding music, movies, books, television programs, etc.). The "Interests" section lends itself to this form of analysis, as the website guides its users by providing headings within this section. Specifically, it asks users to fill out information on "music", "movies and television", "books", and "other". Therefore, it focuses the users' attention to popular culture. However, as the research progressed it was discovered that less than 5% of the cases gathered included any information in the "Interests" section apart from musical preferences. Therefore, it was necessary to narrow the analysis of this section to the connection between subcultural identity and musical taste. This method of analysis is similar to those used in the sociological examination of subcultures. Specifically, the post-subcultural and British perspectives have focused on the analysis of artifacts and taste preferences within subcultures. In the post-subcultural perspective, the majority of these studies have used the term *scene* instead of subculture. Some theorists prefer this term for its flexibility. For example, Khan-Harris (2000) argues that the term can be used to describe "everything from tight-knit local music communities to isolated musicians and occasional fans (p. 25)". Nonetheless, whether the term scene or subculture is being used, what this form of analysis suggests is that an individual's identity

can be connected to a subculture or scene in varying degrees. In the British perspective, the connection between music and subcultural identity is tighter with Hebdige (1979) arguing that there is a "symbolic fit between the values and lifestyles of a group, its subjective experience and the musical forms it uses to express or reinforce its focal concerns" (p. 113). Regardless of the perspective taken, both argue that there is at least some connection between the adolescent's musical preferences and subcultural identity. For this reason, it was decided that the analysis of the "musical interest" section would provide some insight into the adolescent's subcultural identity. However, this method is not without shortcomings, which will be discussed in greater detail below.

It was hoped that by analyzing these artifacts, common terms, phrases, and visual cues would be identified. Rather than depend on the researcher's knowledge of music, another user-created webpage was used as a reference source for interpreting these artifacts. Specifically, the researcher used Wikipedia (*Wikipedia.org*) to determine the subcultural affiliation (if any) of the music the author identified. Every Wikipedia webpage of a musical act contains a text box that provides basic information about the act. One of the headings is titled "genre"; this is where the act's style and subcultural identification is presented.

Wikipedia is a desirable information source for the current research in two ways. First, the website allows authors to identify bands under multiple genres. Additionally, it does not require the author to choose from a pre-created list of genres. Therefore, the majority of pages will list the style of the act in both general (e.g. "alternative", "rock", "pop", etc.) and specific terms (e.g. "metalcore", "third-wave ska", "dub" etc.). This allowed the researcher to examine the correlates of subcultural identity and behavior in both general and specific groups. Second, Wikipedia is a user-generated online encyclopedia. In terms of the current research, this means that the actual listeners are identifying the genre of the acts. This provided the researcher with an indirect path to subcultural identification. In other

words, if listeners identify a specific act as "punk" and an individual in the sample reports listening to several acts that have been categorized (by fellow listeners) as punk acts, then it would be a reasonable conclusion that the authors has at least some punk tendencies. However, this strength is also a possible weakness. As mentioned above, anyone is able to edit these pages and this means that the reliability of the information presented comes into question. In order to protect against this, Wikipedia has introduced a few modifications to their website. First, the webpage allows users to flag any pages that appear to contain inaccurate information. This causes the page to become locked and therefore can no longer be edited by users until a staff member is able to review the page for accuracy. In addition, a notice is placed on the page that it may contain "inaccurate information". Second, the developers have included a system that allows all users to rate how "trustworthy", "objective", "complete" and "well-written" a page is. Therefore, those who are knowledgeable about the topic (i.e. the band or musical act) are able to rate the reliability of the information presented. With these two modifications the information gathered from Wikipedia can be considered fairly reliable.

The final method that was used to help identify authors' subcultural identity in the qualitative analysis was an examination of the individual's pictures (if any were posted). Specifically, the pictures were examined for any visible artifacts of subcultural identity (i.e. clothing styles, makeup or hair styles, band or musical paraphernalia) that the researcher was familiar with. However, this is perhaps the most subjective method of analysis, and can be greatly affected by error. For example, it could be the case that the photos of the individual were from an occasion that did not represent his or her common style (e.g., a costume party), or may have presented a style that the researcher was not familiar with. Therefore, this final form of analysis was only used to expand on the findings of the previous two methods..

In total, 108 personal webpages met the requirements discussed previously and were analyzed. The amount of information provided in these webpages varied. However, all 108 included enough information to produce a valid analysis. More specifically, each webpage examined had to have at least one of the following sections filled out and available to read: "About Me", "Interests" "Friend and Comments" and "Blogs". The majority of the webpages included in the analysis had more than one of these sections filled out. For the purposes of the current research, the researcher searched for evidence of subcultural identity. This involved looking for three things: a proclamation of subcultural membership (e.g. phrases such as "I'm a _____"); musical preferences that securely anchored the individual within a group (e.g. listing a majority of "_____" bands); and/or labels from friends in the participant's comments section (e.g. "You're such a _____").

All 108 cases analyzed included information in the "About Me" section, ranging from a few words to several paragraphs. The "About Me" section is presumably the most valid measurement of subcultural identity, for it is here that the author provides a selfdescription. In other words, if someone sees him/herself in a certain light, it is here that one would expect to find such a proclamation. Interestingly, however, this does not appear to be the case. In fact, of the 108 cases analyzed, only two included statements that might be construed as a statement of subcultural identity:

> Case 017: "I'm true right down to the country tooth..! But i never call myself (RedNeck or Country.) Because I'm just a little barefoot Hillbilly"¹

Case 018: "I'm a hippie"

1 Note that all grammatical errors are left as they were presented in their original format as to preserve the author's voice as well as any possible subcultural language

While very few adolescents clearly proclaimed themselves to be a member of a particular subculture, they still found many ways to express their identities. Some did so by discussing their connection to a dominant adolescent identity. Such authors stressed how average they are:

Case 009: "regular guy"

Case 036: "There's not much I can say about me"

Case 047: "just one of those normal kids"

Case 053: "I'm nothing special there [school] I just blend in with the school. I am usually very quiet"

Case 064: "I'm your typical girl"

Case 069: "I'm just your average guy trying to make his way through this crazy thing called life"

Case 078: "ordinary teenager"

These individuals appear to avoid using any subcultural phrases or terms when describing themselves. In fact, they do not provide any description that would show their individuality. Instead, their singular identity is within the mainstream adolescent identity.

Meanwhile, many of the other adolescents in the sample fall on the opposite end of the spectrum, stressing their individuality. They do not belong to the mainstream culture or any other group that would provide them with an identity. Some achieve this by coming right out and declaring their individuality:

Case 091: "I prefer to keep my individuality"

Case 036: "TV is a waste of time, the average American spends over 4 years of their life watching television, I don't want to be average"

Case 059: "i sing my own song and march at my own beat and pace"

Case 156: "I don't act like you do. I see things you never see and look at things in a different way"

Others substitute the term "individual" with other concepts and phrases that suggest they are apart from the mainstream culture. Such terms as "strange" or "random" suggest that the individual would not appear to be "normal" or easily identified by anyone as belonging to the mainstream. For example:

Case 107: "Im quite a strange young man if I would say so myself"

Case 003: "I'm extremely random"

Case 110: "im a very random people n im no where near perfect"

Case 136: "I am odd & relate to almost no one, but I embrace my weirdness"

Case 085: "i'm the type of girl who don't really give a darn of what people say... i hate it if i'm compared to other girls"

Others use the phrase "walking contradiction" to imply that their behavior does not conform to mainstream ideas:

Case 089: "so basically... i'm a walking contradiction... rawr"

Case 156: "With me usually what you see isn't what you get. One minute I'm shy and the next I'm screaming ridiculously all up on someone. I literally am a walking contradiction of myself"

Finally, one author went so far as to aggressively declare his distinction from the mainstream:

Case 049: "mainstream can eat a dick as ice-t says"

The final way that the authors in this sample declared their individuality was through directly confronting labels that have been applied to them in the past. There are several strong examples of this. First:

Case 091: "I don't have a liking of being stereotyped and classified into these social clichés we have nowadays, so I don't consider myself gothic, prep, emo, redneck, grunge, and of that overused excrement, and you shouldn't either, unless, that is if you just happen to be one of those stereotypical peons that make up the majority of our poor society today"

This individual names several of the subcultures that are perceived as being popular among today's adolescents. Note that he is not denying the existence of these groups, just that he does not belong to any of them. Even further, he is attributing a negative label ("peons") to any individual that would identify him/herself as belonging to a subculture. Along the same lines, several other individuals apply negative labels to others belonging to a *specific* group of individuals:

Case: 097: "I DO NOT SHOP AT HOLLISTER, AMERICAN EAGLE, OR ABERCROMBIE & FITCH. I automatically tend to avoid people wearing those brands of clothing. but if they are good ppl and not annoying or do not talk in a rapid/high pitched voice, i can still be friend with and hang out with them"

This author appears to be referring to individuals that might fall into a specific subculture. She attacks this group by stating she would "tend to avoid people wearing those brands" while at the same time rewarding individual characteristics. In other words, case 097 states that she will not judge an individual based on appearances of subcultural membership; however, if they show other signs of membership (such as behaviors or characteristics), she will avoid these individuals.

Others simply reject labels that have been applied to them by others. This appears to happen most frequently with labels that deal with an individual's intelligence or school performance:

Case 148: "People think I'm smart, but thats only because of my grades. I'm not really that smart; I'm just a quick learner"

Case: 107: "Im like a genius according to my standardized test scores but I get really shitty grades"

Finally, some of the authors even rebelled against the idea of describing themselves at all:

Case 077: "How could one possibly expect me to fit my life story into one paragraph? All of my few accomplishments and erroneous blunders... flaws that scare what little pride I hold? Someone looking at me from afar might think of me as something simple. But could they perceive my own, twisted contemplations"

Case 091: "You have to be a complete dullard to describe your self with one sentence like most of these people on here, but I am not among those dull people"

This seems to be the ultimate declaration of independence. They are not railing against the mainstream or the underground. They are stating that the concept of describing oneself in a sentence or a paragraph does not allow for a nuanced understanding of their identity. They could belong to a subculture; however, they see their identity as too complex to describe in a brief written statement. Case 091 takes it one step further and argues that anyone who attempts to do so is a "dullard".

This final pattern shows an inherent flaw in using an individual's self-description to place him/her in a subculture. Remember that the researcher is analyzing webpages that are purposely developed for viewing by other people. Therefore, it is likely that the authors keep this in mind when constructing their personal pages. In other words, they may intentionally manipulate their self-description section to paint whatever public persona they would like. Therefore, it is hard to know how much one can trust this description in terms of being an accurate reflection of what they actually value. One possible way around this is to look at their "Interests" section. Although, there may be a similar situation (i.e. listing certain bands in order to impress others or simply just feigning interest), there is a great deal more information available—the majority of authors listed more than 20 musical acts on their webpages—and one would expect their true selves to come through. However, this may be an artifact of the website itself. For example, in the "Interests" sections music

prompted to think about their musical preferences before anything else. In addition, MySpace allows the author to stream music on their webpage with a straightforward interface, which, once again, sensitizes the author to musical preferences. Finally, at the time these data were collected MySpace was a popular medium for musical acts to publicize their work. These characteristics of the website skew the individual's declaration of interests

preferences are automatically listed first. Therefore, when filling out a profile the author is

towards music and therefore provide only a narrow and limited basis for ascribing

subcultural identity. The possible impact of this limitation will be discussed in greater detail

below.

At first glance, there are similar patterns in the authors' descriptions of their musical preferences. Some describe their musical taste as being contrary to whatever the mainstream may listen to. For example:

Case 132: "stuff you dont like"

Others identify their musical preference by how others would describe it:

Case 095: My kinda music includes... apparently what everybody in this small town calls emo/punk"

Case 107: "I used to be a loser metalhead who couldn't stand rap. Now I listen to alot more stuff"

Finally, similar to the authors' language in their "About Me" section, the most common response in the "music" category was to avoid any classification. Many of the authors admitted to listening to music without any discussion of specific acts or genre. For example:

Case 003: "stuff"

Case 071: "sounds"

Case 117: "Music is life"

Case 050: "I'm all about the music"

Case 096: "Music rocks"

Case 139: "I don't have a fav. Band or song but i do like music"

Case 123: "i discover new things that i like everyday. i have never only liked one genre"

Others stated that they listen to "anything" or "almost anything":

Case 004: "anything except country"

Case 006: "i love music! i love almost every kind of it"

Case 013: "country, rap, and everything in between"

Case 018: "preddy [sic]much anything"

Case 036: "I listen to absolutely everything!!!!!"

Some were more specific. However, they still listed so many genres that they could not be clearly placed within multiple subcultures, let alone a single subculture. For example:

Case 070: "Punk; Alternative: Rock: Ska Punk: Blues: Acoustic"

Case 049: "Old school rap Hard rock-Alternative Oldies Jazz Techno golden age of hip hip"

Case 148: "I listen to mostly Metal and Industrial music, but my music collection includes just about every genre"

Case 059: "rock, pop (some), ROCK & ROLL, metal, death metal, emo, goth yeah pretty much everything except rap/hiphop/r&b/country"

Case 074: "rock (preferably) hardcore, (preferably) black, death, heavy metal, any usually anything else"

Case 009: "hip-hop, Salsa, Merengue, Alternative, worship, Gospel, and many more!!!"

Case 057: "hip hop, rock and any type of music except country"

A few of the authors commented directly on what they see as the pointlessness of describing musical tastes by genre:

Case 047: "I really try to listen to anything. Bias towards a style of music will never get you anywhere"

Case 076: "good siht! Idk... genre dont matter jus good shit"

Similar to the authors who railed against the idea of using a subcultural term to describe themselves, these authors argue against the use of genre as categorization. Notice that both of these authors are suggesting that the concept of genre is a limitation on musical enjoyment. Case 047 is literally stating this limitation by suggesting that it won't "get you anywhere," while case 076 seems to be suggesting that you will miss out on "good shit" if you limit yourself to specific genres.

These authors see music as a way to express their individuality; therefore, for them musical interests cannot be viewed as a subcultural artifact. However, while these individuals refuse to place themselves into a specific category, a nearly equal number of adolescents listed in their "Interests" musical acts that fall within a single genre. If the researcher is to use musical interests as a window to subcultural identity, which has limitations, these individuals seem to fall into specific subcultures. However, before the researcher is able to declare the existence of tight subcultures based on musical tastes, these cases should be examined more closely. When this is done, an interesting pattern emerges: Every individual in the sample who indicates a taste preference for a specific musical genre also includes at least one piece of evidence to the contrary. In other words, they mention an act or genre outside of the musical subculture they are indicating. For example, case 017 states "Country all the way!!!" in the beginning of her musical preference section, but then goes on to list a few top 20 pop songs in her playlist (a collection of music files the visitor can listen to while viewing her page) that do not fall within the country genre. Similarly, case 005 claims to be part of the "surfing" subculture and the music it

entails. However, later in his musical section, he describes having an interest in music that would fall under different genres. Once again, it is important to note that these findings are based on an examination of musical preferences, and this can be said to be only a very limited aspect of one's identity, subcultural or otherwise. It would have been useful to examine other interests. However, due to certain aspects of MySpace, this was not possible.

This pattern is also found when the "About Me" and "Interests" sections are examined in tandem. While some authors may appear, at first, to identify themselves as belonging to a single subculture, contradictions begin to appear when other sections of their webpages are examined. For example, case 011 states that she likes hard and classic rock. However, in her comments section, her friends refer to her as an "emo girl" while another calls her "my little emo". Similarly, at first glance, case 030 seems to fall solidly within the goth subculture: She refers to wanting to meet other gothic people and stars, she has a great deal of vampire paraphernalia displayed, and the background design of her webpage is a mosaic of drawn skulls. However, her "About Me" section stresses her normality; she does not mention her gothic tendencies at all. In addition, in her "Interests" section, her musical tastes include some varieties outside of her apparent subcultural identity (such as country, pop, and Irish music).

After analyzing the complete sample, not a single case of an individual with a single subcultural identity could be found. This is not to say that these individuals do not exist within middle-class adolescents in general (this is only a relatively small sample, so it may not be representative of the larger population). While looking at these youths' webpages, it appears that subcultural artifacts are still alive and well in youth culture. However, when these adolescents are asked to talk about themselves and their interests, very little subcultural terminology is used. In fact, these individuals appear to go out of their way to prove their individuality as compared to mainstream society as well as smaller subcultures. This may be due to the open-ended cues they are given when creating their profile. Apart

from an open text box and the title of the section (i.e. "About Me" or "Music" within the "Interests" section) the authors are given no other instructions. However, this finding still flies in the face of the Mertonian school of thought, which argues that the adolescent is either in line with mainstream values or derives his or her identity from membership in a subculture. In other words, there is very little room for individuality within the adolescent population. However, this finding appears to be somewhat in line with the post-subcultural authors who argue that modern youth, while still claiming membership within groups, do not see the totality of their identity coming from this membership. Instead, they see themselves as fully formed individuals with their group membership acting as an accessory to their unique identity.

In other words, it appears that the first three hypotheses have been partially confirmed. Specifically, when using musical preferences as an indicator, the individual adolescents in this sample do appear to fall into multiple subcultural identities while at the same time expressing their individuality. While examining the individual adolescent's "Interests" section, it was found that he or she could be placed into a particular subcultural grouping based on musical tastes. This confirms the first hypothesis (a large proportion of the sample will identify with at least one subculture). At the same time, however, the majority of adolescents contained at least one contradictory interest. This confirms the second hypothesis (a significant proportion of the sample will report identify with multiple subcultures at the same time). When the analysis moved to the "About Me" section, it was discovered that most adolescents in the sample used this section to express their individuality. This confirms the third hypothesis (while a significant proportion of the sample will report identify with a subculture, respondents will also be likely to express their individuality). Unfortunately, there were not enough data to test the fourth hypothesis qualitatively (subcultural identities will be more prominent in the life domains of schools and peers and less so in family life domain). Specifically, the authors did not spend time

discussing the various life domains (i.e. family, peers and school) or how their subcultural identity relates to these domains.

3.4.2 Hypotheses 7 and 8 – Publicizing Delinquency:

The next step was to begin analyzing the dependent variable—delinquency. Unfortunately, the findings regarding subcultural identity did not allow the researcher to address the fifth and sixth hypotheses (that the members of the various subcultures identified will express themselves using different forms of delinquency and that not all of the members of the various subcultures identified will express themselves using delinquency). Due to the small sample size, it was not possible to create groupings of adolescent subcultural identities that contained enough members to determine if there was any relationship between specific subcultural identities and specific forms of delinquency. Therefore, the analysis must move to the publication of delinquency and attempt to answer the seventh and eight hypotheses presented in the previous sections (that a significant proportion of the adolescents in this sample will publicize their delinquency, which will tend to take the form of relatively minor acts, such as underage drinking and shoplifting, via social networking sites and that because these minor forms of delinquency are accepted within the subculture, adolescents will speak of these acts in a positive light to other adolescents).

In analyzing the sample of MySpace pages, it became readily apparent that there were multiple ways in which delinquency could be publicized. Some adolescents chose to talk about their general delinquency preferences in their 'About Me' sections. For example, many reported that they drank alcohol, but did not refer to specific incidents, while others spoke about specific delinquent acts with their friends in their 'Comments' sections. Finally, there was often visual representation of delinquency. For example, several authors included personal pictures of themselves consuming what appeared to be alcoholic drinks.

When these various styles of publicity were aggregated, 41 adolescents (37.6%) in the sample reported participating in some form of delinquency. Alcohol use was the most prominent form of delinquency in this sample, with just over three-quarters of the delinquency subsample reporting alcohol use. Drug use, consisting almost entirely of marijuana use, was the next most common form of delinquency, with nearly a third of the delinquency subsample publicizing their use of drugs. There was not much in the way of other forms of delinquency being publicized. Of the 108 cases analyzed, two authors publicized physical fights and one reported stealing something. These findings confirm the seventh hypothesis, suggesting that a little over on third of the adolescents in this sample publicize their delinquency, which generally takes the form of relatively minor acts.

Once again, the majority of delinquent acts publicized on the authors' personal webpages consisted of drinking alcohol and using marijuana. When examining the manner in which these deviant behaviors were discussed, the most common tone can be seen as normalizing the behavior. Specifically, many authors described their actions in a tone that reduced the seriousness of their actions. This can be seen in the following examples:

Case 043: "hey .. yo porker ..hahah im so high... ahah .. yea but i was taking like mad hits ... Imfao [laughing-my-fucking-ass-off] im seeing spiders on my arms..they hurt..dude"

Case 049: "ma ass waz hidng in tha grapevines from tha cops lol [laugh-out-loud] cuz i was drinkin n we went thro tha whole damn field n i barely got home...ALL BUZZED N SHYT LOL [laugh-out-loud]"

Case 070: "when your dad let me smoke some of his shit after i had been drinking already, i was talking to the guy on the card hahaha i think you were passed out on your computer chair haha"

Case 136: "It's time to get drunk one of these nights and hook up with a guy...lol [laugh-out-loud] We both need it :]"

In the above examples, the authors used common internet abbreviations (i.e. lol and lmfao) to signify that the behavior they are speaking of is humorous. Other authors focused more on the actual *effects* of being intoxicated:

Case 005: ".so how was that double kegger...we were going 2 go but the party i went 2 yesterday was beastly and everyone was so fucked up it was THE SHIT!.... i wanted 2 go and meet up with u but like it was 3 when we all decided that we were 2 fucked up 2 keep playing beer pong and filp cup lol so i just went home a crashed."

Case 013: "we were all fucked up"; "im so effin hi!!!"; "I got fuckin wasted the other day"

Case 023: "ohh man i had half a bottle of vanilla rum shot of whiskey and a shot of patrone i turn my head and everything keeps spinnin"

Case 036: "no my heads in the clouds like the rest of tha lil potheads(i.e. you):)"

Case 152: "then you failed the drunk test horribly. i'm suprised you didnt throw up all over them"

These two forms of publicity seem to suggest a focus on the fun and exciting side of substance use. In fact, a few of the authors spoke directly of this side of delinquency. Case 005 represents an excellent example of this. In three of his comments, he spoke of the fun of drinking alcohol: "man it was fucking fun i got super shit faced"; "it was fucking fun...i was super messed up...." and "its gonna be a shit ton of fun man, total drunkness and music!!" In all three comments, he referred explicitly to the fun of getting intoxicated. Similarly, several authors spoke of future plans to drink alcohol. In these cases, the excitement and fun of the activity were stressed:

Case 005: "yo nigga, come out and play some beer pong this weekend"

Case 023: dude when im down there we will hit up some yegger-bombs. will be sick."

Case 049: "5 kegger 0n caldwell ni99a...lezz go0>>>>>"

Case 070: "we dont have to get plastered n shit, just some brewskies, kick back and talk it up!"

Case 132: "duuuude we should have another sesh in your car n get beeehked"

Case 152: "You sound like a fun drunk, I'm going to get you shitfaced someday and have a wonderful time"

Although, the majority of those who publicize their delinquency spoke of its non-serious nature and fun, as these examples illustrate, some authors did speak of negative consequences. This was done, in most cases, by referring to the hangover that follows over-indulgence:

Case 150: "it's 7:25pm, i just woke up, i'm hungover and feel like cocks"

Case 036: "Slightly hung over"

Two authors even discussed more serious effects. For example, Case 043 briefly discussed her struggle with changing her behavior. "im trying my fucking best to change back and stop stealing and drinking and being a bitch and abusivness..." In a more ominous tone, Case 152 reported that he had to "go to drug counciling."

As mentioned above, more serious forms of delinquency were rarely reported. Only three serious acts were discussed in detail in the 'Comments' section. Interestingly, these forms of delinquency were spoken of in much the same tone as alcohol and marijuana use. For example, two cases discussed assault:

Case 008: "Haha last week was interesting. Haha will got tripped and his mom got us, me ian and Elizabeth, a week of lunch resses detention, two other detenions, wait wait!! Then she files a police report on us for assault. Pointless!!!!"

Case 049: "I beat the fuck out of some kid named [...] i'm shure that little fucker regreats ever meating me so now i'm suspended for two days starting tomarow"

Notice in the first example that the author used "Haha" in describing the events that led to his interaction with the police. Similarly, Case 049 did discuss the consequences of his offense—but, at the same time, he focused on the impact it would have on the victim's opinion of him.

These findings lead to a partial confirmation of the eighth hypothesis, which suggested that the authors would speak of their delinquent acts in a positive light. Many of the authos spoke of the fun and excitement of the actions, and this can be seen as a form of publicizing their delinquency in a positive light or, in other words, bragging. Another group of authors underplayed the seriousness of the behavior. This seems to be more along the lines of trying to normalize their behavior rather than bragging about it. Finally, six of the authors spoke of the negative consequences of their delinquency. However, two of these authors also included at least one other post that either spoke of the fun or normalcy of this behavior.

4 Quantitative Methods, Analysis and Findings:

4.1 Quantitative Sample

For the quantitative analysis, a data set gathered by Dr. Simon I. Singer and Dr. Murray Levine from the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1990 consisting of students in public and private high schools in Amherst, New York—a large suburb of Buffalo – was examined. Amherst was used as the site of study, as the town asked the original researchers to conduct an evaluation of the use of various youth programs. Like other large suburban areas, the population density of Amherst is relatively low compared to most urban centers. Amherst is also highly homogenous, with 93% of the town's population classified as white. Only 18% of the town's population, in terms of heads of household, is classified as single parents. The assessed value of housing is twice that of the city of Buffalo, and 23% more than the median home value for the United States. These demographic characteristics paint a clear picture of a middle-class community.

The adolescents in public and private schools formed two separate, stratified samples. Specifically, the rosters of the various high schools in Amherst were used to create a sampling frame from which 1,000 students were selected using simple random sampling. Letters were sent requesting parental permission from these students. In the ends, 561 public school adolescents actually took the survey. The researchers also surveyed 144 students from the private school sample. Both public and private school adolescents were surveyed in groups of about thirty students. The questionnaire was read aloud while respondents followed along and filled in their own surveys. Of the 705 surveys collected 638 included enough data for examination.

Based on the demographic characteristics of the adolescent population obtained from school districts and Census Bureau data, the survey sample appears to be representative of Amherst's high school population. That being said, the private school population is slightly overrepresented. Private school adolescents make up 16% of the population but 18% of the

sample. The grade and age distributions are within 2% of the distributions in the high school population. The percent of boys and girls in the survey are within 1% of the population. The total combined sample of public and private school students (N = 638) represents 12% of adolescents in senior high schools in Amherst, NY—a high percentage for surveys of this kind. Therefore, it can be stated with confidence that this sample is representative of the total public and private high school population of Amherst, New York.

4.2 Quantitative Measures

Three major groupings of measures were used in the analysis: subcultural identities, deviance, and life domains. In order to determine the various forms of subcultural identity in the quantitative sample, participant-selected self-identifications were used. In response to "How well does each type fit you?", respondents were given 16 categories on which to rank themselves: jock, loser, brain, prep or preppie, drug head/burn out, hood, average, air-head, nerd, snob, in-crowd person, individual, punk, rebel, headbanger, and intellectual. This list of identities may not be exhaustive, but it is extensive and therefore allowed the researcher to determine if there were differences between each of these categories. In addition, the possibility of collapsing these identities into a smaller number of major adolescent identifications was examined. This was accomplished through exploratory factor analysis. In addition, certain non-subcultural categories were available, such as average and individual. Therefore, respondents were not forced into subcultural groups, which supports the assumption that any identification with these labels is genuine. The next measure in the survey asked respondents to categorize their friends within these same identifications. Based on the assumption that those most clearly belonging to a subcultural group would identify themselves as well as their friends using similar identity groupings, these measures were added together to create a single measure of group identity.

In actuality, this variable is a measure of the popularity each of these categories, not a measure of subcultural identity. In order to create this measure, the researcher returned

to the survey items that asked respondents "how well does each type fit you" and "how well does each type fit your best friend." The following ordinal response categories were provided as possible answer choices: "Very Well" = 4, "Somewhat" = 3, "A Little" = 2, "Not at All" = 1, and "Never Heard of This Group" = 0. While it could be argued that "Never Heard of This Group" cannot be seen as less than "Not at All", it was felt that this demonstrated a clear null category and therefore was left in the analysis. These two measures were added, making their interpretation a bit muddled. For example, someone with a score of 8 responded "Very Well" for both him/herself and his/her friend. Similarly, an individual who scores a 7 responded with a "Very Well" for at least one of the questions. However, what about those who scored a 4? There are four different possibilities, two of which would include one response of "Not at All"—and it would be unadvisable to place this individual within that particular subculture. Therefore, anyone who scored a 5 or higher on the subcultural identity scale was considered as belonging to said group, making the assumption that someone who scored a 5 identified him/herself or his/her friend as identifying with the group at least "somewhat". Based on the review of the literature, the post-subcultural perspective (i.e. Muggleton, 2000) does not require an absolute or even strong commitment to the group; instead, the level of commitment for subcultural membership waxes and wanes within and between individuals. Therefore, someone with even a passing identification with the group could be considered as deriving at least some of his or her identity from membership in the group.

In the Amherst data, delinquency is measured through 19 survey items pertaining to traditional adolescent deviance and delinquency. Specifically, respondents were asked to identify how many times they had committed the following actions in their lifetime:

- Been drunk or very high on alcohol
- Went to house parties where alcoholic beverages were present
- Sniffed glue, nail polish remover, etc.
- Not counting fights with brothers or sisters, beaten up someone on purpose
- Sold chemicals, cocaine or heroin
- Stolen things worth less than \$5 (by shoplifting or other means)
- Stolen things worth between \$5 and \$50 (by shoplifting or other means)
- Stolen things worth over \$50 (by shoplifting or other means)
- Taken a family member's car for a ride without permission
- Taken a car belonging to someone you didn't know for a ride without the owner's permission
- Banged up something that didn't belong to you on purpose
- Used a bank or credit card (including your parent's) without the owner's permission
- Engaged in sexual intercourse
- Taken things from someone's car (tape deck, etc.) without the owner's permission
- Taken things from work without paying for them
- Vandalized school property
- Hit someone with something other than your fist, not in self-defense
- Been in a fight with a group of friends
- Stolen something with a group of friends

Many of these items are addressing similar behaviors. In addition, several of the behaviors had very low rates of occurrence in this sample. Therefore, in order to reduce the amount of data being analyzed, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine if any patterns of action were present. Specifically, the 19 measures of deviance were analyzed using principle component analysis with varimax rotation. Using an Eigenvalue of 1 as the cutoff point, the first analysis yielded five factors. The factors were confirmed by examining the scree plot as well as checking the significance of the factors through maximum likelihood analysis ($\chi^2 = 110.150$; df = 86, sig. = .041). The fifth factor included "Sniffed glue, nail polish remover, etc." and "Taken a family member's car for a ride without permission". The odd pairing of these two measures and the fact that they did not load very strongly on any of the remaining factors seem to indicate that these two delinquency measures are not very reliable. Therefore, they were dropped and the factor analysis was

conducted again. Once again, the factors were confirmed by examining the scree plot as well as checking the significance of the factors through maximum likelihood analysis (χ^2 = 109.073; df = 74, sig. = .005). The results (shown in Table 4.1) indicated three clear clusters that can be categorized as "stealing", "expressive delinquency" and "partying". The fourth category, consisting of "Sold chemicals, cocaine or heroin", "Taken a car belonging to someone you didn't know for a ride without the owner's permission" and "Used a bank or credit card (including your parent's) without the owner's permission", is more difficult to categorize, particularly because the frequency of each behavior was very low in the sample, suggesting that any findings would be unreliable. Therefore, it was decided to drop these measures from the analysis.

Table 4.1 - Factor Analysis of Deviance Measures*

| Table 4.1 – Factor Analysis of Deviance Measures* | | | | | |
|---|-----------|------|------|------|--|
| | Component | | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| Stolen Between \$5 and | .791 | | | | |
| \$50 | | | | | |
| Stolen Under \$5 | .733 | | | | |
| Stolen More than \$50 | .682 | | | | |
| Stolen with a Group | .599 | | | | |
| Stolen Things from a Car | .518 | | | | |
| Taken Things from Work | .329 | | | | |
| Ever Been Drunk | | .823 | | | |
| Partied with Alcohol | | .818 | | | |
| Sexual Intercourse | | .693 | | | |
| Hit Someone | | | .726 | | |
| Beaten Someone | | | .699 | | |
| Banged Something | | | .599 | | |
| Group Fight | | | .571 | | |
| Vandalized School | | | .384 | | |
| Sold Cocaine | | | | .713 | |
| Taken Stranger's Car | | | | .606 | |
| Used Another's Bank Card | | | | 358 | |

^{*} Only factor loadings with an absolute value greater than .300 are shown

Since each form of delinquency was measured at the interval level, an attempt was made to create delinquency scales using exploratory factor analysis for guidance.

Specifically, three scales were created: "Partying", "Stealing", and "Expressive

Delinquency". The alpha for the "partying" measure was almost acceptable at .689 (see

George and Mallery, 2003). However, the alphas for "stealing" and "expressive delinquency" were relatively weak (.607 and .569, respectively). In order to improve the strength of these measures, these two scales were combined to form a single "Delinquency" measure.

This increased the strength of the alpha to .679, which is almost within the acceptable range. Therefore, the end result was a creation of two scales: "Partying" and "Delinquency" which are similar to Hagan's (1991) conceptualizations.

Finally, two additional measures of deviance were created using the Amherst data. First, the survey includes questions on more serious forms of substance abuse, including: "During the past year, about how often, if ever, have you used cocaine or crack?"; "During the past year, about how often, if ever, have you taken amphetamines on your own—that is, without a doctor telling you to take them?"; and "During the past year, about how often, if ever, have you taken steroids?". These three measures were combined, and the resulting scale of "Substance Use" has an alpha that was close to acceptable (.640).

Second, the survey included measures of emotional deviance, such as running away and suicide ideation:

- Have you ever thought about leaving home?
- How much worse would things have to get before you would want to leave home?
- Have you tried to leave home within the last year?
- How much worse would things have to get before you would wish you were dead?
- Have you ever thought about taking your life?

Hagan (1988) refers to these acts as 'role-exit' behavior. These measures loaded on a single factor and had a relatively strong alpha (.723) when combined to create a single scale

measuring this unique form of adolescent deviance. In total, then, four forms of deviance—partying, delinquency, substance use, and emotional deviance—were created.

Finally, the Amherst data contains several measures that examine the adolescent's experiences within several life domains. Specifically, the variable can be seen as falling within the individual life domains of Family, Peers, and Schools. The Amherst data includes 22 questions dealing with the adolescent's family life (see Table 4.2 for a description of each measure).

Table 4.2: Measures within the Family Domain

| Description of Measure | Level of Measurement | Range | Mean | SD |
|---|-------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| If you had a major personal problem would you discuss it with your mother? | Ordinal | 1-4 | 2.53 | .885 |
| If you had a major personal problem would you discuss it with your father? | Ordinal | 1-4 | 3.04 | .808 |
| Do you talk with your mother about your thoughts and feelings? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.26 | 1.218 |
| Do you talk with your father about your thoughts and feelings? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.86 | 1.102 |
| Would you like to be the kind of person your mother is? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.15 | 1.203 |
| Would you like to be the kind of person your father is? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.11 | 1.311 |
| If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with your mother? | Nominal | 0-1 | .56 | .497 |
| If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with your father? | Nominal | 0-1 | .27 | .442 |

Table 4.2 Continued: Measures within the Family Domain

| If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with your mother? | Nominal | 0-1 | .61 | .488 |
|---|---------|-----|------|-------|
| If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with your father? | Nominal | 0-1 | .46 | .499 |
| How often do you and your family have fun together? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.25 | .968 |
| During the average week, how often do you and your family have dinner together? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.72 | 1.192 |
| How much do you contribute to family decisions? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.46 | .889 |
| How do you and your parent(s) decide how late you can stay out at night? | Nominal | 0-1 | .50 | .50 |
| Does your mother trust you? | Ordinal | 1-4 | 1.83 | .697 |
| Does your father trust you? | Ordinal | 1-4 | 1.85 | .728 |
| How often do your parents nag you? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.68 | 1.022 |
| How often do your parents take away your privileges? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 2.28 | .987 |
| Does your mother know where you are when you are not at home? | Ordinal | 1-4 | 2.00 | .652 |
| Does your father know where you are when you are not at home? | Ordinal | 1-4 | 2.50 | .753 |
| Does your mother know who you are with when you are not at home? | Ordinal | 1-4 | 2.07 | .705 |
| Does your father know who you are with when you are not at home? | Ordinal | 1-4 | 2.48 | .767 |

The Amherst data includes 10 questions dealing with the adolescent's peer relationships (see Table 4.3 for a description of each of these measures).

Table 4.3: Measures within the Peer Domain

| Description of Measures | Level of Measurement | Range | Mean | SD |
|--|-------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| I can tell my best friend anything. | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.18 | .864 |
| If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a friend? | Nominal | 0-1 | .93 | .256 |
| If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a friend? | Nominal | 0-1 | .94 | .243 |
| When I'm having trouble I can rely on my best friend. | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.18 | .907 |
| Would you like to be the kind of person your best friend is? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 2.48 | .780 |
| What do your parents think of most of your friends? | Ordinal | 1-6 | 4.14 | .791 |
| Are your friends at school active in extracurricular school activities? (eg. sports, clubs, etc.) | Ordinal | 1-5 | 2.75 | 1.041 |
| My friends rarely get into trouble. | Ordinal | 1-5 | 2.53 | 1.050 |
| How many of your best friends have ever been picked up by the police? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 1.82 | 1.029 |
| How often do you see your best friend? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 4.49 | 1.058 |

The Amherst data includes 10 questions about the adolescent's experience within the school domain (see Table 4.4 for a description of each of these measures).

Table 4.4: Measures within the School Domain

| Description of Measures | Level of Measurement | Range | Mean | SD |
|--|-------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| Compared to other students In your school, how do you rate yourself in the school work you could do if you tried your hardest? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.08 | .839 |
| In school do you try your hardest? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.51 | .917 |
| If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? | Nominal | 0-1 | .24 | .427 |
| If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? | Nominal | 0-1 | .33 | .469 |
| How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? | Ordinal | 1-4 | 1.30 | .619 |
| My overall average in school is at least | Ordinal | 1-5 | 4.02 | .854 |
| How often do you have trouble with your teachers? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 2.23 | .860 |
| How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.74 | 1.077 |
| On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | Interval | 1-10 | 1.88 | 1.56 |
| How often do you find that you don't like school? | Ordinal | 1-5 | 3.32 | .929 |

4.3 Quantitative Plan of Analysis

The quantitative analysis generally followed the same plan of analysis that was used to examine the qualitative data. First, the independent variable (subcultural identity) was analyzed by using the Amherst data to create groupings of adolescent subcultures. This made it possible to identify the common subcultural identities within this sample. This analysis addresses the first three hypotheses set forth in Chapter 2. Specifically, that a large proportion of the sample will identify with at least one subculture; that a significant proportion of the sample will identify with multiple subcultures at the same time; and finally, that while a significant proportion of the sample will report belonging to a subculture, respondents will also be likely to express their individuality. Next, the analysis focused on the major dependent variable, deviance. Specifically, a bivariate analysis of subcultural identity and deviance was conducted, allowing the researcher to determine, as hypotheses 5 and 6 argued, whether different subcultures express themselves with specific forms of deviance.

Finally, in order to examine the possible existence of drift within these subcultural identities, SEM models for each major identity were compared to see if the relationship between individual life domains and delinquency vary based on subcultural identity.

Structural equation modeling (SEM) is a powerful tool for analyzing quantitative data. SEM can be applied in several different ways in order to test a hypothesis. For the purposes of the current research, latent variable analysis was used. One strength of this method is it allows researchers to examine the differences between multiple causal models that have been split up by various groups (e.g. gender, socioeconomic status, subcultural identity, etc.). This method also gets at the core of SEM and its emphasis on theory. In particular, a model must be constructed with a specific theory in mind. However, this is also SEM's greatest weakness, as all results rest on the assumption that the model and the theory upon which it is based are true. If, in fact, the model does not reflect what actually occurs in

the real world, then the findings will be erroneous—even if those findings are statistically significant. Therefore, it is tremendously important that the theory upon which the current research is based is valid. In the context of the current research, the researcher applied SEM to the hypothesis that subcultural identities will be more prominent in the life domains of schools and peers and less so in the family life domain.

The form of latent variable analysis utilized in the current research is similar to basic path analysis. Both forms of analysis assume that the models being examined are non-recursive, in that they have a unidirectional causal flow. There are some specific advantages to using latent variable analysis specifically, and SEM programs in general (in this case, AMOS). First, in a literal sense, they allow the researcher to visualize the relationships among the variables. Through the construction of models, researchers are able to see how the various independent (exogenous) variables are expected to interact with one another and with the dependent (endogenous) variables. Second, they allow the researcher to combine factor analysis and regression analysis in a single model, as factors created in the first step of this analysis are employed as variables in subsequent regression analyses. In the present context, the observed variables (taken from the Amherst survey) were used to construct latent variables (the factors), which were then analyzed to determine the underlying relationships between various life domains and delinquency within each subcultural identity category.

The next step was to develop the SEM model. This model was created using confirmatory factor analysis, which allows researchers to quantify unmeasured variables and include them in their models as variables. Specifically, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) is employed as a technique "in which the items defining each factor and the relationship among factors are specified a priori rather than letting the factor analytic methods define factors" (Maruyama, 1998, p. 131). By comparing the goodness of fit for various possible

factor arrangements, researchers can determine the most appropriate formation for their data.

While CFA is very popular among researchers, this method is not without its critiques. One of the major challenges in using factor analysis is to avoid what Cliff (1983) calls the "nominalistic fallacy"—assuming, without evidence, that what the researcher names a factor is indeed what that factor represents. Maruyama (1998) suggests that researchers should examine as much information that provides construct validity as possible. This is solid advice that was heeded in the current research as often as it was feasible. However, because much of the current research is wholly original, it was not possible to apply construct validity for each factor. Therefore, the only guard against this fallacy is face validity (i.e., whether a theoretical construct simply appears to be true), and in truth, this is not much of a guard. Therefore, special heed was taken in the current research to be keenly aware of this fallacy and not to take factor names as the end-all-beall within the model.

Another important issue that must be addressed before moving on with the analysis concerns the overall fit of the model. In general, model fit refers to how well the model created by the researcher fits the data. There are two important issues related to goodness-of-fit that affect the findings of the current study. First, just because a model adequately fits the data, this does not necessarily mean that the hypothesis is confirmed. Rather, it simply means that the researcher can move on to attempting to interpret the findings. Second, and more concerning, there is no agreed-upon statistic that determines the overall fit of the model. Therefore, for the current research, several statistics will be considered. Specifically, Kline (2011) suggests including the following indicators of fit:

- 1. Chi-square (χ^2) . Because this statistic is greatly affected by changes in sample size, it will only be reported as a starting point.
- 2. Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). This is considered a "badness-of-fit" index, which means that the closer the score is to zero, the better the fit of the model. Browne and Cudeck (1993) suggest that a model with a RMSEA that exceeds .100 may indicate a serious problem with fit. However, RMSEA is very sensitive to the use of smaller samples sizes, as is the case with the current research.
- 3. Adjusted Goodness-of-Fit Index (AGFI). The range of this index is generally 0.0-1.0 where 1.0 indicates a perfect fit. This measure is generally considered less sensitive to sample size than RMSEA (Breivik and Olsson, 2001).
- 4. The Bentler Comparative Fit Index (CFI). This is similar to the AGFI in that it typically has a range of 0.0-1.0 with a score of 1.0 indicating an excellent fit. For both the CFI and the AGFI, it is generally agreed that a model with a score greater than .95 is considered an adequate fit with the data. However, once again, this is just a general rule and there is no agreed-upon critical score. Finally, although both of these measures are less sensitive to sample size than RMSEA, they are not completely impervious to these effects.

It has also been suggested (Kline, 2011) that Hoelter's "Critical N" (Hoelter, 1983) be presented when discussing the adequate fit of an SEM model. However, in general, this measure is only appropriate when dealing with sample sizes larger than 200 (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Three of the four subcultures being examined in the current analysis do not exceed this cutoff value. Therefore, the "Critical N" will not be reported. Finally, as already discussed, there are no solid cutoffs for any of the measures discussed above and that abnormally low sample sizes can wreak havoc on the adequacy of these indices. Therefore, although, these measures are reported, they will not be used to eliminate any of the models reported.

4.4 Quantitative Analysis and Findings

4.4.1 Hypotheses 1 through 3 – Subcultural Identities

Similar to the analysis of the qualitative data, the first step of the quantitative analysis was to focus on the independent variable of subcultural identity. Specifically, the researcher tested the first three hypotheses. The first step in the quantitative analysis of subcultural identity in middle-class adolescents was to analyze the prevalence of each of the 16 different identities. Scores ranged from 0 to 8, with a higher score indicating greater identification with the label. Two patterns emerge when comparing the means of these measures (see Table 4.5). First, the two most popular identifications were the null categories—students were more likely to identify themselves as "average" or an "individual" than any of the other 14 categories. The second pattern was revealed when the other end of the spectrum—the least popular categorizations—was examined. Those categories that are generally negatively perceived by society were, not surprisingly, the least common categories. For example, *loser*, *burnout*, and *punk* all had means of about 2.30. Finally, the middle categories seem to consist of labels that are less likely to have a specific connotation (e.g., *brain*, *prep*, and *snob*).

Table 4.5: Measure of Subcultural Identity Descriptive Statistics (N = 638)

| | Range | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------|-------|------|----------------|
| Jock | 0-8 | 4.34 | 2.01 |
| Loser | 0-8 | 2.30 | 0.96 |
| Brain | 0-8 | 4.21 | 1.68 |
| Prep | 0-8 | 4.40 | 1.81 |
| Burnout | 0-8 | 2.30 | 1.08 |
| Hood | 0-8 | 1.90 | 1.25 |
| Airhead | 0-8 | 2.84 | 1.36 |
| Nerd | 0-8 | 2.34 | 0.92 |
| Snob | 0-8 | 2.95 | 1.41 |
| Punk | 0-8 | 2.31 | 1.03 |
| Rebel | 0-8 | 2.95 | 1.51 |
| Headbanger | 0-8 | 2.47 | 1.38 |
| Intellectual | 0-8 | 4.54 | 1.90 |
| In-Crowd | 0-8 | 4.91 | 1.87 |
| Individual | 0-8 | 5.63 | 1.74 |
| Average | 0-8 | 4.95 | 1.92 |

In actuality, this variable is a measure of the popularity of each of these categories, not a measure of subcultural identity. Therefore, it was necessary to examine the nominal measures of subcultural identity (Table 4.6).

Table 4.6: Nominal Measure of Subcultural Identity Descriptive Statistics (N=638)

| Subcultural Identity | Р |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Jock | .45 |
| Loser | .03 |
| Brain | .45 |
| Prep | .47 |
| Burnout | .06 |
| Hood | .04 |
| Average | .60 |
| Airhead | .11 |
| Nerd | .05 |
| Snob | .14 |
| Punk | .04 |
| Rebel | .17 |
| Headbanger | .09 |
| Intellectual | .51 |
| In-Crowd | .60 |
| Individual | .74 |

The pattern of identification observed from the nominal measures provided evidence for the post-subcultural tenet that either there is no normative system or, if there is, it does not prevent the individual from belonging to one (or more) subcultures. In this sample, over half of the respondents (60%) reported that they identify with the term "average". This is perhaps the strongest indication of the existence of a larger normative order, since it begs the question, "In comparison to who or what?" Similarly, nearly three quarters of the

respondents (74%) identified themselves as being an *individual*. This, by definition, indicates that a person does not acquire his/her identity solely from a group. However, of these 475 respondents, only 18 (3.8%) did not report identifying with any other group. In support of the first and third hypotheses, this indicates that while respondents typically see themselves as individuals, they also obtain at least some of their identity from a group. Finally, the number of subcultural identities to which respondents belong is considered (Table 4.7). Two interesting patterns emerge. First, only 5% of respondents did not indicate belonging to a subculture (i.e., they either scored a 4 or lower on all 14 measures, or identified with one or both of the null categories). Second, 79.2% of respondents reported belonging to multiple subcultures. In fact, the average respondent indicated belonging to just over 3 groups (not including the null categories of average or individual). This clearly supports the second hypothesis—that a significant proportion of the sample will identify with multiple subcultures at the same time.

Table 4.7: Number of Subcultural Identities

| # | Frequency | Percent |
|-------|-----------|---------|
| 0 | 7 | 1.1 |
| 1 | 27 | 4.2 |
| 2 | 60 | 9.4 |
| 3 | 98 | 15.4 |
| 4 | 131 | 20.5 |
| 5 | 111 | 17.4 |
| 6 | 119 | 18.7 |
| 7 | 54 | 8.5 |
| 8 | 18 | 2.8 |
| 9 | 9 | 1.4 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 |
| 11 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 2 | 0.3 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 2 | 0.3 |
| Total | 638 | 100.0 |

It is possible that these categories are too specific—that they may have been arbitrarily dividing respondents into groups that have no real boundaries. Therefore, it was important to examine how these groups related to one another. This was accomplished by conducting an exploratory factor analysis of subcultural identities. Specifically, the 14 interval measures of subcultural identities were analyzed using principle component analysis. The measures of *individual* and *average* were not included, as they are the null categories. In addition, for the ease of interpretation, varimax rotation was implemented.

Using an Eigenvalue of 1 as the cutoff point, four factors emerged (see Table 4.8). The factors were confirmed by examining the scree plot as well as checking the significance of the factors through maximum likelihood analysis ($\chi^2 = 182.515$; df = 41, sig. = .000).

The first factor, which consisted of the identities burnout, punk, headbanger, rebel and hood, was labeled as Out-Crowd because all of these labels tend to indicate a perspective outside the normative order, in that they can be seen as rebelling against what they perceive as the status quo. The second factor consisted of prep, snob, in-crowd, jock and airhead. The label In-Crowd was applied to this factor because of the positive social status associated with each identiy. The third factor consisted of intellectual and brain, and was labeled as Intellectual, as both terms are positive names for those who do well in school and/or perceive themselves as having an above-average intellect. The fourth factor is made up of loser and nerd and was labeled as Negative, as both terms generally have negative connotations, though perhaps for differing reasons.

Table 4.8: Factor Loadings for Subcultural Identity*

| | Out-Crowd In-Crowd | Intellectual | Negative |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------|----------|
| Burnout | .745 | | |
| Punk | .740 | | |
| Headbanger | .725 | | |
| Rebel | .690 | | |
| Hood | .663 | | |
| Prep | .735 | | |
| Snob | .698 | | |
| In-Crowd | .639 | | 407 |
| Intellectual | | .829 | |
| Brain | | .666 | .362 |
| Loser | | | .791 |
| Nerd | | | .784 |
| Jock | .432 | | |
| Airhead | .492 | | |

^{*} Only factor loadings with an absolute value greater than .300 are shown

These factor loadings were used to create nominal measures of subcultural identity using the labels mentioned above (Table 4.9). When examining the new nominal measures further, there were some similarities to the disaggregated measures shown in Table 4.6. First, the more socially accepted identities were more popular than the less accepted identities (e.g., 83% of individuals reported identifying with the *In-Crowd* while only 25% reported identifying with the *Out-Crowd*). Also, and perhaps most interestingly, the pattern of identifying with multiple groups and to an overall normative order was still found. In other words, even when the broader subcultural categories were used, respondents were still found to identify themselves as belonging to more than one group. Therefore, whether disaggregated or aggregated measures of subcultural identity are used, the first three hypotheses are confirmed. Specifically, adolescents within the quantitative sample report identifying with several subcultures while at the same time stressing their individuality.

Table 4.9 Subcultural Identity Nominal Measures Descriptive Statistics (N = 638)

| | Р | Α |
|--------------|-----|------|
| Out-Crowd | .25 | .679 |
| In-Crowd | .83 | .434 |
| Intellectual | .60 | .675 |
| Negative | .06 | .581 |
| Individual | .74 | - |
| Average | .60 | - |

4.4.2 Hypotheses 5 and 6 – The Role of Delinquency in Adolescent Subcultures

The next step is to test the fifth and sixth hypotheses by examining the relationship between subcultural identity and deviance. First the researcher examined the correlations among the four forms of deviance and the 14 unique subcultural identities provided in the Amherst survey (see Table 4.10). When examining these correlations, several interesting

findings emerged. First, there were four subcultural identities that showed a significant positive correlation between identity and all four measures of deviance. Specifically, those who were more likely to identify themselves as a *burnout*, *hood*, *punk*, or *rebel* were more likely to commit delinquent acts, party, use illegal substances, and have at least considered engaging in emotional deviance. Second, only one subcultural identity was associated with a *reduced* likelihood of committing all four forms of deviance. Specifically, those who were more likely to identify themselves as a *brain* were less likely to commit delinquent acts, party, use illegal substances, and consider emotional deviance. Third, one subcultural identity—being a *snob*—was not correlated with any of the four forms of deviance being measured. This is the only subcultural category with no deviant associations.

Finally, the remaining seven identities had different relationships with deviance. What is important to note is that these seven identities each had their own unique association with the four measures deviance. In other words, of these seven identities, no two showed the same pattern in how they relate to deviance. Additional patterns were found when these seven subcultural identities were examined more closely. First, delinquency had a positive association with subcultural identities that tend to be viewed negatively, such as *loser*, *burnout*, *hood*, *punk*, *rebel*, and *headbanger*. However, it was also positively related to the identity of *jock*. Of the seven identities, only *brain* was negatively related to delinquency. Second, partying was positively associated both with positively viewed subcultural identities, such as *jock*, *prep*, and *in-crowd* and generally negatively viewed identities, such as *burnout*, *hood*, *punk* and *rebel*. Meanwhile, this form of deviance was negatively related to the *loser*, *brain*, and *nerd* categories. Substance use was positively associated with the *burnout*, *hood*, *punk*, *rebel* and *headbanger* subcultural identities and negatively associated with the *brain*, *prep*, *nerd* and *intellectual* identities.

Table 4.10 – Correlations between Subcultural Identities and Deviance Measures*

| Subcultural Identity | Delinquency | Partying | Substance Use | Emotional Deviance |
|----------------------|-------------|----------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Jock | .137 | .195 | 001 | 103 |
| Loser | .082 | 158 | 008 | .098 |
| Brain | 124 | 136 | 119 | 164 |
| Prep | 036 | .091 | 106 | 098 |
| Burnout | .311 | .221 | .343 | .170 |
| Hood | .197 | .113 | .127 | .118 |
| Average | .005 | 083 | .050 | .086 |
| Airhead | 044 | .022 | 007 | .103 |
| Nerd | .020 | 157 | 127 | 025 |
| Snob | 010 | .062 | .070 | 025 |
| In-Crowd | .073 | .210 | 003 | 046 |
| Individual | 045 | .043 | 019 | .004 |
| Punk | .214 | .128 | .183 | .147 |
| Rebel | .217 | .121 | .212 | .211 |
| Headbanger | .176 | .046 | .088 | .149 |
| Intellectual | 043 | 061 | 092 | 074 |

^{*}Shading indicates a statistically significant correlation at the .05 level

headbanger, and airhead subcultural identities and less common among the jock, prep, and brain identities.

Before moving on, it is interesting to note the relationships between the null categories (i.e., average and individual) and the four measures of deviance, particularly because these two categories did not behave similarly. While the individual category was not significantly related to any of the measures of deviance, the average category was negatively associated with partying and positively associated with emotional deviance. This suggests that while these two groups may represent identities that are not affiliated with subcultures, they are not measuring the same thing.

Finally, in order to further explore whether subcultural identity is related to specific forms of deviance, a series of analyses were performed utilizing the aggregate measures of subcultural identity— Out-Crowd, In-Crowd, Intellectual, and Negative. More specifically, a series of independent-sample t-tests were conducted to compare members of these broad subcultural categories to non-members (Table 4.11).

The results were similar to those discussed above for the disaggregated measures of subcultural identity in that each of the four broad subcultural groups had its own unique relationship with deviance. For instance, members of the *Out-Crowd* subculture committed more acts of delinquency, partying, substance use, and emotional deviance than non-members. Members of the *In-Crowd* subculture committed more acts of partying and fewer acts of emotional deviance than non-members. Members of the *Intellectual* subculture committed fewer acts of emotional deviance than non-members. Finally, members of the *Negative* subculture committed fewer acts of partying than non-members.

Table 4.11 – T-Tests of Subcultural Identity and Deviance Measures

| | | Deling | uency | | | Part | ying | |
|--------------|------------|--------|--------|--------|------------|---------|--------|---------|
| Subcultures | Non-Member | | Member | | Non-Member | | Member | |
| | Mea | n (SD) | Mea | n (SD) | Mea | n (SD) | Mea | n (SD) |
| Out-Crowd | 2.43 | (2.69) | 4.08 | (3.51) | 11.36 | (12.51) | 16.10 | (14.24) |
| In-Crowd | 2.94 | (3.37) | 2.82 | (2.92) | 8.96 | (11.70) | 13.24 | (13.26) |
| Intellectual | 3.02 | (3.00) | 2.72 | (2.99) | 13.39 | (12.77) | 11.95 | (13.31) |
| Negative | 2.81 | (2.97) | 3.20 | (3.41) | 12.87 | (13.10) | 7.40 | (12.31) |
| Average | 2.83 | (3.24 | 2.84 | (2.82) | 13.88 | (14.42) | 11.62 | (12.08) |
| Individual | 3.17 | (3.10) | 2.72 | (2.96) | 12.40 | (13.28) | 12.57 | (13.06) |

| | | Substance Use | | | | Emot | tional | |
|--------------|------------|---------------|-------------------|--------|------------|--------|-----------|--------|
| Subcultures | Non-Member | | Non-Member Member | | Non-Member | | Member | |
| | Mean (SD) | | Mear | (SD) | Mear | n (SD) | Mean (SD) | |
| Out-Crowd | .44 | (1.41) | 1.49 | (2.37) | 4.37 | (3.57) | 6.29 | (4.75) |
| In-Crowd | .62 | (1.33) | .71 | (1.82) | 5.64 | (4.29) | 4.69 | (3.89) |
| Intellectual | .79 | (1.68) | .63 | (1.80) | 5.39 | (4.02) | 4.49 | (3.90) |
| Negative | .71 | (1.78) | .45 | (1.26) | 4.81 | (3.94) | 5.43 | (4.44) |
| Average | .74 | (1.87) | .66 | (1.67) | 4.47 | (3.87) | 5.10 | (4.02) |
| Individual | .78 | (2.08) | .67 | (1.63) | 4.98 | (4.08) | 4.80 | (3.94) |

Whether the aggregated or disaggregated measures of subcultural identity were used, these findings clearly support the fifth and sixth hypotheses. It was clearly demonstrated that the members of the various subcultures express themselves with different forms of deviance. However, there are also certain subcultures that do not express themselves via deviance.

4.4.3 Hypothesis 4 – Subcultural Drift within Life Domains

As discussed previously, the survey includes several questions that address the various life domains of the adolescent (i.e., the family, peer network, and school). This allowed the researcher to conduct a deeper examination of the relationship between the independent variable (subcultural identity) and dependent variable (deviance). Specifically, the next step was to address the fourth hypothesis. In other words, the researcher examined whether middle-class adolescents drift between subcultural identities based on the life domain they find themselves in.

In the current research, SEM allowed the researcher to answer the hypothesis by assessing whether subcultural identity had varying effects within each life domain. If the hypothesis was confirmed, it would be expected that in certain life domains (e.g., friends and school networks), the effects of the measures (e.g. relational control, instrumental control, etc) on different forms of deviance would vary between subcultural identities. This would suggest that in these life domains, subcultural identity would have a specific impact on the relationship these measures have with the various measures of deviance.

Conversely, for the life domain that should not be impacted by subcultural identity (i.e., family), it would be expected that no significant differences between subcultures would be found. If so, this would suggest that subcultural identity has little to no impact in this life domain. In other words, the relationship between the various measures and deviance can be seen as coming from an individual drifting into and out of subcultural identities.

The first step in the analysis was to determine how the measures of subcultural identities could be used to differentiate between individuals. In order to make this determination, several issues were considered. First, prior to the SEM analysis, it had been found that the majority of respondents indicated an affiliation with the null identities of "average" and "individual." Based on this finding, a decision had been made to exclude these groups from the current analysis, as this affiliation indicates that there is very little variability in identification with these groups.

Next, it was decided that comparisons across subcultural identities could best be made by creating separate models for each identity. These models could then be compared to one another to determine if the measures within life domains vary significantly between subcultural identities. However, a requirement of this test is that the groups (in this case subcultural identities) being compared must be independent. In other words, each respondent can only fall into a single subcultural identity. This obviously goes against the findings up to this point. Therefore, it was decided to use interaction terms to create independent groupings of identities. This allowed the researcher to create independent groups without arbitrarily forcing respondents in a single subculture. However, these groups are not truly subcultures. Instead, they are combinations of subcultural identities that are common among the sample.

Once the decision was made to use interaction terms to control for subcultural identity groupings, another issue arose: If interaction terms were to be created for every possible combination of the 14 unique identities, a truly huge number of unique combinations would be created. There would, most certainly, be too few respondents within each category to run SEM analysis, let alone draw comparisons between the responses. Therefore, in order to reduce the possible number of categories, the aggregate identities were used. Specifically, the interaction terms between the categories of *Out-Crowd*, *In-Crowd*, *Intellectual*, and *Negative* were used to create unique categories of subcultural

identity. However, when the combinations were examined, it was determined that the number of respondents that fell into the *Negative* category was simply too small and, therefore, unique categories including this identity would also have been too small. For this reason, the *Negative* category was excluded from the analyses. In the end, then, seven unique groups of subcultural identities were created:

- Out-Crowd (those who identify only with the Out-Crowd identity);
- *In-Crowd* (those who identify only with the *In-Crowd* identity);
- Intellectual (those who identify only with the Intellectual identity);
- Contradictory (those who identify with both the Out-Crowd and In-Crowd identities);
- Smart-and-Popular (those who identify with both the In-Crowd and Intellectual identities);
- Smart-and-Unpopular (those who identify with both the Out-Crowd and Intellectual identities); and
- Chameleons (those who identify with all three identities).

The *Intellectual* category included only 44 respondents, making it too small to be examined using SEM. In addition, there were no members in the *Smart-and-Unpopular* and *Contradictory* groups. Therefore, the final analysis was run using the remaining four categories, shown in Table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Final Subcultural Identities for SEM Analysis

Descriptive Statistics (N=562)

| | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Out-Crowd | 82 | 14.6 |
| In-Crowd | 154 | 27.4 |
| Smart-and-Popular | 251 | 44.7 |
| Chameleons | 75 | 13.3 |
| Total | 562 | 100.0 |

At this point, the dependent variables (i.e., the four measures of deviance) and independent variables (i.e., the four major subcultural identities) have been clearly developed.

Now that these issues have been addressed, the SEM model can be constructed. This will be accomplished by first conducting confirmatory factor analysis within the individual life domains of Family, Peers, and Schools, in order to determine the best arrangements of the measures within each domain. The Amherst data includes 22 questions dealing with the adolescent's family life. As a starting point, all 22 measures were included in a single factor. After creating several different models, the best fitting model for the family domain was found to consist of four latent variables: Family Relational Control, Family Dynamics, Family Conflict and Parental Instrumental Control (see Table 4.13 for the relative fit of the single-factor model compared to the four-factor model, and Table 4.14 for a description of each indicator contained within the four latent variables).

Table 4.13: Model Fit of Family Domain

| Model | | χ^2 | | RMSEA | A C E I | CFI |
|-----------|----------|----------|------|-------|---------|------|
| Model | χ^2 | Df | Р | KMSEA | AGFI | CFI |
| 1 Factor | 2958.272 | 209 | .000 | .144 | .602 | .523 |
| 4 Factors | 2007,654 | 203 | .000 | .118 | .659 | .687 |

Table 4.14: Measures within the Family Domain

| Latent Variable | Description of Indicators |
|--------------------------|---|
| | If you had a major personal problem would you discuss it with your mother? |
| | If you had a major personal problem would you discuss it with your father? |
| | Do you talk with your mother about your thoughts and feelings? |
| | Do you talk with your father about your thoughts and feelings? |
| | Would you like to be the kind of person your mother is? |
| Family Relational | Would you like to be the kind of person your father is? |
| Control | If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with your mother? |
| | If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with your father? |
| | If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with your mother? |
| | If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with your father? |
| | How often do you and your family have fun together? |
| Family | During the average week, how often do you and your family have dinner together? |
| Dynamics | How much do you contribute to family decisions? |
| | How do you and your parent(s) decide how late you can stay out at night? |
| | Does your mother trust you? |
| Family | Does your father trust you? |
| Conflict | How often do your parents nag you? |
| | How often do your parents take away your privileges? |
| | Does your mother know where you are when you are not at home? |
| Parental Instrumental | Does your father know where you are when you are not at home? |
| Control | Does your mother know who you are with when you are not at home? |
| | Does your father know who you are with when you are not at home? |

These steps were repeated to create latent variables representing the various aspects within the life domain of peers. The Amherst data includes 10 questions dealing with the adolescent's peer relationships. As a starting point, all 10 measures were included in a single factor. After creating several different models, the best fitting model for the peer domain consisted of three latent variables: Peer Relational, Peer Deviance and Peer Instrumental (see Table 4.15 for a comparison of the single-factor model and the three-factor model and Table 4.16 for a description of each indicator contained within the three latent variables).

Table 4.15: Model Fit of Peer Domain

| Madal | | χ^2 | | DMCEA | ۸ | CET |
|-----------|----------|----------|------|-------|------|------|
| Model | χ^2 | Df | Р | RMSEA | AGFI | CFI |
| 1 Factor | 494.280 | 35 | .000 | .144 | .785 | .581 |
| 3 Factors | 341.086 | 35 | .000 | .117 | .862 | .720 |

Table 4.16: Measures within the Peer Domain

| Latent Variable | Description of Indicators |
|----------------------|--|
| | I can tell my best friend anything. |
| Poor | If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a friend? |
| Peer Relational | If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a friend? |
| | When I'm having trouble I can rely on my best friend. |
| | Would you like to be the kind of person your best friend is? |
| | What do your parents think of most of your friends? |
| Peer Deviance | Are your friends at school active In extracurricular school activities? |
| | My friends rarely get into trouble. |
| | How many of your best friends have ever been picked up by the police? |
| Peer Instrumental | How often do you see your best friend? |

Finally, the school life domain was examined. The Amherst data includes 10 questions about the adolescent's experience within the school domain. As was done with the family and peer domain, the first step was to create a single measure of the school domain. This resulted in the best fit. Creating multiple latent variables only served to reduce the overall fit of the model (see Table 4.17 for the fit indices of this model). Therefore, it was decided to keep the school domain as a single factor (for a description of the indicators included in this domain please see Table 4.18)

Table 4.17: Model Fit of School Domain

| Model | | χ^2 | | RMSEA | AGFI | CFI |
|----------|----------|----------|------|-------|------|------|
| Model | χ^2 | Df | Р | KMSEA | AGFI | CFI |
| 1 Factor | 223.696 | 27 | .000 | .107 | .874 | .801 |

Table 4.18: Measures within the School Domain

| Latent Variable Compared to other students In your school, how do you rate yourself in the school work you could do if you tried your hardest? In school do you try your hardest? If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? How often do you find that you don't like school? | | |
|--|----------|--|
| Compared to other students In your school, how do you rate yourself in the school work you could do if you tried your hardest? In school do you try your hardest? If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | Latent | Description of Indicators |
| work you could do if you tried your hardest? In school do you try your hardest? If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | Variable | |
| work you could do if you tried your hardest? In school do you try your hardest? If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | |
| work you could do if you tried your hardest? In school do you try your hardest? If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | Compared to other students In your school, how do you rate yourself in the school |
| In school do you try your hardest? If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | |
| If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | work you could do if you tried your flandest: |
| If you had questions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | In school do you try your hardest? |
| talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | in school do you dry your mardest: |
| talk with a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | If you had guestions or problems concerning pregnancy or sexuality, would you ever |
| If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever talk with a a teacher/a school nurse/a guidance counselor/a school social worker? School How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | |
| School How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | taik with a teacher/a school harse/a galaance coansciol/a school social worker: |
| School How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | If you had questions or problems concerning alcohol or other drugs, would you ever |
| School How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | |
| How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | Cabaal | talk with a a teacher, a seriod harse, a galacine counselor, a seriod social worker. |
| My overall average in school is at least How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | School | How often do you skip a day of school without your parents' knowledge? |
| How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | Then often do you only a day of our on the first your parones in the mode. |
| How often do you have trouble with your teachers? How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | My overall average in school is at least |
| How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | |
| How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | How often do you have trouble with your teachers? |
| On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
| On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? | | How often do you do homework, or school projects, etc. after school? |
| | | |
| | | On an average about how many hours a night do you watch TV? |
| How often do you find that you don't like school? | | |
| | | How often do you find that you don't like school? |
| | | |

Before the specific results of each model could be examined, it was necessary to determine whether the overall model (i.e. the inclusion of all three life domains within a single model) "fit" the data. The various fit indices are presented in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19: Model Fit

| Madal | | χ^2 | | DMCEA | A CET | CET | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|----------|-------|-------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Model | χ^2 | Df | Р | RMSEA | AGFI | CFI | | | | | |
| | Full Sam | ole (N = | = 638) | | | | | | | | |
| Delinquency | 3563.376 | 792 | .000 | .074 | .721 | .686 | | | | | |
| Substance Use | 3573.782 | 792 | .000 | .074 | .723 | .683 | | | | | |
| Partying | 3636.108 | 792 | .000 | .075 | .719 | .679 | | | | | |
| Emotional Deviance | 3569.072 | 792 | .000 | .074 | .723 | .684 | | | | | |
| | Out-Cro | wd (N = | = 82) | | | | | | | | |
| Delinquency 1490.582 792 .000 .104 .487 .509 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Substance Use | 1486.929 | 792 | .000 | .104 | .484 | .504 | | | | | |
| Partying | 1499.541 | 792 | .000 | .105 | .486 | .500 | | | | | |
| Emotional Deviance | 1481.031 | 792 | .000 | .104 | .487 | .506 | | | | | |
| | In-Crowd (N = 154) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delinquency | 1591.260 | 792 | .000 | .081 | .623 | .599 | | | | | |
| Substance Use | 1585.070 | 792 | .000 | .081 | .625 | .603 | | | | | |
| Partying | 1617.412 | 792 | .000 | .083 | .619 | .591 | | | | | |
| Emotional Deviance | 1604.814 | 792 | .000 | .082 | .621 | .596 | | | | | |
| | Popular-and- | Smart | (N = 25) | 1) | | | | | | | |
| Delinquency | 1812.272 | 792 | .000 | .072 | .683 | .686 | | | | | |
| Substance Use | 1831.347 | 792 | .000 | .072 | .683 | .682 | | | | | |
| Partying | 1825.947 | 792 | .000 | .072 | .680 | .684 | | | | | |
| Emotional Deviance | 1812.523 | 792 | .000 | .072 | .684 | .686 | | | | | |
| Chameleons $(N = 75)$ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Delinquency | 1450.598 | 792 | .000 | .106 | .502 | .493 | | | | | |
| Substance Use | 1448.007 | 792 | .000 | .106 | .501 | .492 | | | | | |
| Partying | 1484.884 | 792 | .000 | .109 | .502 | .480 | | | | | |
| Emotional Deviance | 1477.691 | 792 | .000 | .108 | .503 | .477 | | | | | |

These indices indicated that the fit for all five models was not adequate². However, as discussed above, due to the relatively small sample sizes and the lack of an agreed-upon critical value for each index of fit, the analysis was not halted. Instead, the researcher proceeded with the analysis; the possible limitations of this decision will be discussed in greater detail below.

89

² When examining the modification indices of the various models a number of high scores (i.e. over 10) were found. This indicates that another possible reason for the poor fits of the models might be due to problems with the measures of the life domains. This is something that is commonly seen with measures that have not been extensively validated. This means that the poor fit might have little to do with the conceptualization of the model.

The next step was to analyze the relationship between the major variables within each life domain (e.g., the four factors of the Family domain) and the four dependent variables.—Delinquency, Substance Use, Partying, and Emotional Deviance. The researcher examined the measure of "Delinquency" first (see Table 4.20). Within the *Out-Crowd* identity, the SEM results suggested that an increase in the delinquent activities of one's peers predicts a higher level of delinquency. When the *In-Crowd* subcultural identity was examined, there were no significant relationships between any of the life domain variables and delinquency. Next, two significant relationships were found in the *Smart-and-Popular* identity. Specifically, less relational control by parents and more peer deviance predict higher levels of delinquency. Finally, within the *Chameleon* subcultural identity, adolescents with increased levels of relational control by parents and a more harmonious family life are likely to commit fewer delinquent acts.

Table 4.20 - SEM Results for Delinquency

| | Out-Cr | rowd | In-Cr | owd | Smart-and (N =2 | | Chameleons | |
|----------------------|-----------|-------|----------|-------|--------------------|-------|------------|--------|
| Domain | (N = | 82) | (N = 1) | .54) | , | | (N = 1) | 75) |
| | Estimate* | SE | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE |
| Family: Relational | 1.343 | 1.987 | -1.123 | .685 | -1.284 | .602 | -11.432 | 5.280 |
| Family: Instrumental | 261 | 1.943 | .896 | .850 | .729 | .684 | 233 | 1.704 |
| Family: Dynamics | 1.357 | 1.200 | .022 | .956 | 197 | .577 | -4.275 | 1.472 |
| Family: Conflict | .539 | 1.044 | .306 | .630 | .270 | .611 | 1.154 | 1.244 |
| Peer: Relational | .146 | .716 | .067 | .387 | 514 | .294 | 154 | 1.805 |
| Peer: Instrumental | 148 | .265 | .246 | .161 | .118 | .150 | .386 | .409 |
| Peer: Deviance | 7.147 | 3.640 | 9.877 | 5.947 | 3.931 | 1.676 | .121 | 5.212 |
| School | -3.539 | 3.068 | -2.591 | 2.339 | 650 | .825 | -20.502 | 19.124 |

^{*}All estimates reported are unstandardized

Next, substance use among the various subcultural identities was examined. When this form of deviance was analyzed, significant relationships were found in only two of the identities (see Table 4.21). First, in the *In-Crowd* subcultural identity, all measures within the peer life domain were significantly related to substance use. Specifically, those within the *In-Crowd* identity who spend more time with their peers, who have a more relational relationship with their peers, and who have less delinquent peers were less likely to use

substances. Second, those in the *Smart-and-Popular* subcultural identity who do better in school were less likely to use substances.

Table 4.21 - SEM Results for Substance Use

| | Out-Cr | owd | In-Cro | wd | Smart-and-Popular (N =251) | | Chameleons | |
|----------------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|------------|--------|
| Domain | (N = 82) | | (N =1 | 54) | (// - | 231) | (N = 75) | |
| | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE |
| Family: Relational | .610 | 1.423 | 144 | .264 | 469 | .395 | -3.721 | 3.573 |
| Family: Instrumental | -2.171 | 1.461 | .331 | .319 | .069 | .455 | .139 | 1.150 |
| Family: Dynamics | 948 | .814 | 378 | .381 | 123 | .383 | -1.742 | 1.112 |
| Family: Conflict | .195 | .758 | .096 | .239 | 632 | .410 | 431 | .879 |
| Peer: Relational | 593 | .515 | 431 | .152 | .166 | .200 | 1.805 | 1.365 |
| Peer: Instrumental | -2.171 | 1.461 | 122 | .059 | 005 | .102 | 307 | .287 |
| Peer: Deviance | 3.084 | 1.896 | 3.865 | 1.896 | 1.898 | 1.076 | -3.313 | 4.542 |
| School | -2.618 | 2.218 | .472 | .738 | -1.801 | .568 | -18.578 | 17.184 |

Next, the relationship between the measure of partying and the various life domains was analyzed. Similar to the results for substance use, significant relationships were found only in the *In-Crowd* and *Smart-and-Popular* subcultural identities (see Table 4.22). Within the *In-Crowd* identity, those who had strong relational relationships with their peers were less likely to engage in partying behavior (i.e. drinking alcohol, going to house parties, and engaging in sexual intercourse). When the *Smart-and-Popular* identity was considered, several significant predictors of partying were found. Specifically, those individuals who have more relational relationships with their parents and peers, who have less conflict with their parents, and who spend more time with their peers were more likely to party.

Table 4.22 – SEM Results for Partying

| | Out-Cro | owd | In-Cr | owd | | Smart-and-Popular $(N = 251)$ | | eleons |
|----------------------|---------------|--------|----------|--------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|
| Domain | in $(N = 82)$ | | (N = 1 | L54) | (17 -25 | , _ , | (N = | - 75) |
| | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE |
| Family: Relational | 3.652 | 2.832 | -1.800 | 3.135 | -6.692 | 3.282 | -42.896 | 38.891 |
| Family: Instrumental | -1.541 | 7.440 | 5.495 | 3.842 | 5.621 | 3.759 | 5.531 | 10.705 |
| Family: Dynamics | -1.577 | 4.570 | -2.616 | 4.522 | 2.590 | 3.189 | -15.359 | 10.889 |
| Family: Conflict | 6.354 | 4.414 | 4.363 | 2.878 | 7.376 | 3.425 | .137 | 7334 |
| Peer: Relational | 3.652 | 2.832 | -7.310 | 1.844 | -4.468 | 1.586 | -24.417 | 15.752 |
| Peer: Instrumental | 1.909 | 1.169 | 570 | .718 | 1.069 | .759 | .713 | 1.694 |
| Peer: Deviance | 18.473 | 12.923 | 42.306 | 24.496 | 32.256 | 12.451 | 51.993 | 76.319 |
| School | -22.720 | 16.470 | -4.805 | 10.129 | -1.636 | 4.679 | 152.669 | 155.157 |

Finally, the measure of emotional deviance was analyzed. In doing so, only a single significant relationship was found (see Table 4.23). Specifically, those who identified with the *Smart-and-Popular* subculture and do better in school were less likely to be emotionally deviant.

Table 4.23 – SEM Results for Emotional Deviance

| | Out-C | rowd | In-Cı | rowd | Smart-and-Popular $(N = 251)$ | | Chameleons | |
|----------------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|------------|--------|
| Domain | (N = 82) | | (N = | 154) | (,, _ | J1) | (N = 75) | |
| | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE | Estimate | SE |
| Family: Relational | .200 | 2.526 | 1.161 | .838 | -1.275 | .763 | -21.200 | 16.313 |
| Family: Instrumental | 243 | 2.498 | .523 | 1.026 | -1.144 | .868 | 1.688 | 2.685 |
| Family: Dynamics | 554 | 1.373 | -2.180 | 1.283 | 578 | .755 | -9.927 | 6.953 |
| Family: Conflict | -2.576 | 1.469 | 584 | .778 | 235 | .762 | 2.744 | 2.418 |
| Peer: Relational | 033 | .911 | .583 | .459 | 168 | .365 | -1.042 | 2.251 |
| Peer: Instrumental | 191 | .391 | 044 | .195 | 290 | .196 | .839 | .600 |
| Peer: Deviance | 164 | 2.964 | -2.703 | 3.557 | 484 | 1.730 | 4.330 | 4.455 |
| School | -4.449 | 3.700 | 3.348 | 2.686 | -3.497 | 1.116 | -34.427 | 35.919 |

Taken as a whole, these findings indicate that the relationship between the various life domains and specific measures of deviance vary greatly across subcultural identities. In other words, the predictors of deviance did not appear to be the same between identities. This lends support to the argument that subcultures are distinct social groupings. However, these findings, on their own, did not provide support for the hypothesis that adolescents within the middle-class are more likely to drift into subcultural roles when in the peer and school domains. In order to fully test this hypothesis, further analyses had to be run.

First, it must be determined if there are significant differences between models—in other words, the invariance of measures between models must be tested. "Measurement invariance concerns whether scores from the operationalization of a construct have the same meaning under different conditions" (Kline, 2011, p. 251). In the present study, a finding of invariance of the measures between models would suggest that all of the predictors of the specific form of deviance act the same between the four subcultural identities regardless of the life domain—in other words, a finding of invariance would suggest that drift is not occurring. Therefore, in order to support the hypothesis that subcultural identities will be more prominent in the life domains of schools and peers and less so in family life domain, invariance among the family domain and variance among either/or the peer and school domains would need to be found. This would suggest that the family predictors of deviance remain the same regardless of the adolescent's subcultural identity while in the peer and/or school domains, there are different predictors of deviance depending on the adolescent's subcultural identity. In other words, the adolescent is more likely to drift into subcultural roles while in peer and/or school domain.

The first step of invariance testing in SEM is simply to determine if there is any variability between the models being examined. If there is any variability between models, the next step is to identify the source of this variability. Therefore, before it can be determined if the effects of the various life domains on deviance varies between subcultural identities it must first be determined if there is any differences in the models when they are separated by subcultural identities. In the current analysis, this meant comparing two models. The first is an overall model where the factor variances, measurement errors, factor loadings, and direct effects were constrained between the various subgroups. In other words, this model assumes that regardless of the subculture one identifies with, all of the effects in the model would be the same. The second model is the exact opposite (i.e.,

unconstrained). Specifically, all of the measures were free to vary between the various subcultural identities.

Once both models have been run, the test for invariance is quite simple. If the differences between the model fit indexes are large enough, then it can be assumed that there is some variability between the two models. The research can then move on to the next step of trying to identify where these differences lie. However, as was discussed above, there are no clear ground rules for what is a significant difference in the measures of fit. The first step is to examine the chi-square statistic. However, as Cheung and Rensvold (2002) remind us, the chi-square statistic is sensitive to sample size. Therefore, it is important to include at least one more measure of overall fit to determine if the differences between models are significant. Meade et al. (2008), suggest that the changes in the CFI should be examined with a use a cutoff point of .002. In other words, if the difference in the CFI between the two models exceeds .002, then it can be relatively safe to assume that there is significant variance between the models.

Results from the comparison of the fully constrained model to the fully unconstrained model are shown in Table 4.24. The findings clearly demonstrated that there was significant variability among the various subcultural identities when examining the relationship between life domains and deviance. However, there are two important things to note about these findings. First, the significant differences indicate that there was variability between the subcultural identities. It does not, however, indicate between which subcultural identities these significant difference lie. Second, and similarly, these findings did not give the researcher any indication about which relationships between life domains and deviance might be different. The next step is to address both of these questions.

Table 4.24 - Overall Test of Invariance (Fully Constrained Versus Unconstrained)*

| Unconstrained | Model of | χ^2 | Df | $\Delta \chi^2$ | Δdf | Р | CFI | Δ CFI |
|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|-------------|----------|------|-------|
| Measures | Comparison | | | | | | | |
| | | Deling | uency | | | | | |
| Fully Constrained | = | 6317.592 | 3168 | ı | ı | ı | .605 | 1 |
| All | Fully Constrained | 7089.659 | 3501 | 772.067 | 333 | p < .001 | .550 | .055 |
| | | Substar | nce Use | | | | | |
| Fully Constrained | - | 6345.972 | 3168 | ı | - | - | .601 | - |
| All | Fully Constrained | 7189.893 | 3501 | 843.921 | 333 | p < .001 | .537 | .064 |
| | | Part | ying | | | | | |
| Fully Constrained | - | 6417.733 | 3168 | - | - | - | .596 | - |
| All | Fully Constrained | 7160.889 | 3501 | 743.156 | 333 | p < .001 | .545 | .051 |
| | | Emotional | Deviance | е | | | | |
| Fully Constrained | = | 6365.924 | 3168 | ı | ı | - | .599 | ı |
| All | Fully Constrained | 7127.477 | 3501 | 761.533 | 333 | p < .001 | .545 | .054 |

^{*}Shaded cells indicate that the models being examined meet the basic requirement of a significant difference between chi-square scores and a difference in CFI above .002

Since the hypothesis driving this specific form of research is concerned solely with the relationship between life domains and deviance, a more stringent test of invariance was applied before the researcher began searching for the specific origins of the differences between the models. Specifically, the researcher compared the fully constrained model to a model in which only the direct effects of the life domains were unconstrained. If large enough differences were found between the two model fits, this would suggest that the source of the variance must be in these direct effects and not the factor variances, measurement errors, or factor loadings. This is, in fact, what was found when these two models were compared (see Table 4.25). Specifically, for all four measures of deviance, the differences between the fully constrained and direct effect unconstrained models were large enough to justify further examination.

Table 4.25 - Overall Test of Invariance (Fully Constrained Versus Direct Effects Unconstrained)

| Unconstrained Measures | Model of Comparison | χ^2 | Df | $\Delta \chi^2$ | Δdf | р | CFI | Δ CFI |
|---------------------------|------------------------|----------|---------|-----------------|-------------|----------|------|-------|
| | | Delino | quency | | | | | |
| Fully Constrained | - | 6317.592 | 3168 | i | ı | ı | .605 | ı |
| Direct Effects | Fully Constrained | 7055.087 | 3477 | 737.495 | 309 | p < .001 | .551 | .054 |
| | | Substa | nce Use | | | | | |
| Fully Constrained | - | 6345.972 | 3168 | ı | ı | ı | .601 | - |
| Direct Effects | Fully Constrained | 7091.588 | 3477 | 745.616 | 309 | p < .001 | .546 | .055 |
| | | Part | ying | | | | | |
| Fully Constrained | - | 6417.733 | 3168 | - | - | - | .596 | _ |
| Direct Effects | Fully Constrained | 7135.949 | 3477 | 718.216 | 309 | p < .001 | .545 | .051 |
| Emotional Deviance | | | | | | | | |
| Fully Constrained | = | 6365.924 | 3168 | - | ı | ı | .599 | ı |
| Direct Effects | Fully Constrained | 7075.474 | 3477 | 709.55 | 309 | p < .001 | .549 | .050 |

It was found that there are some differences in the relationship between life domains and deviance when the researcher compared separate models based on subcultural identity. The next step was to gain a clearer picture of these differences. In order to determine where exactly the differences may lie, the researcher began to separate out the specific subcultures. The analysis began with four subcultures (Out-Crowd, In-Crowd, Smart-and-Popular and Chameleons); this means that six separate comparisons were run (Out-Crowd versus In-Crowd, Out-Crowd versus Smart-and-Popular, Out-Crowd versus Chameleon, In-Crowd versus Smart-and-Popular, In-Crowd versus Chameleons, and Smart-and-Popular versus Chameleons). For each of these comparisons, the original examination of invariance was replicated. In other words, to determine if there were any significant differences in the relationship between life domains and delinquency between the subcultures, the researcher compared fully constrained and fully unconstrained models for each comparison of subcultural identities. When this analysis was conducted (see Table 4.26), the researcher found that for all six comparisons, there was a significant difference between the models and that these differences must lie in the direct effects between life domains and delinquency.

Table 4.26 - Test of Invariance for Individual Models Separated by Subcultures

| Models of Comparison | Unconstrained Measures | χ^2 | df | $\Delta \chi^2$ | Δdf | р | CFI | Δ CFI |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------|------|-----------------|-----|--------|------|----------|
| | • | Delinquency | | | | | | |
| Out-Crowd | All | 3047.114 | 1584 | - | - | - | .572 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3278.265 | 1695 | 231.151 | 111 | p<.001 | .537 | .035 |
| In-Crowd | Direct Effects (DE) | 3267.767 | 1687 | 220.653 | 103 | p<.001 | .538 | .034 |
| Out-Crowd | All | 3271.252 | 1584 | - | - | - | .639 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3600.904 | 1695 | 329.652 | 111 | p<.001 | .593 | .046 |
| Smart-and-Popular | Direct Effects (DE) | 3580.809 | 1687 | 309.557 | 103 | p<.001 | .595 | .002 |
| Out-Crowd | All | 2904.224 | 1584 | - | - | - | .515 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3075.077 | 1695 | 170.853 | 111 | p<.001 | .493 | .022 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3107.896 | 1687 | 203.672 | 103 | p<.001 | .478 | .037 |
| In-Crowd | All | 3404.287 | 1584 | - | - | - | .653 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3634.700 | 1695 | 230.413 | 111 | p<.001 | .630 | .023 |
| Smart-and-Popular | Direct Effects (DE) | 3631.718 | 1687 | 227.431 | 103 | p<.001 | .629 | .024 |
| In-Crowd | All | 3045.033 | 1584 | - | - | - | .557 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3293.294 | 1695 | 248.261 | 111 | p<.001 | .515 | .042 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3283.796 | 1687 | 238.763 | 103 | p<.001 | .515 | .042 |
| Smart-and-Popular | All | 3269.540 | 1584 | - | - | - | .630 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3599.147 | 1695 | 329.607 | 111 | p<.001 | .582 | .048 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3582.930 | 1687 | 313.390 | 103 | p<.001 | .584 | .046 |
| | | Substance Us | е | | | | | |
| Out-Crowd | All | 3053.433 | 1584 | - | - | - | .568 | ı |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3351.383 | 1695 | 297.950 | 111 | p<.001 | .513 | .025 |
| In-Crowd | Direct Effects (DE) | 3271.183 | 1687 | 217.750 | 103 | p<.001 | .534 | .004 |
| Out-Crowd | All | 3302.817 | 1584 | - | - | - | .632 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3622.868 | 1695 | 320.051 | 111 | p<.001 | .588 | 042 |
| Smart-and-Popular | Direct Effects (DE) | 3603.171 | 1687 | 300.354 | 103 | p<.001 | .590 | 040 |
| Out-Crowd | All | 2914.075 | 1584 | - | - | - | .506 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3110.093 | 1695 | 196.018 | 111 | p<.001 | .475 | .031 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3105.489 | 1687 | 191.414 | 103 | p<.001 | .473 | .029 |
| In-Crowd | All | 3417.144 | 1584 | - | - | - | .652 | ı |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3706.360 | 1695 | 289.216 | 111 | p<.001 | .618 | .034 |
| Smart-and-Popular | Direct Effects (DE) | 3664.631 | 1687 | 247.487 | 103 | p<.001 | .624 | .028 |
| In-Crowd | All | 3036.253 | 1584 | - | - | - | .559 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3356.366 | 1695 | 320.113 | 111 | p<.001 | .495 | .064 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3279.892 | 1687 | 243.639 | 103 | p<.001 | .516 | .043 |
| Smart-and-Popular | All | 3285.963 | 1584 | - | - | - | .627 | ı |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3619.641 | 1695 | 333.678 | 111 | p<.001 | .579 | .048 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3600.322 | 1687 | 314.359 | 103 | p<.001 | .581 | .046 |

Table 4.26 Continued - Test of Invariance for Individual Models Separated by Subcultures

| Models of Comparison | Unconstrained Measures | χ^2 | df | $\Delta \chi^2$ | Δdf | р | CFI | Δ CFI |
|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------|------|-----------------|-------------|--------|------|----------|
| | | Partying | | | | | | |
| Out-Crowd | All | 3099.050 | 1584 | - | - | - | .559 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3309.873 | 1695 | 210.823 | 111 | p<.001 | .530 | .029 |
| In-Crowd | Direct Effects (DE) | 3301.415 | 1687 | 202.365 | 103 | p<.001 | .530 | .029 |
| Out-Crowd | All | 3310.800 | 1584 | - | - | - | .632 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3608.526 | 1695 | 297.726 | 111 | p<.001 | .592 | .040 |
| Smart-and-Popular | Direct Effects (DE) | 3602.870 | 1687 | 292.070 | 103 | p<.001 | .592 | .040 |
| Out-Crowd | All | 2984.494 | 1584 | - | - | - | .490 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3162.590 | 1695 | 178.096 | 111 | p<.001 | .466 | .024 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3155.360 | 1687 | 170.866 | 103 | p<.001 | .465 | .025 |
| In-Crowd | All | 3444.142 | 1584 | - | - | - | .648 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3678.346 | 1695 | 234.204 | 111 | p<.001 | .625 | .023 |
| Smart-and-Popular | Direct Effects (DE) | 3667.730 | 1687 | 223.588 | 103 | p<.001 | .625 | .023 |
| In-Crowd | All | 3105.571 | 1584 | - | - | - | ,546 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3352.093 | 1695 | 246.522 | 111 | p<.001 | .506 | .040 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3345.970 | 1687 | 240.399 | 103 | p<.001 | .505 | .039 |
| Smart-and-Popular | All | 3317.721 | 1584 | - | - | - | .624 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3639.910 | 1695 | 332.189 | 111 | p<.001 | .578 | .000 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3630.175 | 1687 | 312,454 | 103 | p<.001 | .578 | .000 |
| | | otional Devia | nce | | | | | |
| Out-Crowd | All | 3067.829 | 1584 | - | - | - | .565 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3286.843 | 1695 | 219.014 | 111 | p<.001 | .533 | .032 |
| In-Crowd | Direct Effects (DE) | 3275.476 | 1687 | 207.647 | 103 | p<.001 | .534 | .031 |
| Out-Crowd | All | 3278.709 | 1584 | - | - | - | .635 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3587.906 | 1695 | 309.197 | 111 | p<.001 | .593 | .042 |
| Smart-and-Popular | Direct Effects (DE) | 3577.299 | 1687 | 298.590 | 103 | p<.001 | .593 | .042 |
| Out-Crowd | All | 2958.797 | 1584 | - | - | - | .492 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3117.510 | 1695 | 158.713 | 111 | p<.01 | .474 | .018 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3109.507 | 1687 | 150.710 | 103 | p<.01 | .474 | .018 |
| In-Crowd | All | 3418.113 | 1584 | - | - | - | .651 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3659.928 | 1695 | 241.815 | 111 | p<.001 | .626 | .025 |
| Smart-and-Popular | Direct Effects (DE) | 3643.167 | 1687 | 225.054 | 103 | p<.001 | .628 | .023 |
| In-Crowd | All | 3069.630 | 1584 | - | - | - | .554 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3336.400 | 1695 | 266.770 | 111 | p<.001 | .507 | .047 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3310.695 | 1687 | 241.065 | 103 | p<.001 | .512 | .042 |
| Smart-and-Popular | All | 3297.137 | 1584 | - | - | - | .625 | - |
| versus | Fully Constrained | 3630.552 | 1695 | 333.415 | 111 | p<.001 | .576 | .049 |
| Chameleons | Direct Effects (DE) | 3593.555 | 1687 | 296.418 | 103 | p<.001 | .582 | .043 |

The next step was to determine exactly where these differences lie. The methods used to accomplish this are similar to those that were used to determine the differences between the fully constrained and fully unconstrained models discussed above. However, instead of comparing fully constrained and fully unconstrained models, the researcher left only specific direct effects unconstrained and compared these model fit scores to those of the model with all direct effects unconstrained. Using the hypothesis (that subcultural identities will be more prominent in the life domains of schools and peers and less so in the family life domain) as a guide, the researcher began by examining the family domain. It

was expected that the relationship between the variables within the family domain and the measure of delinquency would remain constant between the subcultural identities examined (see Table 4.27). This was, in fact, what was found. In all six comparisons, the family unconstrained model did not differ from the direct effect unconstrained model in any significant way.

Next, the researcher examined the school and peer domains. According to the hypothesis, the researcher expected to find significant differences in the relationship of these domains with delinquency when the subcultural identities were compared. When these analyses were conducted it was found that no variability existed within the school domain. However, in agreement with the hypothesis it was found that there was some variability within the peer domain.

In order to further explore these findings, two additional models were created based on the peer measures. In one, peer deviance was kept unconstrained, while peer relational was constrained. In the second model, the measure of peer relational was allowed to vary, while peer deviance was constrained. Both of these models were compared to the model in which all direct effects were unconstrained. In 12 possible comparisons (two models within all six comparisons), three significant differences were found. Specifically, in the comparison of the *Out-Crowd* and *Chameleon* subcultural identities, the relationship between peer deviance, peer relational and delinquency were significantly different. Similarly, in the comparison of the *Out-Crowd* and *Smart-and-Popular* identities, the effect of the peer relational measure on delinquency varied significantly. These findings lend partial support to the fourth hypothesis. Specifically, when examining delinquency, the effects of the family domain do not vary between identities but the effects of the peer domain between subcultural identities do vary. In other words, the adolescents in this sample appear to drift into subcultural identities while with peers but remain in their conventional identities when they are with their family.

Table 4.27 – Invariance Tests for Delinquency

| Unconstrained Measures | χ^2 | df | $\Delta \chi^2$ | Δdf | Р | CFI | Δ CFI |
|---------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------|------|-------|
| | Out-C | <i>rowd</i> ve | rsus <i>In-Cro</i> | wd | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3267.767 | 1687 | - | - | - | .538 | - |
| Family | 3274.594 | 1691 | 6.827 | 7 | NS | .537 | .001 |
| School | 3270.814 | 1691 | 3.047 | 4 | NS | .538 | .000 |
| Friends | 3270.814 | 1692 | 3.047 | 5 | NS | .538 | .000 |
| Peer Deviance | 3272.288 | 1694 | 4.521 | 7 | NS | .538 | .000 |
| Peer Relational | 3277.441 | 1694 | 9.674 | 7 | NS | .537 | .001 |
| | Out-Crowa | | Smart-and | -Popula | <u>ir</u> | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3580.809 | 1687 | - | - | - | .595 | - |
| Family | 3591.675 | 1694 | 10.866 | 7 | NS | .594 | .001 |
| School | 3587.301 | 1691 | 6.492 | 4 | NS | .595 | .000 |
| Friends | 3587.687 | 1692 | 6.878 | 5 | NS | .595 | .000 |
| Peer Deviance | 3590.641 | 1694 | 9.832 | 7 | NS | .595 | .000 |
| Peer Relational | 3600.900 | 1694 | 20.091 | 7 | p <.01 | ,595 | .003 |
| | | | sus <i>Chamel</i> | eons | T | , , | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3107.896 | 1687 | - | - | - | .478 | - |
| Family | 3109.755 | 1694 | 1.859 | 7 | NS | .479 | .001 |
| School | 3115.252 | 1691 | 7.356 | 4 | NS | .477 | .001 |
| Friends | 3117.094 | 1692 | 9.198 | 5 | NS | .477 | .001 |
| Peer Deviance | 3075.002 | 1694 | 32.894 | 7 | p<.001 | .493 | .016 |
| Peer Relational | 3075.069 | 1694 | 32.827 | 7 | p<.001 | .493 | .016 |
| | | | Smart-and- | Populai | <u>-</u> | 1 | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3631.718 | 1687 | - | - | - | .629 | - |
| Family | 3634.663 | 1694 | 2.945 | 7 | NS | .629 | .000 |
| School | 3632.428 | 1691 | 0.710 | 4 | NS | .630 | .001 |
| Friends | 3632.428 | 1692 | 0.710 | 5 | NS | .630 | .001 |
| Peer Deviance | 3634.440 | 1694 | 2.722 | 7 | NS | .630 | .001 |
| Peer Relational | 3633.889 | 1694 | 2.171 | 7 | NS | .630 | .001 |
| | | | us Chamele | eons | T | 1 | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3283.796 | 1687 | - | - | - | .515 | - |
| Family | 3288.802 | 1694 | 5.006 | 7 | NS | .515 | .000 |
| School | 3286.398 | 1691 | 2.602 | 4 | NS | .516 | .001 |
| Friends | 3289.100 | 1692 | 5.304 | 5 | NS | .515 | .000 |
| Peer Deviance | 3290.192 | 1694 | 6.396 | 7 | NS | .516 | .001 |
| Peer Relational | 3291.302 | 1694 | 7.506 | 7 | NS | .515 | .002 |
| | Smart-and- | | versus <i>Cha</i> | meleoi | าร | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3582.930 | 1687 | - | | - | .584 | - |
| Family | 3591.208 | 1694 | 8.278 | 7 | NS | .583 | .001 |
| School | 3588.621 | 1691 | 5.691 | 4 | NS | .583 | .001 |
| Friends | 3591.992 | 1692 | 9.062 | 5 | NS | .583 | .001 |
| Peer Deviance | 3592.008 | 1694 | 9.078 | 7 | NS | .583 | .001 |
| Peer Relational | 3598.450 | 1694 | 15.520 | 7 | p <.05 | .582 | .002 |

The next step was to replicate the above analysis for the three remaining dependent variables. When this was done, similar findings emerged. For all of the models and comparisons examined, the direct effects unconstrained models were significantly different from the fully constrained model. In other words, regardless of the form of deviance being

examined or the subcultural identities being compared, significant differences were observed in the direct effects. Therefore, the next step was to examine the individual models and comparisons more closely. The results of the examination of substance use (see Table 4.28) paints an interesting picture: In all but one comparison, the relationship between the family domain and substance use did not vary between subcultures. This confirms part of hypothesis four in that between the four subcultural identities the relationship between the family domain and substance use was consistent. In further support of this hypothesis, it was found that five of the 12 peer measures vary significantly between subcultural identities. These findings were similar when compared to the examination of delinquency (discussed above).

When the examination moved to partying, however, the picture became a bit murky (see Table 4.29). No significant differences were found in the relationship between any of the life domains and the dependent variable of partying. The initial tests of invariance suggest that some differences do exist; however, no specific differences could be identified. This suggests that there is something about the overall relationship between these life domains and partying that varies significantly between subcultural identities. For this reason, when it comes to partying the hypothesis could not be confirmed.

Finally, for the measure of emotional deviance (see Table 4.30), the findings were similar to those for partying and substance use. Specifically, for four out of the six comparisons, no significant differences were found between subcultural identites. For the remaining two comparisons (*In-Crowd* versus *Chameleons* and *Smart-and-Popular* versus *Chameleons*), significant differences were found for nearly all of the life domains. These findings are too inconsistent for the researcher to come to any conclusions regarding the driving hypothesis of this analysis.

Table 4.28 – Invariance Tests for Substance Use

| Unconstrained Measures | χ^2 | df | $\Delta \chi^2$ | Δdf | Р | CFI | ΔCFI | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|------------------|-------------|--------|------|------|--|--|
| Out-Crowd versus In-Crowd | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3271.183 | 1687 | - | - | - | .534 | - | | |
| Family | 3275.026 | 1691 | 3.843 | 7 | NS | .534 | .000 | | |
| School | 3286.156 | 1691 | 14.843 | 4 | P<.01 | .531 | .003 | | |
| Friends | 3294.215 | 1692 | 22.843 | 5 | p<.001 | .529 | .005 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3304.724 | 1694 | 33.541 | 7 | p<.001 | .526 | .008 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3350.725 | 1694 | 79.542 | 7 | p<.001 | .513 | .021 | | |
| | Out-Crowd | <i>l</i> versus | Smart-and | -Popula | ar | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3603.171 | 1687 | ı | ı | =. | .590 | - | | |
| Family | 3611.351 | 1691 | 8.180 | 7 | NS | .589 | .001 | | |
| School | 3612.042 | 1691 | 8.871 | 4 | NS | .589 | .001 | | |
| Friends | 3613.216 | 1692 | 10.045 | 5 | NS | .589 | .001 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3619.896 | 1694 | 16.725 | 7 | p <.05 | .588 | .002 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3621.117 | 1694 | 17.946 | 7 | p <.01 | .588 | .002 | | |
| | Out-Cr | owd vers | sus <i>Chame</i> | leons | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3105.489 | 1687 | _ | - | - | .473 | - | | |
| Family | 3107.550 | 1691 | 2.061 | 7 | NS | .474 | .001 | | |
| School | 3107.952 | 1691 | 2.463 | 4 | NS | .474 | .001 | | |
| Friends | 3108.312 | 1692 | 2.823 | 5 | NS | .474 | .001 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3109.311 | 1694 | 3.822 | 7 | NS | .474 | .002 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3109.638 | 1694 | 4.149 | 7 | NS | .474 | .001 | | |
| | In-Crowd | | Smart-and- | Popula | r | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3664.631 | 1687 | _ | - | - | .624 | - | | |
| Family | 3664.979 | 1691 | 0.348 | 7 | NS | .625 | .001 | | |
| School | 3686.135 | 1691 | 21.504 | 4 | P<.001 | .621 | .003 | | |
| Friends | 3695.285 | 1692 | 30.654 | 5 | p<.001 | .620 | .004 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3699.129 | 1694 | 34.498 | 7 | p<.001 | .619 | .005 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3698.249 | 1694 | 33.618 | 7 | p<.001 | .619 | .005 | | |
| In-Crowd versus Chameleons | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3279.892 | 1687 | - | - | - | .516 | - | | |
| Family | 3315.274 | 1691 | 35.382 | 7 | p<.001 | .507 | .009 | | |
| School | 3289.512 | 1691 | 9.620 | 4 | P<.05 | .514 | .002 | | |
| Friends | 3306.574 | 1692 | 26.682 | 5 | p<.001 | .510 | .006 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3310.051 | 1694 | 30.159 | 7 | p<.001 | .509 | .007 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3356.159 | 1694 | 76.267 | 7 | p<.001 | .495 | .021 | | |
| Smart-and-Popular versus Chameleons | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3600.322 | 1687 | - | - | =- | .581 | - | | |
| Family | 3613.939 | 1691 | 13.617 | 7 | NS | .579 | .002 | | |
| Friends and School | 3604.608 | 1691 | 4.286 | 4 | NS | .581 | .000 | | |
| Friends | 3611.016 | 1692 | 10.694 | 5 | NS | .580 | .001 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3618.811 | 1694 | 18.489 | 7 | p<.01 | .578 | .003 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3615.550 | 1694 | 15.228 | 7 | p<.05 | .579 | .002 | | |

Table 4.29 – Invariance Tests for Partying

| Unconstrained | χ^2 | Df | $\Delta \chi^2$ | Δdf | Р | CFI | Δ CFI | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|------|-----------------|-------------|----|-------|-------|--|
| Measures Out-Crowd versus In-Crowd | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3301.415 | 1687 | - - | _ | - | .530 | _ | |
| Family | 3308.035 | 1691 | 6.62 | 7 | NS | .529 | .001 | |
| School | 3303.504 | 1691 | 2.089 | 4 | NS | .530 | .000 | |
| Friends | 3304.604 | 1692 | 3.189 | 5 | NS | .530 | .000 | |
| Peer Deviance | 3308.668 | 1694 | 7.253 | 7 | NS | .530 | .000 | |
| Peer Relational | 3308.035 | 1694 | 6.620 | 7 | NS | .530 | .000 | |
| Teer relational | Out-Crowd | | | | | 1.550 | .000 | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3602.870 | 1687 | - | | - | .592 | - | |
| Family | 3605.465 | 1691 | 2.595 | 7 | NS | .592 | .000 | |
| School | 3604.807 | 1691 | 1.937 | 4 | NS | .592 | .000 | |
| Friends | 3607.898 | 1692 | 5.028 | 5 | NS | .592 | .000 | |
| Peer Deviance | 3608.480 | 1694 | 5.610 | 7 | NS | .592 | .000 | |
| Peer Relational | 3608.502 | 1694 | 5.632 | 7 | NS | .592 | .000 | |
| Out-Crowd versus Chameleons | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3155.360 | 1687 | - | - | - | .465 | - | |
| Family | 3161.100 | 1691 | 5.740 | 7 | NS | .465 | .000 | |
| School | 3156.555 | 1691 | 1.195 | 4 | NS | .466 | .001 | |
| Friends | 3159.869 | 1692 | 4.509 | 5 | NS | .466 | .001 | |
| Peer Deviance | 3162.343 | 1694 | 6.983 | 7 | NS | .465 | .000 | |
| Peer Relational | 3160.419 | 1694 | 5.059 | 7 | NS | .465 | .000 | |
| In-Crowd versus Smart-and-Popular | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3667.730 | 1687 | - | - | - | .625 | - | |
| Family | 3673.783 | 1691 | 6.053 | 7 | NS | .625 | .000 | |
| School | 3671.209 | 1691 | 3.479 | 4 | NS | .625 | .000 | |
| Friends | 3671.342 | 1692 | 3.612 | 5 | NS | .626 | .001 | |
| Peer Deviance | 3675.286 | 1694 | 7.556 | 7 | NS | .625 | .000 | |
| Peer Relational | 3675.591 | 1694 | 7.861 | 7 | NS | .625 | .000 | |
| | | | is Chamele | ons | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3345.970 | 1687 | - | - | - | .505 | - | |
| Family | 3349.470 | 1691 | 3.500 | 7 | NS | .505 | .000 | |
| School | 3348.817 | 1691 | 2.847 | 4 | NS | .505 | .000 | |
| Friends | 3351.148 | 1692 | 5.178 | 5 | NS | .505 | .000 | |
| Peer Deviance | 3351.431 | 1694 | 5.461 | 7 | NS | .506 | .001 | |
| Peer Relational | 3351.992 | 1694 | 6.022 | 7 | NS | .505 | .000 | |
| Smart-and-Popular versus Chameleons | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3630.175 | 1687 | - | | - | .578 | - | |
| Family | 3631.940 | 1691 | 1.765 | 7 | NS | .579 | .001 | |
| Friends and School | 3636.083 | 1691 | 5.908 | 4 | NS | .578 | .000 | |
| Friends | 3637.601 | 1692 | 7.426 | 5 | NS | .578 | .000 | |
| Peer Deviance | 3639.827 | 1694 | 9.652 | 7 | NS | .578 | .000 | |
| Peer Relational | 3637.947 | 1694 | 7.772 | 7 | NS | .578 | .000 | |

Table 4.30 – Invariance Tests for Emotional Deviance

| Unconstrained Measures | χ^2 | Df | $\Delta \chi^2$ | Δdf | Р | CFI | Δ CFI | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|------|-------------------|---------|---------------|------|-------|--|--|
| Out-Crowd versus In-Crowd | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3275.476 | 1687 | - | - | _ | .534 | _ | | |
| Family | 3282.617 | 1691 | 7.141 | 7 | NS | .533 | .001 | | |
| School | 3278.712 | 1691 | 3.236 | 4 | NS | .534 | .000 | | |
| Friends | 3284.538 | 1692 | 9.062 | 5 | NS | .533 | .001 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3284.663 | 1694 | 9.187 | 7 | NS | .534 | .000 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3286.519 | 1694 | 11.043 | 7 | NS | .533 | .001 | | |
| | Out-Crowd versus Smart-and-Popular | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3577.299 | 1687 | - | - | - | .593 | - | | |
| Family | 3578.759 | 1691 | 1.460 | 7 | NS | .594 | .001 | | |
| School | 3583.016 | 1691 | 5.717 | 4 | NS | .593 | .000 | | |
| Friends | 3583.703 | 1692 | 6.404 | 5 | NS | .593 | .000 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3583.966 | 1694 | 6.667 | 7 | NS | .593 | .000 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3587.379 | 1694 | 10.080 | 7 | NS | .593 | .000 | | |
| Out-Crowd versus Chameleons | | | | | | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3109.507 | 1687 | | - | - | .474 | - | | |
| Family | 3112.640 | 1691 | 3.133 | 7 | NS | .475 | .001 | | |
| School | 3115.842 | 1691 | 6.335 | 4 | NS | .473 | .001 | | |
| Friends | 3115.920 | 1692 | 6.413 | 5 | NS | .474 | .000 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3117.417 | 1694 | 7.910 | 7 | NS | .474 | .000 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3117.409 | 1694 | 7.902 | 7 | NS | .474 | .000 | | |
| | | | Smart-and- | Populai | r | r | • | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3643.167 | 1687 | - | - | - | .628 | - | | |
| Family | 3657.830 | 1691 | 14.664 | 7 | p<.05 | .626 | .002 | | |
| School | 3653.029 | 1691 | 9.862 | 4 | p<.05 | .627 | .001 | | |
| Friends | 3657.558 | 1692 | 14.391 | 5 | p<.01 | .626 | .002 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3659.865 | 1694 | 16.698 | 7 | p<.05 | .626 | .002 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3658.774 | 1694 | 15.607 | 7 | p<.05 | .627 | .001 | | |
| | | | us Chamele | eons | T | | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3310.695 | 1687 | - | - | - | .512 | - | | |
| Family | 3325.941 | 1691 | 15.246 | 7 | p<.05 | .509 | .003 | | |
| School | 3335.565 | 1691 | 24.870 | 4 | p<.001 | .509 | .003 | | |
| Friends | 3333.373 | 1692 | 22.678 | 5 | p<.01 | | .005 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3335.012 | 1694 | 22.317 | 7 | p<.01 | .507 | .005 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3335.749 | | 25.054 | | p<.001 | .507 | .005 | | |
| Diversity Effective (DE) | Smart-and- | | versus <i>Cna</i> | meieoi | | F02 | | | |
| Direct Effects (DE) | 3593.555 | 1687 | 10.004 | | - NC | .582 | - 001 | | |
| Family | 3603.649 | 1691 | 10.094 | 7 | NS n c 001 | .581 | .001 | | |
| Friends and School | 3615.908 | 1691 | 22.353 | 4 | p<.001 | .578 | .004 | | |
| Friends | 3628.889 | 1692 | 35.334 | 5 | p<.001 | .576 | .006 | | |
| Peer Deviance | 3630.395 | 1694 | 36.840 | 7 | p<.001 | .569 | .013 | | |
| Peer Relational | 3630.535 | 1694 | 36.980 | 7 | p<.001 | .569 | .013 | | |

Taken as a whole, these findings provide support for the fourth hypothesis. In general, it appears that when the predictors of deviance are considered, adolescents within the middle-class drift into subcultural identities when among peers and not when with family.

5. Discussion

5.1 Introduction

The above analyses were for the purpose of identifying adolescent subcultural identities among middle-class youths, and relating them to reported deviance. The first task of the research was to identify if youths belonged to one or more adolescent subcultures, and the extent to which they stressed their individuality or non-group identity. The research then asked whether middle-class adolescents in different subcultures expressed themselves with unique forms of deviance. Finally, the analysis closed by expanding on the questions asked previously. By examining subcultural identity and deviance the researcher attempted to discover whether middle-class adolescents drift between subcultural and mainstream identities based on the life domain they are in. In other words, are middle-class adolescents more or less likely to express their subcultural identities when with family or peers?

5.2 Adolescent Subcultural Identity within the Middle-Class

The results of the analysis generally confirm that adolescents will report having multiple subcultural identities while simultaneously stressing their individuality. This is in line with the findings of scholars within the post-subcultural perspective. Specifically, it appears that the traditional concept of subculture is valid, although it needs a bit of tweaking. In other words, no evidence of tight, Mertonian subcultures was found in the current analysis. Instead, it appears that adolescents—whether given categories to choose from or free reign to identify themselves—avoid being labeled as belonging to a single group.

Few adolescents affiliated with a single subcultural identification. This was best illustrated in the quantitative data. Even when using Mertonian-like measurements (i.e., tight definitions of subcultural identity), the vast majority of respondents identified with multiple groups, while at the same time stressing their individuality. This was also seen in

the qualitative data, particularly when musical tastes were examined. Although many of the authors reported listening to a specific type of music, all of the authors included at least one example of a musical style or specific act that fell outside this dominant category. Thus, it appears that adolescents are drawing on mainstream and subcultural groups as reference points from which to stake their identities. Interestingly, these findings do not support concepts introduced by the British subculturalists discussed in the second chapter. For example, using the terminology developed by Hebdige (1984), bricolage (borrowing and reinventing artifacts) is not occurring. Furthermore, multiple and conflicting styles indicates that homology (the use of musical tastes to inform subcultural norms) is not present in modern, middle-class subcultures. However, it is possible that homology is used with the dominant musical interest of the respondent while the remaining music is simply enjoyed at a shallow level.

While these results do not support the British perspective, it is important to recall that these researchers were analyzing working-class adolescents in Britain, while the current research examined middle-class adolescents in America. Therefore, all that can be said is that the theories of the British perspective cannot be applied to the current sample. Instead, Polhemus' (1996) concept of 'style surfing' appears to be more appropriate. Specifically, the adolescents in both the qualitative and quantitative samples had no problem identifying with several subcultures. However, "surfing", with its images of moving from one wave to another, suggests a progression. In other words, the adolescent moves forward, from one subcultural identity to another. This says nothing of holding multiple identities simultaneously, or perhaps something along the line of 'style straddling', which is exactly what was found in the current research.

Another pattern, similar to the one just discussed, revealed itself when examining what could be considered null categories of subcultural identity —"individual" and "average". In the former case, the individual see him/herself as independent from any group, be it

subcultural or mainstream, while the latter category can be seen as a proclamation of membership within the mainstream. There were measures of these concepts present in both the quantitative and qualitative data sets, and similar results were found. Specifically, while many adolescents identified with belonging to one or more subcultures, a majority presented some evidence for being seen as independent and/or average. Perhaps the most interesting subgroups within the quantitative data were those found in the overlap—i.e., those who identified themselves as an individual and/or average while also claiming to be part of a subcultural group. There are three possible ways to view these findings. First, the individuals may be unaware of their multiple group identities. However, since the quantitative survey asked respondents about identity in various groups during a single session, it is unlikely that they would have been unaware of these conflicts. Second, respondents may not see all of these as identities. Although they may invoke certain characteristics of these subcultures (e.g. its music, fashion, language, etc.) it may not influence who they are. In other words, they may be interested in some aspects of these subcultures, but they may not actually identify with them. Finally, the respondent does not see a conflict with multiple identifies, even if some of those identities would appear to be in conflict with one another. In other words, these subcultural identities may not necessarily co-exist at the same time. Instead, the individual may switch between them as needed. This is similar to the argument postulated by Arnold (1970), though he takes it even further by suggesting that subcultures (at least the ones found among middle-class youth) are not significantly different from the mainstream culture and have "few or no truly unique elements, but only variant patterns" (p. 84). Therefore, adolescents do not have multiple identities—just multiple expressions of the same identity.

However, these findings also vary from some of the thoughts presented by postsubcultural theorists. For example, Muggleton (2000) argues that "[s]ubcultural styles have two options: they can feed off of each other in a cannibalistic orgy of cross-fertilization, destroying their own internal boundaries in the process; or indulge... in stylistic revivalism" (p. 44). In other words, Muggleton believes that modern adolescent subcultures may have become so diluted by borrowing from one another as to no longer exist or they may simply be borrowing from past styles and therefore have no distinct identity. The findings of the current research suggest this lack of distinct identity.

5.2 The Role of Deviance in Middle-Class Adolescent Subcultures

The findings of the bivariate analyses of subcultural identity and deviance within the quantitative data clearly demonstrate that not all adolescent subcultural identities are created equal. In fact, there is a great deal of diversity in the forms of deviance individuals with varying subcultural identities will use to express themselves. For example, more than half (10 out of 14) of the subcultural identities examined had a unique deviance pattern. This finding remained when the subcultural identities were aggregated into four general groups. This is even more impressive when one considers that aggregated measures of deviance were used, and therefore, there were fewer categories of deviance to distinguish between subcultural identities. Based on these findings, deviance can be said to play various roles in adolescent subcultural identities in the middle class.

The analysis also relates to Hagan's (1991) finding distinguishing the subculture of delinquency from a party subculture. In his examination, deviance was the defining characteristic of a subculture so that those in the subculture of delinquency were placed in that category if they had committed specific acts of delinquency, while those in the party subculture were placed there if they admitted to partying. In contrast, the current research related self-selected subcultural identities to specific forms of deviance. The findings suggest that Hagan's grouping of subcultural affiliations is tautological and narrow. Specifically, by analyzing delinquent behavior as the basis of subcultural membership, Hagan ignored the possibility that these behaviors (delinquency and partying) are actually

expressions of the subcultures. In addition, by relating only two behaviors in the creation of subcultural boundaries, Hagan may have obfuscated the existence of multiple subcultures that may actually be guite distinct from one another.

When only the deviance measure of delinquency and partying are examined in the current research, preps, airheads and in-crowd-ers could be placed into the party subculture and the losers, burnouts, hoods, punks, rebels and headbangers could be placed into the subculture of delinquency. However, once substance use and emotional deviance are considered, these groupings fall apart. For example, in Hagan's (1991) conceptualization, preps and airheads could belong to the party subculture. However, when the measure of emotional deviance is included, a significant difference appears. Specifically, while both groups are more likely to party, preps are less likely to commit acts of emotional deviance while airheads are more likely. In other words, both groups are likely to go to house parties, drink and engage in sexual intercourse, but airheads are more emotionally troubled with an increased likelihood of thoughts of running away and attempting suicide. This is especially important when one considers that preps are significantly less like to be emotionally troubled. This difference is probably best understood when one considered the connotation these labels carries. For example, both preps and airheads are likely to be part of the global In-Crowd of adolescent culture (as can be seen in the discussion of the creation of the aggregate subcultures). However, where they diverge is in judgments regarding intelligence. Airheads are considered flighty, unintelligent and superficial while preps are considered focused, intelligence, and socially capable. This indicates that there are some significant differences between these two groups. So, while they may be grouped together, as in Hagan's (1991) party subculture or Thornton's (1995) club-culture, they are actually distinct subcultural identities.

The two null categories of *individual* and *average* within the quantitative data set reveal that *individuals* are no more or less likely to commit any of the four measured forms

of deviance, while those who identify themselves are average are significantly less likely to party and more likely to consider committing acts of emotional deviance. This suggests that these categories are, in fact, measuring two different identities. Specifically, it would seem that an *individual* identity is neutral while an average identity might be seen as somewhat negative. For example, these findings would suggest that those who see themselves as average are less likely to go to house parties, drink, and engage in sexual intercourse while being more likely to think about running away and attempting suicide. Similar to Thornton's (1995) and other post-subculturalists' conceptualization, modern adolescents do not want to appear average. This also appears to be similar to the British school's vision of 'dynamic' subcultures. While it cannot be said whether all youth cultures are actually 'dynamic', it can be said that adolescents do imbue dynamism with a positive aspect.

These findings clearly indicate that it is important for researchers to delve further into the use of distinct forms of deviance as unique expressions of subcultural identity. Specifically, future research should examine the role of individual forms of deviance within different subcultures. This could be achieved through survey methods as well as qualitative interviews of subcultural members.

5.3 Publicity of Delinquency

Nearly all forms of subcultural theory, be it Mertonian, the British, or post-subcultural, are formed on the basic concept that interaction within the subculture is dynamic and there is a direct relationship between status and delinquency. Since Matza's (1964) intriguing reference to the power of "storytelling" within the subculture of delinquency, there has been little investigation on the publicity of delinquency. Therefore, the current research attempted to explore two related issues: how the increased popularity of indirect communication via the internet has affected this phenomenon (i.e., to determine if adolescents have taken their storytelling to a new venue), and the tone in which

delinquency is publicized. If, as most subcultural theorists would argue, delinquency (or, at least, stories of delinquency) is traded for status, one would expect adolescents to speak of this behavior in generally positive terms.

The findings show that adolescents do, in fact, use personal webpages to publicize their delinquency. In this sample, publicized delinquency generally toke the form of relatively minor acts surrounding substance use. By far, the most common form of delinquency was alcohol use, with marijuana use being a close second. Interestingly, the prevalence of the publicity of both of these acts was almost exactly half the prevalence of these acts as reported in the quantitative data. If these figures are accurate, they suggest that in middle-class areas, half of the adolescents who drink alcohol or use marijuana, speak of their actions on personal webpages. This is an even more impressive figure when one considers the fact that only public webpages were analyzed. It would be interesting to see how this figure would change if private webpages were analyzed. However, it is important to note that these figures are based on equating two different samples and an assumption that they are both representative of the same population

The next step was to examine the tone with which adolescents spoke about delinquency on their webpages and, more importantly, what this said about their subcultural identity. The findings revealed that the general tone used by the authors when discussing delinquency was normalizing and entertaining. In other words, the majority of adolescents who publicized these forms of delinquency appeared to regard the behavior as normal and exciting.

This normalizing and entertaining tone appears to be in line with Matza's (1961, 1964) conceptualization of the subculture of delinquency. When relating future plans, most authors focused on the excitement of the delinquency. In other words, when planning on getting drunk or high, most of the authors described the fun of the behavior. This most closely resembles Matza's and Sykes (1961) subterranean value of "adventure". However, when the authors spoke of past events, they used terms and phrases that accentuated the

normalcy of this behavior. This change in tone could be an example of the authors' attempts to neutralize the behavior. In other words, although the behavior can be fun, exciting, and illegal, it is, at the same time, normal adolescent behavior.

This attempt to normalize delinquency appears to contradict Thornton's (1995) concept of subcultural status. Specifically, Thornton argues that adolescents use their expert-knowledge of certain topics to gain status within the group. This would suggest that if delinquency were a status-imbuing action, the authors would be more likely to brag about their experiences and therefore less likely to normalize it. This is not to say that Thornton's conceptualization of subcultural status is invalid or incompatible with Matza's (1964) subculture of delinquency. Instead, these findings simply suggest that publicizing delinquency does not follow the same path as publicizing specialized knowledge. It is possible that delinquency and specialized knowledge serve two different but related purposes within adolescent subcultures. While specialized knowledge may serve to increase one's status within the subculture, delinquency may simply serve as a means of announcing one's membership within the subculture, with no special status-imbuing power. This would explain why adolescents brag about specialized-knowledge while simply seeing delinquency in a positive light. Unfortunately, not enough data are available to test this hypothesis in the current research; therefore, this is something that should be considered in future research. This could be accomplished through interviews with youth as well as surveys that ask about subcultural identities, status, delinquency and specialized knowledge.

5.4 Adolescent Subcultural Drift within the Middle-Class

The Mertonian school argues that subcultural identity is universal and therefore does not drift across the various life domains. The adolescent is expected to act the same whether he or she is with parents, with peers, or at school. If this were true, one would not expect any patterns to develop in the relationship between the variables and the measures of deviance analyzed in the current research. In other words, because deviance is being

examined, the route within each life domain should be the same for all adolescents, regardless of their subcultural affiliation—because it is not their relationship with peers or with parents that predicts deviance, but rather their relationship with the greater culture. If this were true, the findings for the various subcultures in the current research would have been the same. However, this was not the case. Once again, then, the research does not provide support for the Mertonian school of thought. Instead, Matza's (1964) conceptualization of drift is clearly supported.

Matza (1964) argues that drift in subcultural identity is more likely to occur in the company of peers. Specifically, adolescents are more likely to drift into their subcultural identities when among peers. Therefore, applying the logic behind Matza's argument to the quantitative methods of SEM, one would expect to find variability only within the life domains where subcultural identification is rewarded. In other words, the variables within the family domain that predict deviance among adolescents should not vary between subcultures because this life domain should not be connected to the subculture. Therefore, these variables should affect all adolescents equally regardless of their subcultural affiliation. Support for this prediction was fairly strong. Specifically, of the 24 comparisons between subcultural identities of the family domain in predicting the measures of deviance, only four were significantly different.

These findings indicate that drift is not occurring within the family domain. The researcher also examined the peer and school domains. There was no clear finding regarding the school domain. Within the peer domain, however, support for subcultural drift was found. Specifically, of the 48 comparisons between subcultural identities of the variables in the peer domain in predicting deviance, nearly half (21) were significantly different. Unfortunately, there is not enough data to clearly dissect the individual differences. In other words, it is difficult to find a distinct pattern of how the relationship between peers and deviance differ across the various subcultural identities. However, what

can be said is that they do differ. This is an important finding when Matza's argument of drift is considered. Taken as a whole, these findings clearly demonstrate that members of middle-class adolescent subcultures drift in and out of their subcultural identities based on the situation they find themselves. Future research should build on these findings. It would be particularly helpful to use larger sample sizes, as these will allow researchers to examine these differences more fully so that these researchers can begin to understand the specific adolescent middle-class subcultures and the effects identity might have on deviance when in the company of peers.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary

At the beginning of this investigation the researcher set out to gain a better understanding of middle-class adolescent subcultural identities. The first step was to determine if these identities even exist. Using qualitative and quantitative data, the subcultural preferences of two samples of middle-class adolescents were examined. What was found was a picture of middle-class adolescents similar to that painted by the post-subcultural school. Specifically, when examining both qualitative and quantitative data sets it was found that these adolescents do appear to congregate around certain demarcations that place them in distinct groups; however, these demarcations are porous and non-exclusionary. In other words, middle-class adolescents often identify with more than one subculture. Finally, in contrast to Mertonian subcultural theories, these identities are actually quite heterogeneous. While there may be distinct norms, values, and artifacts that are common within a specific subcultural identity, there is still quite a bit of room for these adolescents to embrace their individuality.

The findings of the quantitative analysis also support some of the other tenets of the post-subcultural school. Specifically, the popularity of the *independent* category suggests that adolescents do stress their individuality while also identifying with different groups. Additionally, the findings indicate that adolescents have no difficulty identifying with more than one subculture. In fact, identification with multiple subcultures appears to be the norm among middle-class adolescents.

However, the findings did not entirely support the post-subcultural image of subcultures. Specifically, when provided a fixed-response question about identity labels, adolescents did willingly place themselves into categories. The term 'willingly' is used because respondents were provided with null category options. In other words, if

adolescents truly did not associate their identity with any subcultures, one would expect them to identify with the 'individual' and/or 'average' categories and not any of the remaining choices. Nonetheless, the triangulation of the qualitative and quantitative data shows that middle-class adolescent subcultures do exist and their structure appears to be closer to that proposed by the post-subcultural school than that set forth by the Mertonian school. However, these subcultures are not tightly formed and membership within them does not preclude identification with multiple subcultures, the mainstream or individuality.

The next step in the analysis was to determine the role of delinquency in middleclass subcultures. The majority of recent subcultural examinations can be found within the fields of sociology and cultural studies, and thus the topic of delinquency has not been given much attention. The few theorists who have examined delinquency within modern subcultures tend to group adolescents in one or two subcultures, such as Hagan's (1991) examination of the party subculture and the subculture of delinquency. The findings from the quantitative data, on the other hand, indicate that finer distinctions may be needed when considering the relationship between subcultural identities and delinquency. For example, although it was found that the predictors of deviance tend to be very similar for some subcultural identities (such as punks, headbangers, rebels, and hoods) deviance appears to have more unique causes among the remaining identities. This is perhaps most clearly demonstrated when the researcher examined two identities that could be found within Hagan's party subculture: the in-crowd and air-heads. While both had a similar connection to partying variables (hence Hagan's inclusion of both in the party subculture), these two subcultural identities had opposite relationships to emotional deviance (such as running away and suicide attempts). More specifically, identifying with the *in-crowd* group is negatively related to emotional deviance while identifying with the air-head group is positively related. This indicates that while these two identities are closely related, there are also some unique qualities that distinguish them from each other. Further, these findings

suggest that researchers should bring delinquency back into subcultural studies, as this type of behavior can be seen as an expression of unique norms and values.

The importance of delinquency in middle-class adolescent subcultures leads the researcher to question how it is communicated among the subcultures' members. Matza (1964), one of the earliest theorists to discuss this relationship, argued that it is the publicity of this delinquency that is more important than the actual act of delinquency. In other words, the credit given (or taken) for the action is more important than the action itself. This is an important phenomenon, but one that is difficult to examine firsthand. However, using content analysis of personal webpages, the researcher was able to demonstrate the publication of delinquency—in particular, a large portion of the sample discussed alcohol and substance use. More importantly, the researcher was able to examine the tone in which these actions were discussed. In general, members of the sample attributed excitement and entertainment to these actions. Recall that excitement and entertainment are subterranean values first discussed by Sykes and Matza (1961). Thus, it appears that middle-class adolescents are discussing their delinquency by stressing the excitement and entertainment of this behavior.

After examining how delinquency is communicated within middle-class adolescent subcultures, the researcher examined whether middle-class adolescents drift in and out of subcultural identities based on the situation they are in. The most important finding of this analysis was that for the most part, the effects of the variables within the family domain on the various measures of deviance did not vary between subcultures. However, for these same subcultures, the effects on these forms of deviance did vary within the peer and school domains. In other words, while subcultural identity does have an impact on the correlates of deviance within peer and school domains, the effect of subcultural identity within the family domain is negligible. This demonstrates, as was hypothesized, that subcultural members can drift in and out of this identity based on who they are with.

When taken together, these findings paint an intriguing picture of middle-class adolescent subcultures. In particular, they seem to suggest that the average adolescent residing in a middle-class neighborhood identifies with multiple subcultures while at the same time stressing his or her individuality. In addition, the adolescent drifts in and out of these subcultural identities based on the life domain he or she is in. Finally, deviance—most commonly the consumption of alcohol and marijuana—is communicated by the subcultures' members as was demonstrated by the behavior's publicity.

6.2 Limitations

As with any social science research, there are certain limitations that prevent the researcher from presenting more momentous conclusions. In particular, there were limitations within the data, both qualitative and quantitative, that impacted the findings of the current research. There were two major limitations of the qualitative analysis. First, the methods used did not allow the researcher to gather a truly representative sample of adolescents with personal webpages. As was discussed previously, only webpages that were set to 'public' were included in the sample. While the major hypotheses of this research were confirmed, it did not allow the researcher to examine subcultural identity and the publicity of delinquency among adolescents who set their webpages to private. It is likely that there is something fundamentally different about these two groups (i.e., adolescents with "public" versus "private" webpages). However, there is no way to determine what these differences are or if they impact the individual's likelihood to identify themselves as belonging to subcultural groups or to publicize their delinquency.

Second, only two individuals in the sample used specific subcultural definitions in their self-descriptions. Therefore, in order to create subcultural categories, the individuals' musical preferences were analyzed. This is a method that has been all but unused by American criminologists studying subcultures. In fact, since the British subcultural studies of

the 1970s and 80s, this method has nearly dropped out of subcultural research. The major argument against the use of this technique is that it may lead to arbitrary groupings of adolescents. In other words, the division between musical genres may not accurately represent divisions between adolescent subcultures. As the British subculturalists demonstrated in their work, for the 'dynamic' subcultures (such as *punks*) there is a clear connection between subcultural identity and musical preference. In fact, one cannot separate the two. However, for the remainder of adolescents who do not belong to these 'dynamic' subcultures, it may be difficult to create subcultures based on musical preference, as these preferences may not vary greatly between these groupings. In future research, therefore, it is suggested that musical preference be used as one of *many* indicators of subcultural identity. In doing so, researchers will be able to examine both the 'dynamic' and common subcultures among middle-class adolescents as well as determine the proper role of musical taste in subcultural research.

The major limitations of the quantitative data rest in three important areas: time ordering, sample size, and question design. First, as is always the case in cross-sectional research, researchers are unable to determine the causal ordering of the variables. For example, the current research cannot determine the origin of deviance within the subcultures examined. It is possible that individuals join a subculture based on their similarities on other norms, values and artifacts and deviance as a status enhancement develops out of this group. Conversely, these adolescents may have formed a subculture based on their mutual desire to commit certain forms of deviance. However, the purpose of this research was not to understand the formation of middle-class adolescent subculture. Instead, it was to determine whether subcultural identities exist and, if so, what is the role of delinquency. Therefore, the inability to determine time ordering of the variables did not prove to be a major roadblock in the research.

Second, as was seen in the later stages of analysis, certain subculture identities within the sample did not have large enough memberships to run more complex forms of quantitative analysis (i.e., SEM). This forced the researcher to collapse these subcultural identities into larger collections which, while providing very interesting findings, did not allow for all of the questions to be addressed as originally posed. It would have been desirable to have a larger sample size so that the effect of subcultural identities within the various life domains could have been examined for all fourteen subcultural groups. In addition, the number of members within the four subcultures examined (In-Crowd, Out-Crowd, Smart-and-Popular, and Chameleons) were relatively small. This led to some issues when examining the model fit for each SEM model. Specifically, because of the relatively small sample size, it was extremely difficult to meet the suggested cutoff points for all four models. However, because these cutoffs are only suggested levels, it was decided to continue with the analysis. It is important to keep in mind, therefore, that the findings cannot be seen as absolute proof of drift among adolescent, middle-class subcultures. That being said, the fact that even with relatively small sample sizes the findings seemed to support the hypothesis regarding drift, highlights the need for additional research into this topic.

Third, the survey from which the quantitative data were drawn was not constructed with the analysis of subcultural identity and drift in mind. However, for the most part, this did not prove to be an issue. For example, the researcher was able to clearly distinguish between subcultural identities as well as examine the relationship between the major life domains and several forms of deviance. The only question that could not be addressed using these data was the amount and form of publicity that occurs within these subcultures. While the analysis of the qualitative data permitted an examination of this question, it would have been favorable to triangulate these findings with quantitative data. For example, survey questions about what respondents discuss in peer groups could have shed some light

on the relationship between deviance and publicity within subcultural identities. In addition, a stronger measure of emotional deviance could have been included. The measure in the survey examines *thoughts* of role-exit behavior. It is important to also consider how actual role-exit behavior (such as running away and suicide attempts) is related to the various subcultures.

6.3 Future Directions

The current research has shown that middle-class adolescent subcultural identities provide a fertile ground for investigation within the field of criminal justice and sociology. In particular, there are three areas upon which future research should seek to expand. First, further exploration of subcultural identities among middle-class adolescents is needed. This population can be studied using the same methods that have been popular within subcultural analysis for the past several decades (i.e., case studies and participant observation). As discussed previously, these methods have not often been used in studies of middle-class adolescents. For researchers to paint a clear picture of this phenomenon, this must change. By doing so, researchers will be able to gain an understanding of how these subcultural identities form, how adolescents move between identities, the role of delinquency and other norms, and how these identities are actually applied within the various life domains.

Second, the role of delinquency within adolescent subcultures needs to be better understood. Specifically, researchers need to determine if delinquency leads to status within these groups, and if so, whether the amount of status gained differs depending on the form of deviance. Unfortunately, this topic could not be addressed in the current research, due to limitations in the data. Additionally, researchers need a better understanding of how this transaction occurs. Anderson, (1999) in his book "Code of the Streets" discusses the role delinquency plays in the subcultures of many urban areas. However, with respect to the

middle-class, subcultural theorists have taken this delinquency-status relationship for granted. The next step is to investigate the intricacies of this phenomenon. The current research has demonstrated that the publicity of these actions does occur among middle-class subculture members. Therefore, researchers need to determine if deviance is being traded for status within the subculture.

Finally, recent theories of adolescent subcultures seem to indicate that the members' identification with these groups is dynamic and can vary across life domains. The current research confirms this. However, because of the relatively small sample size, the researcher was only able to examine large groupings of adolescents. The next step is to gather larger samples so that researchers can use advanced quantitative methods to examine more specific groupings of adolescents. This will allow researchers to better understand how the form of the subculture may influence the adolescent's ability to drift in and out of his or her subcultural identity. In other words, it is possible that certain subcultural identifications change as the adolescent moves across life domains. This is a question that could be addressed with a larger sample size. By answering these questions, researchers can begin to understand how middle-class adolescents interact with one another and some of the correlates and explanations of their delinquent behavior.

Bibliography

- Altheide, D. (1996). Qualitative media analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Anderson, E. (2000). *Code of the street: decency, violence, and the moral life of the inner city* W. W. Norton & Company
- Arnold, D. O. (1970). Subculture marginality. In D. O. Arnold (Ed.), *The sociology of subcultures* (pp. 81-89). Berkeley, CA: Glendessary
- Bennett, A. (1999). Subcultures or neo-tribes: Rethinking the relationship between youth, style, and musical taste. *Sociology*, *33*(3), 599-617.
- ----- & Kahn-Harris, K. (2004). Introduction. In A. Bennett & K. Kahn-Harris (Eds.), After subculture (pp. 1-20). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Berger, B. M. (1963). On the youthfulness of youth cultures. Social Research, 30, 319-342.
- Boyd, D. (Ed.). (2008). Why youth [heart] social networking sites: The role of networked publics in teenage social life. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- ------ & Ellison, Nicole (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. Journal of Computer Mediated Communication, 13(1), article 11
- Brake, M. (1985). Comparative youth culture. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Breivik, E. & Olsson, U.H. (2001). Adding variables to improve fit: The effects of model size on fit assessment in LISREL. In R. Cudeck, S. Du Toit, & D. Sorbom (Eds.), Structural equation modeling: Present and future. A Festchrift in honor of Karl Joreskog (pp. 169-194). Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Browne, M.W. & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K.A. Bollen and J.S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Brubaker, R., & Cooper, F. (2000). Beyond identity. Theory and Society, 29, 1-47
- Bury, R. (2003). 'The X-Files', online fan culture, and the David Duchovny Estrogen Brigades. In D. Muggleton & R. Weinzierl (Eds.), *The post-subcultures reader* (pp. 269-283). New York, NY: Berg.
- Cagle, V. M. (1989). The language of cultural studies: An analysis of British subcultural theory. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, *10*, 301-313.
- Chaney, D. (2004). Fragmented culture and subcultures. In A. Bennett & K. Kahn-Harris (Eds.), *After subculture* (pp. 36-48). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cheung, G.W. & Rensvold, R.B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural equation modeling*, 9, 233-255
- Clarke, G. (1990). Defending ski-jumpers: A critique of theories of youth subcultures. In Firth & Goodwin (Eds.), *On record*. London: Routledge

- Clarke, J. (1976). Style. In S. Hall & T. Jefferson (Eds.), *Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain* (pp. 175-191). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Cliff, N (1983). Some cautions concerning the application of causal modeling methods. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 18, 115-126
- Cloward, R. A., & Ohlin, L. E. (1960). *Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Cohen, A. K. (1955). Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang. New York, NY: Free Press.
- ----- & Short, J. F. (1958). Research in delinquent sub-cultures. *Journal of Social Issues, 14*(3), 20-36.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gordon, M. M. (1947). The concept of the sub-culture and its application. *Social Forces, 26,* 40-42.
- Hagan, J. (1988) Structural criminology. Cambridge: Polity Press
- ----- (1991). Destiny and drift: Subcultural preferences, status attainment, and the risks and rewards of youth. *American Sociological Review, 56*, 567-582.
- Hawkes, T. (1977). Structuralism and semiotics. London: Methuen.
- Hebdige, D. (1984). Subculture: The meaning of style. London: Methuen.
- Hodkinson, P. (2005). Communicating goth: Online media. In Gelder K (ed.), *The subcultures reader*, second edition. London: Routledge
- ------ & Deicke, W. (Eds.). (2007). *Youth cultures: Scenes, subcultures, and tribes*: London: Routledge.
- Hoelter, J.W. Factoral invariance and self-esteem: Reassessing race and sex differences, *Social Forces*, 1983, 61(3), 835-846
- Jenks, C. (2004). Subculture: The fragmentation of the social Sage.
- Khan-Harris, K. (2000). Roots?: The relationship between the global and the local within the Extreme Metal scene. *Popular Music*, 19(1), 13-30.
- Kline, R.B. (2001). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. New York. NY: The Guilford Press
- Kornhauser, R.R. (1977). Social sources of delinquency: An appraisal of analytic models. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press
- Lenhart, A., & Madden, M. (2007). Teens, privacy, and online social networks: How teens manage their online identities and personal information in the age of MySpace. *Pew Internet & American Life Project, April 18, 2007*

- Maffesoli, M. (1996). In the time of tribes: Sage.
- Maruyama, G. M. (1998). Basics of structural equation modeling. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Matza, D. (1961). Subterranean traditions of youths. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *378*, 116.
- ---- (1964). Delinquency and drift. New York, NY: Wiley.
- ------ & Sykes, G. (1961). Juvenile delinquency and subterranean values. *American Sociological Review*, 26, 712-719.
- Meade, A.W., Johnson, E.C. & Braddy, P.W. (2008). Power and sensitivity of alternative fit indices in test of measurement invariance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 568-592.
- Merton, R. (1938). Social structure and anomie. American Sociological Review, 3, 672-682.
- Miles, S. (2000). Youth lifestyles in a changing world. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Miller, W. B. (1958). Lower-class as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues, 14*, 5-19.
- Muggleton, D. (2000). *Inside subculture: The postmodern meaning of style*. New York: Berg/NYU.
- Nunnally, J.C. & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Polhemus, T. (1996). *Style surfing, what to wear in the 3rd millennium* New York, NY: Thames and Hudson.
- Prescott, L. (Producer). (2007, November 12, 2008) Hitwise US Consumer Generated Media Report. retrieved from http://www.hitwise.com
- Redhead, S. (1990). *The end-of-the-century party: Youth and pop towards 2000*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Reimer, B. (1995). Youth and modern lifestyle. In J. Fornas & G. Bolin (Eds.), *Youth culture in late modernity* London: Sage.
- Reuters. (2006). MySpace gains top ranking of US web sites. USA Today, July 11th, 2006
- Roszak, T. (1968). The making of a counter culture. Berkeley University of California Press.
- Sykes, G., & Matza, D. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review, 22*, 664-670.
- Thelwall, M. (2008). Social networks, gender and friending: An analysis of MySpace member profiles. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59(8), 1321-1330.

- Thornton, S. (1995). Club cultures: Music media and subcultural capital: Wesleyan
- Thrasher, F. (1927). The gang. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ueno, T. (2003). Unlearning to raver: Techno-party as the contact zone in trans-local formations. In D. Muggleton & R. Weinzierl (Eds.), *The post-subcultures reader* (pp. 101-118). New York, NY: Berg.
- Wattenberg, B. J. (1974). Chapter 19: The new culture/youth *The real America* (pp. 257-271). Garden City, NJ: Doubleday.
- Whyte, W. F. (1955). Street corner society. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Willis, P. (1977). Learning to labour. London: Saxon House.
- Wilson, B., & Atkinson, M. (2005). Rave and straightedge, the virtual and the real: Exploring online and offline experiences in Canadian youth subcultures. *Youth and Society*, *36*, 276-311.
- Wolfgang, M., & Ferracuti, F. (1967). *The subculture of violence: Towards an integrated theory in criminology*. London: Tavistock.