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Abstract of Dissertation

When it comes to the basic perspectives on personal and social reality, it is commonly assumed that these perspectives are learned within the parent-child relationship. As a result, the family has been typically accorded a place of primary importance the explanation of socialisation. But another influence has been lurking in the background - the mass media.

Media influence upon children has generally been assumed to be significant, with powerful, long lasting consequences. However, traditional explanatory attempts have predominantly dealt with the effects of media violence on juvenile behaviour. The result has been a relative neglect of empirical analysis of media socialisation as it relates to delinquent behaviour, a matter that the present study attempted to rectify. The present study proposes that the media's commitment to conformity varies in degree of congruence with societal expectations and this variation is directly transmitted to the child influencing the child's behaviour.
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Chapter 1

Introduction:
The Role of Mass Media Socialisation in Juvenile Delinquency

1.1 Introduction

Childhood and adolescence are formative stages of development during which the child is shaped both personally and socially, and acquires the standards of society, which will influence his or her thoughts, feelings and actions. It is the prime period for the formal inculcation of social values, which are the determinants of virtually all social behaviours and which have far-reaching effects on all human endeavours (Rokeach 1973:23). Dominant values influence beliefs and attitudes, and are reflected in behaviour and/or lifestyle (Goff & Gordinard 1999:48). Childhood is a period of information-seeking where the focus lies on defining the world, and when multiple transitions occur. With these rapid changes come a heightened potential for both positive and negative outcomes (Carlo, Fabes, Laible & Kupanoff 1999:133). That which occurs during this stage of development often remains fixed later on in life.

Living in a media-saturated world, the media has become an integral part of everyday life and children are spending between 35 – 55 hours per week on the different forms of media (Strasburger 1995:2). When one considers the amount of time children spend in the presence of the media, and their capacity to give themselves over completely to the world created by the media (Roberts & Schramm 1971:603), one cannot ignore the influence that this must be exerting on their development. The media exposes them to a world far beyond their immediate experience, presenting attitudes and values different from those of their family and in quantities far greater than available first hand (Roberts & Schramm 1971:596). Research has shown that excessive time spent in unorganised, unsupervised activities tends to introduce opportunities in which adolescents bond with antisocial values, consequently leading to delinquency (Yin, Katims & Zapata 1999:170). With
this constant exposure to media influence, it is not surprising that the question most often asked when a child behaves in a deviant or criminal manner is: what role did the media play?

Traditional research has focused on the effects of violent media content on juvenile behaviour. Separate studies have concluded that media violence facilitates aggression and antisocial behaviour (Strasburger 1995, Shaffer 1994, Baron & Byrne 1994, and Sege 1998). Most studies have focused on the priming effects, the issue of arousal, decreasing inhibition and modelling. Decades of research examining the relationship between exposure to media violence and childhood violence have neglected studies into the other areas of the media's impact. This study examines another aspect of media influence – namely that of its values. It attempts to demonstrate an association between the values the media portrays and juvenile delinquency. The role of personal values in explaining human behaviour has been of interest to social scientists for many years but the focus has primarily been on the family. Little has been done on the media's role of value inculcation, although several theories have suggested that youth crime may be related to values adopted as guiding principles that result in deviant self-images (Goff & Goddard 1999:47).

1.2 Rationale

“Fifteen-year-old attacks forty-four-year-old man in Butterworth”; “Twelve-year-old rapes seven-year-old girl in Burgersdorp”; “Sixteen-year-old murders twenty-five-year-old near Qumbu” [Raash: 2002]. Headlines like these appear regularly in our newspapers and on an equally regular basis is the appearance of youths, some as young as seven, in our courts. In 1995/1996, 8% of all the convictions for serious offences were perpetrated by youths aged between 7 and 17, and 14% by young adults aged between 18 and 20 [CSS: 1998]. The Correctional Services Department Report of 2000 showed that at the end of March 2001 there were 26 688 juveniles aged between 7 and 20 in South African prisons, and of those 1912 were 16 years old or younger [DCS: 2000].

With virtually no statistics available, it is difficult to determine whether youth crime is on the increase in South Africa or not and, if so, at what rate. Dr Chris De Kok of the Crime Information Analysis Centre attributes this dearth of information to the non-requirement of the SAPS to fill in the perpetrator's age for statistical purposes, but he goes on to say that the age group 15 to 29 is the highest risk group for potential
criminals [Raash: 2002]. Though we may not have an accurate indication of the incidence of juvenile crime in South Africa, we need only to look at our newspapers to see that youth crime is one of the biggest problems facing our society and country today.

In the United States, the FBI attributed 17% of all arrests and 16% of all violent crimes to youths, and estimated that, in 1999, 2.5 million arrests were made of persons under the age of 18 [Snyder: 2000]. When one takes into account that childhood and adolescence are formative stages of development and that that which becomes anchored during this period has the potential to remain fixed later on in life (Muncie 1997:41), youth crime becomes an issue that requires urgent addressing. One way of addressing it, is to examine possible factors that contribute to the problem. By doing this, one gains an understanding of the dynamics at work and is then able to take the necessary steps to minimise the influence of these factors in the hope of reducing the incidence of this serious problem.

If part of our culture is criminogenic then it is expected that some will engage in delinquency and crime. Society and culture contribute more than any other factor to making us think, feel and behave as legal norm-violators, just as they do in all other roles we may play in life (Barron 1974:69). Donald Toff (1952) proposed that societies experienced the kind and scope of crime and delinquency that their own values provoked. This is supported by various researchers (Barron 1974, Hawkins 1996, Goff & Goddard 1999) who regard values that are informally and unsystematically inculcated in youth during the socialisation process as significant to youth crime. As early as the 1950's, criminologists conceded that the socialisation process is of importance in the prevention and causation of delinquency (Muncie 1999:209).

Socialisation is a complex and multi-determined process that teaches and reinforces the social behaviours that are acceptable in that specific society. It is the key determinant of behaviour and it is during this process that the norms, standards and values are transmitted, as is the social knowledge which individuals draw upon when deciding a course of action to pursue. Socialisation is more than the mere transmission of these norms and values. It is the process whereby the child's distinct self will emerge and an internal system of control develops (Horton & Hunt 1968:98). This internal system of control that develops, results in the ability to distinguish between right and wrong and the ability to act accordingly, while upholding the
social order (Schaffer 1996:290). The process is crucial for the well-being of the child and the well-being of the community of which that child is to be a citizen. The norms internalised become the basis of one’s moral system, vital in the development of morality. It has been noted that if the process is incomplete or negatively focused, socialisation can produce adolescents who feel little attachment to a law-abiding lifestyle (Segel & Senna 2000:165).

Part of socialisation entails the learning of how to cope with social situations and relationships in acceptable ways. The techniques needed to survive, function and thrive in society are taught, thereby preparing the individual for the effective handling of the life tasks of adulthood, guiding behaviour both directly and indirectly through the norms internalised and the influence of the various socialisation agents. Social institutions are responsible for the promoting of socialisation and any reinforcement received from the socialising agent is an important factor that increases the probability of affecting behaviour (Schickendanz, Schickendanz & Forsyth 1998:401). The socialisation process revolves around the modelling and imitation of the behaviour of significant others in the individual’s life, therefore the significant other is as important to the process as the process itself. The role of the socialising agents varies between societies as well as at different times during the individual’s life span, with communication playing a crucial role in the socialisation process. It is through communication that individuals receive, process, interpret and internalise the stimuli extracted from the socialisation agents.

Traditionally the family has been the child’s primary socialiser, with its role extended by the school, church/mosque/synagogue/temple and the larger community. These institutions, initially designed to help youth in the transition to adulthood, are now experiencing severe stress themselves and are becoming sources of risk. During the socialisation process the mass media forms one of the most important connections between societal and individual culture and its use is the means by which individuals internalise their shared sets of values (Rosengren & Reimer 1986:4). With the ever-increasing use of the media, the mass media has become like a “third parent”, influential in purveying social values and shaping the juvenile’s notions of the world. The media is increasingly fulfilling the functions previously performed by the family, school and religion. As a result the family, educational and religious systems are having less of an impact on value inculcation than previously. What is also occurring is that the different agents are socialising the
youth more and more in isolation from one another, creating conflicting norms and values, and having a profound effect on the way an individual behaves.

The Centerwall’s study on the comparison between homicide rates in the USA and South Africa when TV was introduced showed a 10 – 15 year elapse between the introduction of TV and the subsequent doubling in homicide and larceny rates (Strasburger 1995:20). These are the kind of findings one would expect to find if TV violence primarily affected children. The study’s findings are not surprising when one considers that one in ten TV characters are involved in violence in any given week (Vivian 91:300). Coupled with the fact that a child will see 800 murders and 100,000 acts of violence by the time he or she finishes primary school and double that by the time he or she finishes high school (Sege 1998:133), one is forced to consider the impact that media socialisation is having on our youth’s value systems, particularly in light of the fact that the media is playing a more significant role in the socialisation process because of its availability, accessibility, simplicity and persuasive ability. The mass media is a fast-paced medium that entertains, informs and stimulates without the individual stopping to consider that which is being presented.

Hawkins (1996:107) believed that antisocial tendencies could be increased by the internalisation of antisocial beliefs and attitudes. A tendency which is further increased when the individual is surrounded by antisocial models. It has also been determined that when observed behaviour is justified, it is more likely to cue modelling (Strasburger 1995:9). These two factors are of particular relevance when it comes to the media. Media heroes and villains randomly use violence as an acceptable means of achieving their goals, with crime and deceit often portrayed as normative behaviour. With the presentation of these kinds of models and justifications, is it no wonder that we are finding more and more juveniles modelling such behaviours? Deviant behaviour is a drawcard that attracts audiences and as a result it has become a focal point for most media coverage. Antisocial behaviour and values are portrayed and even glamorised in our films, computer games, music and newspapers.

The influence of the mass media is a contentious issue when it comes to juvenile behaviour. The nature and degree of media influence on juvenile behaviour has been extensively addressed at some time or other, with the bulk of decades of research focusing on the relationship between the exposure to media violence and
violent juvenile behaviour. Over 3000 studies have been done on the effects of TV violence alone [Moscovitch: 1998]. While the issue of media violence has been extensively investigated, the "third parent's" role as socialising agent has been overlooked. When one considers that the media is a significant source of values and that it has the ability to impact on the thoughts, feelings, and behaviour of individuals, the media's role in the inculcation of deviant values is of relevance if one is to fully understand how this social system has become increasingly a source of risk.

1.3 Research Problem

Psychologists, sociologists, and criminologists have stressed the importance of the socialisation process on the developing child. Sonnekus (1991:57) regarded socialisation as of cardinal importance in the prevention of juvenile delinquency and stated that if socialisation does not take place or is lacking, the juvenile may develop an antisocial personality and/or numerous forms of antisocial behaviour. When addressing socialisation, the focus has always been on the family's role and influence on the process but, with up to 55 hours per week being spent in the presence of the media, we should be looking at the media's role and influence on the process.

Central to the socialisation process is the internalisation of core values, which guide an individual's behaviour. Selnow's (1990) study of values in prime time TV found that 42.9% of values emerged without description and minimal behavioural expression, and that the underlying value can be inferred through observation by extracting for oneself the rule that governs the event. With values being so easily inferred from behaviour, it has been argued that media content is eroding a sense of values among its audiences (Selnow 1990:64), thereby contributing to the problem of delinquency.

This study proposes to investigate the association between media values and juvenile behaviour by examining the variation in the nature of the media's values and then examining how these values relate to the involvement in juvenile delinquency under the conditions of media-child value agreement and media-child value disagreement. This will be achieved by comparing:
(1) The mean delinquency score when the juvenile agrees with the media's stance on the antisocial values and the mean delinquency score when the juvenile disagrees with the media's stance on the antisocial value.

(2) The mean delinquency score when the juvenile agrees with the media's stance on the pro-social values and the mean delinquency score when the juvenile disagrees with the media's stance on the pro-social values.

It is believed that by comparing these four value stances an understanding of the media's role in differential socialisation will develop, thereby identifying one of the ways the media may unwittingly be contributing to juvenile delinquency.

The Differential Association Theory proposed that when definitions favourable to deviant behaviour exceed the frequency and intensity of definitions to conform, the probability of criminality increases (Muncie 1997:104). These definitions are values, which get transmitted from individual to individual and from generation to generation. Burgess's study of social disorganisation discovered that the value system of a person who lives in a delinquent area supports and even encourages delinquent and criminal behaviour (Kratcoski & Kratcoski 1990:53). The premise of the Social Process theorists is that criminals are socialised into the criminal world through the learning of values conducive to crime (Stevens 1990:333). All these theories highlight the role of values in delinquent behaviour.

The question that arises is: what happens when these values that are conducive to crime are brought into the home by the media? It is this question that the study will indirectly attempt to address. This by no means implies that the correlation between media socialisation and juvenile delinquency is linear or simplistic. The media functions among and through a combination of mediating factors and influences working together in a total situation. Some of the possible mediating factors will be mentioned in the study, though the exact role and influence of these factors will not be examined in this study.

1.4 Key Concepts

The goal of this research is to gather knowledge on the mass media and the process of differential socialisation in order to gain insight into how mass media socialisation may be conducive to juvenile delinquency. The concepts central to this study are: mass media, socialisation, values and juvenile delinquency.
1.4.1 Mass Media

Mass media may be defined as any means of communication that reaches a relatively large anonymous audience (Croteau & Hoynes 1997: 8) and that imparts, conveys and exchanges ideas and knowledge while transterring messages and thoughts (Schramm 1971:12). It is a differentiated subsystem of society capable of assuming forms that have characteristics of messages, and then transmitting these visual and/or auditory messages (Gerbner 1972:39). Mass media is the mechanism through which human relations exist and develop all the symbols of the mind, together with the means of conveying them through space and time (Defleur 1971:13). Mass media is the transfer of information, the sharing of an orientation toward a set of informational signs. It is distinctive in that it addresses a larger cross section of the population rather than a few individuals (Friedson 1971:198), transmitting the messages directly to the audiences.

Mass media is a source that delivers information but that also entertains and stimulates. It comprises of three categories – namely: print, broadcast and visual (Klapper 19960:111), though broadcast can be re-classified as electronic to include computers. For the purpose of this study, all three categories were used to define mass media and nine types of mass media were included to facilitate the measurement of degree of exposure to mass media and to quantify the concept. The nine forms of mass media were: TV, videos, Internet, radio, music (CD’s and tapes), books, newspapers, magazines and cinema.

1.4.2 Socialisation

Socialisation is the process by which individuals acquire the knowledge, skills and dispositions that enables them to effectively participate as members of the social group (Goslin 1969:2) and develop a sense of self that is connected to the larger social world. It is an interactional process by which individuals develop the abilities and motivations to conform to the values and norms of their group (Magura 1979:81), guiding the individual into socially acceptable behaviour patterns through the distribution of information, approval, rewards and punishments (Siegel & Senna 2000:165).

The learning of the distinctive patterns of the society occurs through the various agencies of socialisation (Hyman 1974:41) and as a result the agents of socialisation irrevocably influence both the content and the process. These agents are the
institutions responsible for the promoting of socialisation and the passing on of core values, skills and orientations (Croteau & Hoynes 1997:15) and include the family, school, religion and the media. Because of it’s connection between societal and individual cultures, cultural transmission that relays the beliefs, attitudes and values from one generation to the next is part of the socialisation process (Wolfgang 1974:242).

The process of perpetuating cultural values is an ongoing process, where both intergenerational differences and similarities are constructed. It forms the key to the maintenance of social order, as individuals are educated into co-existing with others in all social situations. Society socialises the individual for the common good to internalise shared conceptions of the desirable (Rokeach 1973:20). Internalisation is the process by which the child adopts the standards of others and takes these standards as his or her own (Shaffer 1994:584), accepting them without being explicitly instructed to do so (Cole & Cole 1996:G3). There occurs a shift from externally controlled behaviour dependent on external surveillance (Feldman 1977:42) and the anticipation of external consequence (Young 1995:405) to behaviour governed by internal standards and principles (Shaffer 1994:402). In this study the socialising agent being examined is the mass media and the socialisation process will be measured in terms of the juvenile’s agreement with the media’s stance on the specified value.

1.4.3 Values

The most comprehensive definition of values is that of Schwartz (1994). He defines values as beliefs pertaining to desirable end states or modes of conduct that transcend specific situations, guiding the selection or evaluation of behaviour, people and events, and are ordered by importance relative to other values to form a system of value priorities (Schwartz 1994:20). Values can be viewed as a type of belief centrally locked within one’s total belief system about how one ought or ought not to behave (Selnow 1990:65). These personal beliefs that serve as reference points in the self-regulation of behaviour (Wojcieszke 1989:4) influence an individual’s behaviour (Kane, Taub & Hayes 2000:59) by forming the beliefs upon which an individual acts by preference (Rokeach 1973:7). They are important functional aids, which assist in the making of choices, arriving at decisions, and the resolving of personal conflict (Gandy 1984:209). Values are the key antecedents, consequences, and correlates of human action and experience, and they develop out of group life.
These beliefs about desirability, that encode and decode self and others (Balt-Rokeach & Lodges 1996:281) and that organise experience and direct behaviour, are mere cognitive representations of individual needs and societal and instrumental demands (Rokeach 1973:20). Values function as standards for judging and justifying action (Schwartz 1994:21) and are transmitted to the individual as goals others expect him or her to meet (Drenan 1983:229) and form the primary sources of internal control (Elliot, Huizinga & Ageton 1985:16). Values can emerge without description and little behavioural expression and are readily inferred through observation (Selnow 1990:71). Values define the goals of life, specify the legitimate paths to their attainment, elaborate the rewards, judge deviance and suggest appropriate compensations for failure (Inkeles 1969: 627). The integration of the value orientations of the different individuals in the same social system is of fundamental importance in the maintenance of the social system, as values provide the structure that holds the society together.

For the purpose of this study, this higher-order schematic organisation of beliefs, evaluations, norms and principles that are considered useful and worthwhile (Kahle & Timmer 1983:43) is subdivided into two categories. The first is that of antisocial values which can be regarded as the principles or accepted standards of a person or group. They are negative and bring about a mutual opposition to the interests of society in general (Botha, van Ede & Piek 1991: 289). Delinquent values, which grant legitimacy to delinquent activities as acceptable modes of behaviour, and which create a general willingness to violate law to achieve other ends (Thomberny 1998:474), fall into this category. The second category is that of pro-social values that can be defined as principles or accepted standards that lead to a motivation to act in a way that benefits others. Pro-social values are values in which one and others act in accordance with some socialised moral principle (Batson 1989:223) that is in the interest of society in general. Values are operationalized through the indication of preferences, and internalised by the indication of importance.

1.4.4 Juvenile Delinquency

The Correctional Services Act 8 of 1959 defines a juvenile as a person under the age of 21. Yet both national and international law have recognised the age of 18 as the appropriate age for the separation of young people from the adult criminal justice system. It is not only the age that is of issue but that acts itself. Thomberny (1998:474) defines delinquent behaviour as acts that place a youth at risk for adjudication and ranges from status offences to serious violent activities.
Geldenhuys (1990) points out that juvenile delinquency has a separate judicial and criminological definition.

Judicially juvenile delinquency is defined as punishable acts committed by a juvenile in the age group of 7 to 17 and in some instances by 18 to 20-year-olds, and includes acts prohibited by law and/or the disregard of acts decreed by law (Geldenhuys 1990:91). Criminologically juvenile delinquency includes judicial crimes and acts not conducive to the general good of the society, that disturb the public order, create unrest and are harmful to the individual, his or her family and society (Geldenhuys 1990:92). Blumberg (1974:19) states that there are certain conditions that classify behaviour as a crime. The first is when there is an act of commission or omission accompanied by an intent or guilty state of mind.

Secondly, the acts involve violation of a specific legal norm, and there is some kind of harm precipitated by the illegal behaviour. Thirdly, there must exist a sanction or punishment of some kind, which is imposed for the breach. Using the judicial and criminological approaches, juvenile delinquency can be defined as a broad range of behaviours, from socially unacceptable to status offences and criminal acts (Santrock 1996:497), committed by one aged between 7 and 17. In this study juvenile delinquency, which is commonly referred to in South Africa as youth crime, was measured in terms of the number of self-reported acts of socially unacceptable and/or criminal behaviour.

1.5 The Study’s Approach

The approach used in this study is based on Thompson’s (1978) Differential Socialisation model. In his model Thompson (1978) examined the family as the socialising agent. In this study the basic principles of Thompson’s (1978) model are being applied to the media as the socialising agent. In Thompson’s (1978) model, he viewed the socialising agent as a subsystem of society. Being a subsystem of society, dissimilarity from society’s ideals can occur and be transmitted from the socialising agent to the child. Essentially, differentially preparing the child for affiliation with and participation in the larger society. The effects are fundamental, long-lasting and encompass diverse contents with respect to commitment to conformity. Thus the agent’s influence may be directly involved in the causation of youth crime by being one of the potential sources of differentially learned commitments to conformity (Thompson 1978:41).
The model proposed that the agent's values reflect different degrees of congruence with societal ideals. The subjective stances range from socially valued positions, which are in accordance with societal prescriptions, to socially devalued positions, which are generally not prescribed or are even contrary to those of the larger society (Thompson 1978:10). The socialising agent's views are then communicated to and ingrained in the child during the complex process of socialisation, irrespective of the nature of the views. Consequently if the agent is not aligned with societal prescriptions, it can pass on antisocial views as normal conforming views (Thompson 1978:12).

Fundamental associations between attitudes and behaviour are established early. Behavioural choices made as a result of a juvenile's early commitments to conformity establish precedents upon which later behaviour choices are based (Thompson 1978:129). The model suggests that youths can be differentially socialised by the agent to the extent that when the youth's values are congruent with that of the agent and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour can occur as a result of the weakened or missing commitment to conformity. Thus as the agent's views on conformity vary, it is expected that there will be different effects on the youth's commitment to conformity and ultimately his or her behaviour.

The use of Thompson's (1978) model allows for the identification of the influence of antisocial values on a juvenile's behaviour when the juvenile agrees, as compared to the same influence when the juvenile disagrees. The influence of pro-social values on juvenile behaviour can also be identified under the same conditions of congruence and incongruence. The approach will entail matching certain values on the part of the media with comparable views on the part of the juvenile, then analysing the two-attitudinal stances to determine how they relate to delinquent behaviour. The following diagram, based on Thompson's model (1978:15), represents this model:
A – represents the congruently antisocial position, where both media and juvenile stances are antisocial.

B – represents the negatively discrepant position. Here the media’s value stance is pro-social while the juvenile’s is antisocial.

C – represents the positively discrepant position. In this stance it is the media whose value stance is antisocial while the juvenile’s is pro-social.

D – represents the congruently pro-social position, where both the media and the juvenile’s value stances are pro-social.

1.6 The Study’s Actuating Questions

With the aim of examining the effects of both pro-social and anti-social values on juvenile behaviour in mind, and the use of the Differential Socialisation Diagrammatic Model of Thompson (1978), the following pertinent questions arise:

1. Is there more delinquency when the media portrays antisocial values and the juvenile also holds antisocial values? (congruently antisocial position)

   OR

2. Is there more delinquency when the media portrays pro-social values and the juvenile’s values are antisocial? (negatively discrepant position)

   OR

3. Is there more delinquency when the media portrays antisocial values and the juvenile holds pro-social values? (positively discrepant position)

   OR

4. Is there more delinquency when the media portrays pro-social values and the juvenile’s values are also pro-social? (Congruently pro-social position).
As this study is based on the premises of the Differential Socialisation model, which was tested using the family as the socialising agent, certain outcomes are anticipated. Firstly, it is anticipated that where both the media and juvenile value stances are pro-social (congruently pro-social position), the least amount of delinquency is expected to occur. This is most likely the result of the media's positive influence and the absence of conflicting values.

Secondly, it is expected that where the media holds a predominantly antisocial value stance and the juvenile a pro-social stance (positively discrepant position), the occurrence of delinquency will be higher than that of the congruent pro-social position but less than the negatively discrepant position. Although the juvenile's positive values mitigate the media's negative influence, the existence of conflicting values increases the probability of delinquency as a result of the existence of conflict, as predicted by Nye (1958).

Nye (1958) noted that there exist other sources of influence during the socialisation process. These can range from structural or environmental factors, to the agent's effectiveness in transmitting its views; from the relationship between the agent and the child, to the degree of receptivity on the part of the child. All these influences sometimes lead to differences, which can create conflict. Nye (1958:125) proposes that it is this degree of conflict that causes delinquency rather than the unique sub-cultural values or frustrations of the chile. The influences that create these conflicts are not included in this study but conflict as a variable is. This is measured in terms of the agreement or disagreement between the values of the media and the child.

Thirdly, delinquency is predicted to be greater than the two above positions when the media's values are pro-social but the juvenile's values are antisocial (negatively discrepant position). Thompson (1978:16) refers to this as the "stereotypically rebellious position". Here any positive influence the media may have had is counteracted by the juvenile's own antisocial values.

Finally, delinquency is expected to be the highest when both the media and the juvenile's values are antisocial (congruently antisocial position). This demonstrates the occurrence of Differential Socialisation where the media's antisocial position has a direct effect on the juvenile's behaviour. This is central to the study's hypothesis which, if established, will add credence to the theory that direct
transmission of antisocial values from media to juvenile exists and that this transmission is linked to subsequent involvement in delinquent behaviour.

How the congruently antisocial position will compare with the negatively discrepant position and the positively discrepant position respectively is difficult to predict, as there is little research to justify such predictions. Therefore the relative influence of the media's antisocial value stance as compared to the presence of conflict between media and juvenile values remains to be seen from the study's findings.

1.7 The Study's Presuppositions

With the use of Thompson's (1978) Differential Socialisation Model, there exist three presuppositions on which this study is based. These are:

1. The media portrays values that reflect different degrees of agreement with ideal societal values. The media plays a part in the construction of reality for us, presenting the basic societal values, norms and reinforcing existing behavioural tendencies (Klapper 1960:157). As the media is impacted by the contemporary social environment, inconsistencies that exist in the socially accepted value systems, particularly those between verbally sanctioned and actively sanctioned values, are often manifested by the media (Klapper 1960: 215) which is then reflected as different degrees of agreement with the societal values. The more complex the society, the more numerous the subdivisions, the more numerous the sub-cultural differences that develop in values, influencing the media's values and what they transmit. Media is a differentiated subsystem of society, but much dissimilarity from society's ideals can occur and be transmitted, challenging the conventional beliefs and practices.

2. The values portrayed by the media range from pro-social values to antisocial values. Pro-social values are positive values that enhance the interests of society and foster collectivism. Antisocial values are negative values that bring about a mutual opposition to the interests of society and foster individualism. The media is a commercial industry, which presents that which proves most profitable. Deviance is a drawcard that sells and as a result, often that which is portrayed does not represent the best of human character. By depicting it, showing how it is done and by making it known that it is taking place, the media offers it as an alternative to anyone that is watching, reading or listening. Just as
it portrays antisocial values, the media also presents pro-social values. Certain TV Networks have produced programmes aimed at family values.

3. These varying value positions are transmitted to children on a regular basis, resulting in an effect on the child’s commitment to conformity and ultimately his or her behaviour, as the child will act upon these values under the belief that they are those of society. A great part of socialisation occurs through the process of modelling, as we learn through observation. Therefore that which is observed and communicated through all kinds of interaction becomes internalised, leaving room for differentiated consequences. Even if the agent seems to support society’s values but has hidden feelings of dissatisfaction, frustration, disillusion or disagreement, the proposed values may be contradicted to the child differentially influencing the nature of the child’s perceptions and commitments. As behaviour is learnt from direct experience and observation and dependent on the predominant norms and values (Zillmann, Bryant & Huston 1994:157), this differential influence will impact the child’s behaviour.

These three presuppositions form the basis of the model and it is from these presuppositions that the central theoretical statement is derived.

1.8 The Study’s Hypotheses

The study’s central theoretical statement is that juveniles can be differentially socialised by the media to the extent that when the juvenile’s values are congruent with that of the media and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour can occur as a result of the weakened or missing commitment to conformity. In order to substantiate this statement, the following hypotheses will need to be tested:

H1
A > D:
That the congruently antisocial position has higher mean delinquency scores than the congruently pro-social position.

H2
B > D:
That the negatively discrepant position has higher mean delinquency scores than the congruently pro-social position.
H3
C > D:
That the positively discrepant position has higher delinquency scores than the congruently pro-social position.

There is little research available to predict how the congruently antisocial position will compare with the negatively discrepant position and the positively discrepant position respectively. However, adolescents become acutely aware of contrast between values expressed by adults and those implicit in their behaviour, which may lead them to reject the formally espoused values and act in accordance with what they judge to be the covert values (Inkeles 1969: 627).

The more dramatic, low taste content has the capacity to elicit the attention of the largest audience (Defleur 1971:80). We may expect that the negatively discrepant position will have higher mean delinquency scores than the positively discrepant position. If the media’s financial stability is maintained by the low taste content as proposed by Defleur (1971), it will be more likely that the juvenile will perceive the media’s stance as more antisocial than it is pro-social. As a result it is unlikely that the media’s positive influence will be able to counter the juvenile’s antisocial stance because of the juvenile’s overall impression of the media. Furthermore, the juvenile will more likely reject the media’s attempt at inculcating pro-social values.
In order to be able to substantiate the central theoretical hypothesis, it is in the interest of this study to determine whether:

H4
B > C:
The negatively discrepant position has higher mean delinquency scores than the positively discrepant position.

H5
A > C:
The congruently antisocial position has higher mean delinquency scores than the positively discrepant position.
H6
A > B:
The congruently antisocial position has higher mean delinquency scores than the negatively discrepant position.

Therefore the aim of the study is to examine the relation between A, B, C, and D and to demonstrate that: \[ A > B > C > D \]

By establishing that the congruently antisocial position has the highest delinquency means scores, the statement that - when the juvenile's values are congruent with that of the media and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour can occur - will be supported. It establishes a link between the transmission of antisocial values from media to child and subsequent involvement in delinquency.

1.9 Outline of the Study's Methodology

This research project is an exploratory field study, the goal of which is the exploration of the relatively unknown area of media socialisation. Hypotheses are generated in order to obtain knowledge of the process of differentiated socialisation, thereby gaining insight into how this may act as a contributing factor in juvenile delinquency. Quantitative in nature, this study concerns itself with the measurement of observations in numerical terms in order to determine the statistical probabilities of the relationship between mass media socialisation and juvenile delinquency.

This study combines both theoretical research from literature and empirical research from practical investigation. The literature study is comprised of descriptive analysis of appropriate published research data, which was obtained through the library and Internet. The sources of this portion of research data included books, journals and articles. In the empirical research, the approach used consisted of matching certain media values with comparable views on behalf of the juvenile, then analysing these two value stances as they relate to delinquency. The data for this analysis was obtained from a survey of high school pupils in the Johannesburg Metropolitan district during the 2001 academic year, through the use of a questionnaire.

Prior to the study's undertaking it was necessary to establish whether this area of thought merited further research and to test the questionnaire's reliability and
validity, so a pilot study was performed. A sample group of fifty students, sharing the same characteristics as those that would make up the final sample group, were asked to complete the questionnaire. This sample was from the same geographical area as the intended study but would not form part of the final study in order to prevent pre-test sensitisation. From the first testing it became evident that adjustments were needed to certain of the wording. These were made and the same group was re-tested. Though the pilot sample was small, findings did show support for the study’s central theoretical statement, meriting further investigation.

500 pupils aged between 13 and 18 were randomly selected from 20 different schools for the main study and given a structured questionnaire to fill in. The sample selected was made up of all races, both genders and all socio-economic groups that are exposed to some form of mass media on a regular basis. Sections of the questionnaire included the self-reporting of delinquent acts, which was the means of measuring the dependent variable, the perceived values the media portrays, and the values deemed important to the juvenile’s personal goals, serving as measures for the independent variable. In this study media values were inferred from the respondent’s reports of the values most commonly portrayed in the media. The degree that the individual’s value choices and his perceptions of the media’s values are congruent, it is possible to regard the media value as shared.

Due to the reliability checks built into the study, the final analysis of this study was done on 493 high school pupils. All the research data obtained, which consisted of behavioural and attitudinal data, was analysed by means of statistical analysis and consisted of the use of percentages, frequency tables and means scores in order to test the hypotheses. The method of analysis consisted of matching up the delinquency mean scores for each congruent and in-congruent value position and comparing them.

1.10 Outline of the Dissertation

This dissertation comprises two sections. The first section entails the exploratory expression of the problem. In this section the variables are identified, the suppositions that the variables have a relation to one another are set out and backed by theoretical findings, and the methods for investigating the relation between the variables is examined. Section A begins with this chapter “The Introduction”. In this chapter both the objectives and the importance of this study have been described, the research problem has been clearly formulated and the
key concepts have been unambiguously defined. This has culminated in the formulation of the research hypotheses. This chapter is followed by "The Research Methodology".

Chapter Two examines the research setting, its design, the study population, the general form of analysis, the operational definitions of both the dependent and independent variables, as well as all measures of validity and reliability. Chapter Three "Mass Media and the Socialisation Process" comprises a literature review that examines these two aspects in greater detail. Here the general background of the problem is discussed and how the research problem relates to previous research findings and theories is demonstrated. Section A ends with Chapter Four, "Theoretical Aspects of Deviance". In this chapter the theoretical basis of the study of juvenile delinquency is examined and the issue of mass media socialisation is considered in terms of the traditional theories.

The second section of the dissertation comprises the operational expression of the problem and involves the analysis and findings of the collected data. Section B begins with Chapter Five "The Research Findings". In this chapter the study's results are presented in the form of tables and statistical analysis. All data is presented without discussion or interpretation. These are followed by the study's discussion in Chapter Six. Chapter Six provides a detailed account and interpretation of the findings, as well as an explanation of their meanings and implications in light of the objective for which the research was undertaken. It establishes what the study has found. Section B, and the dissertation, ends with Chapter Seven "The Summary and Conclusion". Here the research data is tied together in a brief explanation, highlighting the main points of the study and the dissertation. A conclusion is reached and suggestions for further research are made.

1.11 Summary

The mass media has become and continues to be a prominent factor in the lives of children today. Researchers believe that it is the biggest influence on intellectual and moral development, simply due to the amount of time spent on it (Schickendanz, Schickendanz & Forsyth 1998:403). Childhood and adolescence are a time of not only physical but also social development, where the child is learning the beliefs and practices of the society to which it belongs. The most common way we form our beliefs is to rely on what external authority tells us to believe, but we are being burdened by an informational overload of conflicting
and ill-defined value systems (Hunter 1990:19). The Zanjanc study of 1945 revealed that the media has extensive immediate effects on the values of young people (Klapper 1960:217). The more one is exposed to a value, the more likely one is to accept the value. Previously values and beliefs were clearly prescribed, but now the burden lies on the individual to formulate and select his or her own from a wide selection of contradictory information, a lot of which is promulgated by the media.

Behaviour in a given situation depends on socialisation and the values taught (Schickendanz, Schickendanz & Forsyth 1998:400). Values cause individuals to act consistently and live in certain ways (Kane, Taub & Hayes 200:58). Socialisation guides people into socially acceptable behaviour patterns; it runs deep and has lifelong influences (Siegel & Senna 2000:165). Socialisation can be viewed as a form of graded access to information, revealing a relationship with the media which is involved in the distribution of information. Behaviour as a product of socialisation means that people are unable to do things that they have learnt to be wrong (Kronhauser 1978:34). Even children living in deteriorated inner city environments will not get involved in delinquency if socialisation experiences are positive and supportive (Siegel & Senna 2000:165).

Strasburger (1995:30) noted that antisocial patterns learned early in life are predictive of serious adult antisocial behaviour. Deficiencies in the teaching of law-abiding norms and values have been linked to delinquent behaviour (Thornton & Voigt 1992:241). Adolescents who have not internalised values for conventional behaviour are more likely to be involved in problem behaviours than those that have (Garner & Stein 1998:103). Some researchers strongly believe that delinquent values are major reinforcers of delinquent behaviour and associations (Thornberry 1998:485).

In terms of time and exposure, media occupies a larger portion of our lives than any other source of socialisation. The media is an influence that surrounds, dominates and engulfs children for many hours of the day. It’s become a significant influence that begins well before the child enters school. It is a social system that is becoming more and more deeply established. Research has demonstrated the media’s power by individuals adopting the dominant media values (Ball-Rokeach & Lodges 1996:290) simply because they believe those opinions to be in accordance with the majority view (Klapper 19960:125).
Of all the media issues, violence is the one that has received the most concentrated attention. Research has focused on the effects of specific media content on the specific behaviour of children, but little has been done on the study of the possible role that media socialisation plays in delinquency, with value acquisition as one of the most needed and most neglected areas of research. The weakening of institutions as well as rapid technological changes have resulted in a value gap. A shortage of firm bases for distinguishing right from wrong, for justifying and legitimising actions, and guiding individual moral choices means there exists a need to look at how the media affects the socialisation process and the effects of media socialisation. There is a need to explore the role of the media in instilling values. Thus the aim of this study is to move away from the issue of violence and to focus on the role of media values and media socialisation.

1.12 Conclusion

The influence of media values on juvenile behaviour, and a proposed association between the values portrayed and juvenile delinquency, are being investigated in this study. This is being done by examining the variation in the nature of the media's values and then exploring how these values relate to the involvement in juvenile delinquency under the conditions of media-child value agreement and media-child value disagreement. Six hypotheses, as set out in this chapter, are to be tested in order to demonstrate the existence of value transmission from media to child and the correlation of this factor to subsequent involvement in delinquent behaviour. To obtain the necessary data to test these hypotheses, a survey was carried out, and a combination of both theoretical research from literature, and empirical research from practical investigation was undertaken. The ensuing chapter examines all methods and procedures used in the study.
Chapter 2

Research Methodology: The Study of Mass Media Socialisation and Juvenile Delinquency

2.1 Introduction

Despite the commonly held notion that values are central to one's self-concept and a major determinant of human behaviour, little research exists on the role values play in delinquent behaviour. Consequently, it became the objective of this study to investigate the association between media values and juvenile delinquency, in view of the overwhelming presence of the media in the lives of children and adolescents. Scientific research aims to predict and control and these are best accomplished through the development and testing of theory. This study undertook to test the Differential Socialisation Model of Thompson (1978), by applying it to the media.

Social research is concerned with the gathering of data that can help answer questions about various aspects of society, thereby enabling one to understand society (Bailey 1994:4). The methods used to gather data benefit society, either through direct application of findings to the issue at hand, or alternatively through the application of findings to the testing of theoretical issues. The measurement process is an integral part of social research and if concepts aren't adequately measured, the research will fail (Bailey 1994:62). Measurement entails the assignment of numbers to concepts or variables. The predictor variables in this study included juvenile delinquency as the dependent variable and media values matched with those of the juvenile's values as the independent variable.

In order to attain the goal of development and testing, the sampling procedures, research design and analytical techniques implemented need to be appropriate, as the methods utilised to collect the data enormously affect what one can infer from the data. This chapter examines the methods by which the data was
collected, as well as the important threats to the validity of the research findings, in greater detail.

2.2 The Pilot Study

In terms of time and exposure, the media occupies a larger portion of our lives than any other source. It has become, and continues to be, a prominent factor in the lives of youth today. Thus it was felt that the media as a research topic remains valid. With the issue of violence being so extensively studied, a search began into the other areas of media influence that have not received the same attention from social scientists. It has been argued that media content is eroding a sense of values among its audiences (Selnow 1990:64), but despite this argument, little has been done on the study of the possible role that media socialisation plays in delinquency. Value acquisition, particularly with reference to the media, was found to be one of the most needed and most neglected areas of research. The little available research that existed was often more than twenty years old, and most research into value acquisition related to the family setting. It was decided that this neglected area of research would form the focus of this study.

Research carried out by Thompson (1978) examined the issue of values and delinquency, yet once again the focus fell on the family. The theory proved sound and the probability of whether the same model could be applied to the media as a socialising agent, and be as relevant today as it was then, became a matter of interest. Consequently, a pilot study on a limited number of subjects from the same population as that for which the eventual study was intended was undertaken. The purpose was to investigate the feasibility of the proposed study, to detect possible flaws in the measurement procedures, in the measurement instrument, and in the operationalisation of the independent variables. If the practicality of the study were to be determined, the pilot study would need to closely resemble the main study as far as possible, and the procedures used would need to be the same as those to be used in the main study.

Therefore a sample group of 50 pupils was randomly selected from one high school in the Johannesburg Metropolitan District, the same geographical area in which the main study would take place. The sample consisted of ten pupils from each grade (grades 8 to 12). The pupils in the sample were of roughly the same race, gender, age and socio-economic groups as those that would be included in the main study. The sample group used in the pilot study would not be included in the
main study, so as to prevent pre-test sensitisation. The respondents were given a questionnaire, designed for this study, to complete. Huysamen (1994:197) notes that when a measuring instrument is compiled specifically for a research project, it is necessary to investigate the reliability and validity of such an instrument. This was done in the pilot study.

As the main study would include subjects from differing socio-economic backgrounds and ages, the respondents’ literacy levels would need to be taken into consideration. Therefore respondents in the pilot study were asked to underline any words, and circle any questions, which they did not understand. Huysamen (1994:131) remarks that questionnaires should strive for conciseness and unambiguity, so respondents were asked which questions they felt could not be answered using the response categories given. A few of the pupils felt that a “Yes” or “No” answer could not answer some of the questions adequately. As a result, any response category that was previously “Yes” or “No” was changed to “Never”, “Seldom”, “Sometimes” or “Often”. While preceding items in a questionnaire may affect the responses to subsequent items, the order in which items are placed are of importance to the structure of the questionnaire (Huysamen 1994:132). Therefore both the sequence of the questionnaire and the rating scales were tested. The respondents of the pilot study were finally asked to comment on the questionnaire’s length, presentation and questioning.

The findings of the pilot study revealed that when a juvenile’s values are congruent with that of the agent, and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour (as measured by mean delinquency scores) is high. This lends support to the central theoretical statement. It was determined that a further, more extensive study was warranted. After the testing of the questionnaire in the pilot study, it was evident that some of the question response categories as set out above were ambiguous and adjustments were made. Wording which proved too difficult for some of the respondents was also made easier. Once an instrument is revised, the revised instrument should be tested to a new study (Huysamen 1994:198); accordingly, the questionnaire was re-tested seven weeks later. A sufficient time lapse should be allowed, in order to prevent pre-test sensitisation, yet this should not be too long a lapse as to result in significant changes in attitude and behaviour. The same sample used in the first pilot study was used in the second round of testing. The second round of testing showed that no further changes were needed. The questionnaire was ready for the main study.
2.3 The Sample

The information required for this study consisted of behavioural and attitudinal data and, as such, the survey method was selected as the simplest way to obtain such data. This was done by means of a survey carried out during the 2001 academic year, which consisted of a self-administered questionnaire, conducted, in a single point in time, with respondents representative of a cross-section of the population. The advantage of using cross-sectional study is that data gathered from a large number of people can be compared, as the data is not affected by changes over time (Bailey 1994:36). One problem faced when using the survey method is whether respondents are making responses more favourable than they really are. Though the absence or presence of this factor cannot be determined, it was presumed to be minimal.

Random sampling was selected as the sampling method. Random sampling is an efficient method to gather information, practical for gathering information from a smaller number of cases that are drawn from a larger social grouping (Lutz 1983:251). It is considered one of the better methods of collection because of its ability to produce samples representative of the population, as no one group is favoured over another (Huysamen 1994:90). The use of this method guarantees the inclusion of subjects with a wide range of social, economic, gender and racial characteristics. Random sampling also has the advantage of cancelling out biases and providing statistical means for estimating sampling errors (Bailey 1994:90).

No preferential treatment was given to any case or set of cases, and the only operating factor in selecting cases for the sample was chance (Lutz 1983:252). The process of selection required that the researcher first obtain a list of all students in the chosen school, after which numbers were assigned to each name on the list. Then, with the use of a table of random numbers, the 25 students that would be taking part in the study were selected. Since the desired population’s size was 500, the table was read in sets of three digits, ensuring that the selection process was not haphazard or accidental, factors which would later reflect biases in the findings.

It was decided that the sample would consist of 500 high school pupils from the Johannesburg Metropolitan District. The sample size of 500 was chosen as it was believed to be large enough for the necessary values of the dependent variable to occur with sufficient frequency to complete the type of analysis planned for this
study, yet small enough to be manageable. Johannesburg was selected as the geographical area of choice because of its technological development. Access to the media would be greater and more readily available in Johannesburg than a smaller town, allowing for the effects of media value transmission to be more evident. By selecting Johannesburg, comparisons to youth in other urban cities in our country would be possible.

Though exposure to media influence begins in early childhood, adolescents were selected as subjects for two reasons. Firstly, adolescence is a critical stage of development, where the individual's identity, attitudes and values are being formed and developed, and the acquisition of standards is occurring (Schaffer 1996:232), standards that will define the goals of life and specify the means of achieving these goals. It is also a stage during which youths are susceptible to the influence of visual and auditory form (Oldenburg 1999:404).

Adolescence is a period of life characterised by change, re-organisation, and development in knowledge and abilities, a period of training and preparation for future and adult roles. They are being shaped personally and socially, participating and negotiating in their social world, and their behaviour is becoming more dependent on norms and values to which they have bonded (Zillmann, Bryant & Huston 1994:157). Interaction with others during this stage plays an important role in the shaping of their view of reality. Thus adolescence is of interest because much of the socialisation that has taken place in childhood has become internalised at this stage.

Secondly, it emphasises the age range in which involvement in delinquent behaviour takes place. During middle adolescence delinquent values are more fully articulated and have stronger effects and, as this study examines the transmission of values, the effects of this transmission would most likely be seen during this stage. Early adolescence (11–14) is when delinquent careers begin, with middle adolescence (15–17) accounting for the highest rate of delinquent involvement (Thornberry 1998:483).

High school adolescents were chosen, as opposed to institutionalised adolescents, as the general population of non-institutionalised adolescents is not entirely non-delinquent. Therefore, mean scores for delinquent and non-delinquent behaviour could be obtained. Furthermore, restrictions imposed on institutionalised
adolescents, such as restricted access to equipment, less chance of control over what they are exposed to and less chance to view on their own, would reveal false differences in media exposure and acts committed in the preceding twelve months, between delinquents and non-delinquents. Studies have shown that offenders have similar habits and preferences to ordinary school children (Hagell & Newburn 1994:88), making the use of high school students a viable option.

The 500 subjects needed for this study were randomly selected from 20 different high schools in the Johannesburg Metropolitan District. The schools, both private and governmental, which were randomly selected, formed the sampling units and all students attending these schools during the 2001 academic year comprised the target study population. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from each school. Another school, in the same area, randomly replaced any school that declined. The final 20 high schools participating in the study were selected from various geographical and socio-economic areas within the Johannesburg Metropolitan District. This was done for practical rather than theoretical purposes. Firstly, the areas were accessible; secondly, it ensured a wider distribution of characteristics, allowing for the generalisation of findings to the rest of the population.

In order to establish a fairly balanced representation of the various age groups, it was decided that the 25 from each school should consist of 5 from each grade, grades 8 to 12, as age and grade are closely linked. This further simplified the sampling procedure. All except those absent on the day had equal opportunity of being selected to participate. The gender, racial and social class distributions were not proportionally sized, as they were not considered vital variables to this study. Both value transmission and delinquency occur across all gender, racial and socio-economic divisions. The final biographical breakdown of the sample was as follows:
Graph 2.1
Gender Distribution of the Sample Group

Gender Distribution

Female (49.1%)
Male (50.9%)

Of the 493 subjects, 251 were male and 242 were female.

Graph 2.2
Age Distribution of the Sample Group

Age Distribution

Of the 493 subjects, there were: 31 (6%) - 13 year olds, 124 (25.2%) - 14 year olds, 104 (21%) - 15 year olds, 130 (26.4%) - 16 year olds, 86 (17.4%) - 17 year olds, 18 (4%) - 18 year olds.
Graph 2.3
The Socio-economic Background of the Sample Group

Of the 493 subjects, 91 (19%) were from lower socio-economic backgrounds
298 (60%) were from middle socio-economic backgrounds
104 (21%) were from upper socio-economic backgrounds

2.4 The Questionnaire

The questionnaire, one of the most common data collection techniques, was administered in a single sitting in each school. All 20 schools were completed in a period of four weeks between August and September 2001. The wording and meanings of the questionnaire items were pre-tested, uncovering misinterpretations of questions, natural wording and categories of responses. The finalised questionnaire was introduced as a media survey, the purpose of which was to examine the youth’s views on the media as well as their beliefs. The subjects were told that participation was voluntary and confidential and they were asked not to put their names or that of their school's anywhere on the questionnaire. This was reiterated on the cover note of the questionnaire. It was done in attempts to create confidence among the respondents so as to improve response rates and encourage honesty. It was also suggested that a number of schools would be taking part in the study so that they did not feel that they were being singled out for any specific reason. The questionnaire was divided into four sections.
2.4.1 Section One - Biographical

The first section was biographical. This section provided an overview of the respondents that took part in the study. It asked the respondents' gender, age and parent's occupation. While providing biographical information, these three variables can also be considered as mediating factors in the process of media socialisation. The section comprised of:

2.4.1.1 Gender: Grobbelaar (1991:8) concluded that boys have a greater propensity for delinquent behaviour than girls do, therefore gender may be considered a mediating factor. For this question, respondents were required to mark the appropriate block. The response categories for gender were male and female. The numbers assigned to each were:

Female = 1       Male = 2

2.4.1.2 Age: may act as a mediating factor in that age is often closely correlated with a child's emotional and intellectual capacity, and susceptibility (Cole & Cole 96:448), thereby influencing the socialisation process. Respondents here were also required to mark the appropriate block. The response categories for age were 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18. The numbers assigned to each ordinal level were:

13 = 1  14 = 2  15 = 3  16 = 4  17 = 5  18 = 6

2.4.1.3 The parent's occupation: for this question respondents were required to fill in their parent's occupation. Occupation of the respondent's parent/guardian was applied as an index of socio-economic level of the respondent. Occupation was selected as measure of socio-economic level for three reasons. Firstly, because of its correlation with other criteria such as class and status. Secondly, occupation permeates the lives of individuals and relates to values, attitudes and social relations and finally, it's easily obtainable from adolescents.

The family's socio-economic level may influence the type of mass medium that the juvenile has access to, and amount of time, consequently acting as a mediating factor. For the purpose of this study, blue-collar workers (manual, unskilled and industrial) were classified as lower income. White-collar workers (professional and clerical) were classified as middle income. Those with upper management positions
(CEO's, MD's) and medium to large business owners were classified as upper income. The numbers assigned to each were:

Lower Income = 1  Middle Income = 2  Upper Income = 3

2.4.2 Section Two - Further Mediating Factors

The second section comprised the possible mediating factors as the media functions among and through a combination of mediating factors and influences working together in a total situation, some of the other possible mediating factors were mentioned in the study. The exact role and influence of these factors were not examined, as they are too numerous to control for a sample of this size, yet of sufficient interest that they should be mentioned. This section was divided into two parts, with questions spread throughout the questionnaire. This was done in order to prevent question sensitisation in section three. The mediating factors included:

2.4.2.1 Media Exposure – (a) Time: the amounts of exposure time to the media measures the frequency of media usage, which can influence the acceptance of values (Dong, Tan & Cao 1998:87). Research has shown that heavy viewers hold opinions that are more closely associated with the media than those who are light viewers (Barrile 1980:320). This variable was measured by asking respondents the number of hours per week that they spent on books, magazines/newspapers, TV/videos, computer/video games, radio/music, and cinema. The total number of hours spent was worked out by adding the hours together, then working out an average per day. One to four hours per day was classified as low exposure, five to eight hours per day was classified as medium exposure, nine hours and more per day was classified as high exposure. Numbers were assigned to each of the levels in the following way:

Low exposure = 1  Medium exposure = 2  High exposure = 3.

2.4.2.2 Media Exposure – (b) Media type: The categories provided made up the three media classifications as set out by Vivian (1991:5). Namely, print media (books, magazines, newspapers), Electronic media (TV, videos, computers, radio, music) and Photographic media (cinema). By dividing them into the three categories it was possible to compare which of the three media types are most popular with adolescents. Each specific mass medium was also compared. Numbers were assigned to each of the levels in the following way:
2.4.2.3 Influence of other socialising agents – the influence of other socialising agents may account for the youth’s values being at variance with that of the media’s. As the exact extent of the influence cannot be precisely determined, an indication of its influence can be established by comparing the amount of time spent with the differing agents in comparison to the time spent with the media. This variable is of interest as it can result in the transmission of conflicting values, which according to Nye (1958:126) is a contributing factor to increased delinquency.

Though its influence cannot be determined with precise accuracy. This variable was measured by asking respondents the number of hours spent with the following socialising agents per week: family, school, and religion. The average time spent per day was calculated in the same way as that for media exposure. The classification of the amount of exposure is exactly the same as set out above for media exposure. Numbers were assigned to each of the levels in the following way:

- Low exposure = 1
- Medium exposure = 2
- High exposure = 3

### Table 2.1
Exposure Level to the Different Socialisation Agents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Exposure</td>
<td>67 (14%)</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
<td>295 (60%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Exposure</td>
<td>243 (49%)</td>
<td>320 (65%)</td>
<td>147 (30%)</td>
<td>470 (95%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Exposure</td>
<td>183 (37%)</td>
<td>160 (32%)</td>
<td>51 (10%)</td>
<td>23 (5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2.4 Perception of reality – Once an individual accepts the reality of a medium he or she no longer questions or scrutinises the validity of the content, and real world values are replaced with media values (Kane, Taub & Hayes 2000:59). The influence of this variable is therefore of interest, thought the precise nature of its influence was not examined in this study. It was measured by asking respondents whether they felt the media reflected reality. The response categories and numbers assigned were as follows:

Not at all = 0    Not really = 1    To some degree = 2    Totally = 3

2.4.2.5 Supervision – Previous research has shown the importance of parental supervision in the prevention of delinquency as children who are generally unsupervised are more likely to be subject to inadequate socialisation thereby increasing the likelihood of yielding to deviant behaviour (Magura 1979:157-158). Supervision was measured by asking respondents how often their parents/guardians supervise what they see/hear/read in the media. The response categories and numbers were assigned to each of the levels in the following way:

Never = 0    Seldom = 1    Sometimes = 2    All the time = 3

2.4.2.6 Identification & Imitation – The process of social learning involves both identification and imitation of the behaviour of significant others. It is through this process that the child acquires social behaviour (Yawkey & Johnson 1988:10). To measure these variables respondents were asked firstly how often they have identified with someone in the media and secondly, how often they have imitated something in the media. The response categories and the numbers assigned to the response levels were:

Never = 0    Once or twice = 2    Several times =3    Often = 4

2.4.2.7 Tolerance – Strasburger (1995:10) noted that individuals who are more tolerant of what they see in the media are more likely to develop attitudes favouring the issues portrayed. Tolerance of what is shown in the media may influence the media-child value relation thus it was measured by asking respondents to rate their individual level of tolerance of that which be portrayed in the media. The response
categories and the numbers assigned to the response levels were:

Not at all = 0    Not really = 1    To some degree = 2    Totally = 3

2.4.2.8 Social approval – Group approval is an overriding need created by socialisation (Kornhauser 1978:35). Once a message is perceived as appropriate the individual is motivated to comply with the message thereby accepting the value (Young 1995:406). As the media’s overemphasis of certain aspects may be perceived as a display of social approval of the things emphasised, this variable is of interest. Respondents were asked firstly, if something was shown often in the media that it was an indication that it was socially approved. Secondly respondents were asked if the media influenced their view of what is socially acceptable. The response categories and the numbers assigned to the response levels were:

Not at all = 0    Not really = 1    Somewhat = 2    Definitely = 3

The third section dealt with the media and juvenile’s values. The fourth section comprised the self-report of involvement in delinquent behaviour. These sections are discussed separately in the following sections of Dependent and Independent Variables. The graphic representations of the mediating factors are as follows:
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*Average Time Spent in a Week with the Different Socialising Agents*

**Socialising Agents Time Distribution**

- Religion (0.4%)
- Family (15.5%)
- School (19.8%)
- Peer (25.4%)
- Media (38.9%)
The questionnaire ended with general questions about the media's role in the respondent's life and which socialising agent they felt taught them how to fit into society. The sequence of the sections used was done to improve the response rate of the questions. The questionnaire both began and ended with easy non-threatening questions so as to put the respondent at ease. Questions of more sensitive nature were placed near the end so that by the time the respondent reached those questions he or she felt comfortable answering them.
### Table 2.2
Respondents’ Views on the Mediating Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342 (69%)</td>
<td>96 (19%)</td>
<td>53 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Approval</td>
<td>86 (17%)</td>
<td>100 (20%)</td>
<td>123 (25%)</td>
<td>184 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence Social view</td>
<td>69 (14%)</td>
<td>93 (19%)</td>
<td>139 (26%)</td>
<td>192 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Reality</td>
<td>64 (13%)</td>
<td>117 (24%)</td>
<td>209 (42%)</td>
<td>103 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>29 (6%)</td>
<td>41 (8%)</td>
<td>123 (25%)</td>
<td>300 (61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As per the response categories set out above: 0 = Not at all / Never 1 = Not really / Seldom 2 = Somewhat/ Some degree / Sometimes 3 = Definitely/ Totally/ All the time*

Each group of respondents was given oral instructions on how to complete the questionnaire. The researcher was present to clarify any questions that arose. No school staff members were present in the room while the questionnaires were being administered; this was done in order that the respondents felt free to answer as honestly as possible. Students spent on average twenty minutes completing the questionnaire, afterwards each questionnaire was checked for completeness. The target sample consisted of 500 students who completed the questionnaire but for reliability reasons 0.014% of the sample was lost. This will be explained in greater detail under section 2.7 Validity and Reliability of the Measures. As a result the final analysis of this study was done on 493 high school pupils.
Table 2.3
Respondents' Views on Identification & Imitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>14 (3%)</td>
<td>227 (46%)</td>
<td>208 (42%)</td>
<td>44 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
<td>193 (39%)</td>
<td>231 (47%)</td>
<td>64 (13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As per the response categories set out above: 0 = Never 2 = Once or twice 3 = Several times 4 = Often

The behavioural portion of the data was collected by means of self-report involvement in delinquent behaviour. The self-report data, which was of primary focus of this research, was measured in the questionnaire by means of fourteen items covering behaviour committed in a period of 12 months. From the indicators of the self-reported delinquency it would be possible to depict the frequency of participation from the chosen list of delinquent acts as well as to compare the seriousness of each act.

The attitudinal portion of the data was collected by means of attitudinal measures obtained from the subjects in the questionnaire. The measures were assumed to express the values of the juvenile. The second major source of data that was of essential importance to the study was that of the media. As it was impractical to determine the exact type of mass medium each of the 500 subjects were exposed to and then to view each in order to establish the exact values portrayed. It was decided to make use of the measure recognition of value theme portrayals as indicators of media values in this study.

Eight values were selected for this study all of which conform to Schwartz (1994:24) categories of Collectivism and Individualism. Values that fall under the category of Collectivism are concerned with the enhancement of others, co-operation, conformity and group cohesion. The four values selected to embody this concept were considered as pro-social values. Individualism on the other hand is concerned with self-interest and the four values selected to embody this concept were characterised as antisocial as per the definition of pro-social and antisocial set out in Chapter 1.
Because of the limited number of values used they do not represent all possible values, but were considered enough coverage of the different areas of values to justify the study. The media data was asked in such a way that it could be matched with that of the juvenile’s. This allowed for the analysis of the impact of values on behaviour. The criteria employed in the selection of items to measure both the dependent and independent variable were that items had to have an acceptable distribution of replies and secondly the items had to appear to have the possibility of measuring the variable. Each of the variables and their indicators will be discussed in greater detail in the subsequent sections.

2.5 Dependent Variable: Self-reported Delinquent Behaviour

A dependent variable is a variable, which is thought to be, influenced by or predicted by another (independent) variable (Lutz 1983:47). The dependent variable being examined in this study is juvenile delinquency. The source of data selected to measure this variable was the juvenile’s self-report of his or her own delinquent behaviour. The self-report is aimed at determining individual delinquent behaviour to verify particular theoretical interpretations (Moffit & Silva 1988:227). This would involve the direct questioning of the youth about his or her activities in the last 12 months. The self-report method provides information on prevalence, incidence, distribution thereby promoting insight into crime phenomenon, while eliminating prejudice, minimising possible differences with regards to the gathering and reporting of data. The use of self-report was preferred over the use of official reports for the following reasons:

a) Law enforcement records are limited and provide an imperfect index of the total volume of criminal and delinquent acts. Official reports only reflect crimes known to the police and often, illegal activity goes unreported (Glick 1995: 40), as result the true incidence of delinquency would not be accurately reflected, affecting the validity of the research results.

b) Official records are also exposed to inherent biases based on variation in exposure, detection, and apprehension of juveniles on the basis of the juvenile’s social-economics, ethnic background, age, sex and demeanour.

c) Procedures following legal perceptions and definitions of seriousness change, policies are amended criminalisation and decriminalisation occurs which will affect the data.
The shortcomings of using self-reports include the uncertainty of whether youths are over-reporting or under-reporting the amounts and types of delinquent behaviour in which they have engaged in. In order to overcome this and maximise the validity and reliability of the variable the following steps were taken:

a) Confidentiality of responses was guaranteed. This was done to encourage respondents to reply truthfully without fear of recourse.

b) To reduce the degree of threat perceived by the respondents, instructions and response categories provided were set out in a way that implied that some respondents but not all would have engaged in the particular forms of delinquent behaviour set out at some time in the last 12 months.

c) The behavioural measures were embedded in the questionnaire in a way that the focus fell on other personal aspects namely the respondents values, thereby lessening the perceived threat.

d) The questionnaire dealt with a specified time span, namely the past 12 months. This relatively short period of time would ensure that the respondents could to a certain degree of accuracy recall the activities that they had been involved in.

e) The ordering of responses of the behavioural indicators was occasionally reversed. This was done to reduce the possibility of response set. By reversing the responses, greater attention was required by the respondent thereby increasing the validity of the responses. Secondly it also allowed for the identification of unreliable respondents who carelessly ticked any answer.

It was felt that by taking these measures a good report would be established thus lowering the rate of incomplete questionnaires thereby increasing the reliability of the variable. The basic measure of delinquency must provide an estimate of the number of delinquent acts committed by the respondent during a particular time frame. It must also take into account the seriousness of the act, and the specific nature of the act. For this reason fourteen indicators were selected that could be classified as either minor or serious offences.

Minor offences, or deviant acts, were acts that are unlikely to result in arrest or conviction. The seven minor offence indicators were:
• Fist fighting - respondents were asked if and how often in the last 12 months had they started or been involved in a fistfight with another person.

• Trespassing - respondents were asked if and how often in the last 12 months had they gone onto someone else's property without their permission.

• Licence violation - respondents were asked if and how often in the last 12 months had they driven without a legal certified licence.

• Run away - respondents were asked if and how often had they in the last 12 months run away from their home.

• Alcohol Use - respondents were asked if and how often they drank alcohol in a week. The time frame selected was different to that of the other acts as it is thought to occur more regularly than the other acts, and respondents would be unlikely to recall the exact number of times that they had drunk in the last 12 months.

• Vandalism - respondents were asked if and how often in the last 12 months had they broken/damaged/ defaced/set alight to someone else's property or building.

• Gang involvement - respondents were asked if and how often in the last 12 months had they taken part in or been part of gang activities.

The response categories for each of the delinquent acts were; never, once or twice, several times, and often. These categories provided a rough indication of the frequency of involvement in both serious and minor offences. Numbers were assigned to each of the ordinal response levels in the following way:

Never = 0  Once or twice = 1  Several times = 3  Often = 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Offence</th>
<th>Fist Fighting</th>
<th>Trespassing</th>
<th>Licence Violation</th>
<th>Run Away</th>
<th>Alcohol Use</th>
<th>Vandalism</th>
<th>Gang Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>288 (58.4%)</td>
<td>232 (47%)</td>
<td>321 (65.1%)</td>
<td>433 (87.8%)</td>
<td>114 (23%)</td>
<td>432 (88%)</td>
<td>429 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or Twice</td>
<td>169 (34.3%)</td>
<td>204 (41%)</td>
<td>56 (11.4%)</td>
<td>60 (12.2%)</td>
<td>41 (8%)</td>
<td>48 (10%)</td>
<td>24 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Times</td>
<td>36 (7.3%)</td>
<td>57 (12%)</td>
<td>116 (23.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>338 (69%)</td>
<td>13 (2%)</td>
<td>40 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- N = 493, 2315 non-serious acts were committed by 172 of the respondents

Serious offences, or criminal acts, are those acts that violate the law and if detected by police would result in arrest and possible conviction. The seven serious offence indicators were:

- Breaking and entering - respondents were asked if and how often in the last 12 months had they broken into someone’s home or place of business with the intent to steal.

- Robbery - respondents were asked if and how often had they in the last 12 months used force or the threat of force to steal something from someone.

- Joyriding - respondents were asked if and how often in the last 12 months had they taken and driven someone’s car without their knowledge and/or permission.

- Shoplifting - respondents were asked if and how often in the last 12 months had they taken something of value from a shop without paying for it.

- Stolen property - respondents were asked if and how often had they in the last 12 months purchased, been in possession of, or sold stolen property.
• Sale of drugs - respondents were asked if and how often had they in the last 12 months sold illegal drugs to others.

• Drug use - respondents were asked if and how often they used illegal drugs in a week. The time frame selected was different to that of the other acts as it is thought to occur more regularly than the other acts, and respondents would be unlikely to recall the exact number of times that they had used drugs in the last 12 months.

The use of drugs was classified in this study as a serious offence as researchers have pointed out that crimes are often committed as a result of the effects of drugs but also at times for the maintaining of the drug habit (Joubert 1990:188). The response categories for each of the delinquent acts were; never, once or twice, several times, and often. These categories provided a rough indication of the frequency of involvement in both serious and minor offences. Numbers were assigned to each of the ordinal response levels in the following way:

Never = 0  Once or twice = 1  Several times = 3  Often = 4

This scoring procedure provided a conservative estimate of the actual frequency of self-reported acts.

Table 2.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stolen Property</th>
<th>Breaking &amp; Entering</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Selling Drugs</th>
<th>Joyriding</th>
<th>Shoplifting</th>
<th>Drug Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>407 (83%)</td>
<td>483 (98%)</td>
<td>464 (94%)</td>
<td>479 (97.2%)</td>
<td>448 (90.9%)</td>
<td>359 (72.8%)</td>
<td>434 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or Twice</td>
<td>56 (11%)</td>
<td>10 (2%)</td>
<td>29 (6%)</td>
<td>12 (2.4%)</td>
<td>41 (8.3%)</td>
<td>127 (25.8%)</td>
<td>43 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several Times</td>
<td>30 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (0.4%)</td>
<td>4 (0.8%)</td>
<td>7 (1.4%)</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = 493, 495 serious acts were committed by 54 of the respondents
The categorisation of youths into delinquents and non-delinquents was done according to their cumulative scores. Youths with cumulative scores of zero or one were categorised as non-delinquents. The score of one was included because of the possibility of overzealous reporting. Those with scores above one were divided into two categories, namely those lightly involved in delinquent acts (cumulative scores of two to six) and those heavily involved in delinquent acts (cumulative scores of seven and above). 70% of the 493 respondents were non-delinquents, 242 of the respondents were lightly involved in delinquent behaviour and 181 of the respondents were heavily involved in delinquent behaviour. The total percentage categorised as delinquents was 86% percent.

**Graph 2.6**

Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Categorisation of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delinquency Categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-delinquents (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major delinquency (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor delinquency (49.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85.8% were involved in some form of delinquency, 36.7% heavily involved and 49.1% lightly involved. 14.2% were not involved in any acts of delinquency in a period of 12 months.

The basic analytic procedure involved the calculation of the frequency of self-reported offences by serious and minor classification and type of offence. The type of measure for the dependent variable was a raw frequency score, a simple calculation of delinquent acts admitted on the self-report delinquency question section. The frequency scores reflected the extent of the juvenile’s involvement in delinquent activity during the course of the study but ignored the increase or
decrease in the respondents delinquency. To obtain the frequency of both serious and non-serious acts as a single measure; the "number" of non-serious acts were added together and then added to the total "numbers" of serious acts. When the raw scores were combined the distribution for self-report behaviour was:

\[
\text{mode} = 3 \quad \text{mean} = 5.9 \quad \text{median} = 5
\]

2.6 Independent Variable: Media-Youth Values Matched

An independent variable is a variable that is thought to influence or to predict another (dependent) variable, with no outside or previous influence on itself being investigated (Lutz 1983:47). In this study, values are the independent variables by which to explain delinquent behaviour. To analyse the influence between media and youth values it was necessary to match the values. In order to achieve this, the response category items from the media data were matched to that of the juvenile value data in terms of the direction of the pro-social and antisocial value stances. As values are theoretical constructs, latent variables, they had to be measured indirectly by means of one or more indicators.

It is acknowledged that because of its secondary analysis nature, there exist weaknesses in the data. It was however, felt that sufficient information would emerge to assess the effects of media – youth values upon delinquent behaviour as proposed by the Differential Socialisation model. One of the shortcomings was whether respondents were making responses more favourable than they really are. Though the absence or presence of this factor cannot be determined with certainty, as previously stated it was presumed to be minimal.

Secondly, when dealing with socialisation one cannot rule out or completely isolate the influence of other socialising agents in the life of the child. This influence was factored into the study by determining the amount of time spent with other socialising agents and establishing the importance attributed to the media by the respondents. It was assumed that if the respondents attributed significant importance and time to the media the greater the likelihood that the media was the more substantial influence in the child’s life in relation to the other socialising agents.

The pro-social or antisocial nature of the value indicators is fairly apparent. The eight values employed in the study for both media and juvenile values were
selected from Schwartz (1994:22) motivational types of values. Each of the eight values fit into one of the ten types of value paths as set out by Schwartz (1994:31).

The four pro-social value indicators used signify co-operation, conformity, and group cohesion, and are as follows:

Value 3 (Honesty) and 8 (Responsibility) these values emphasise the enhancement of others and transcend one’s selfish interests. They place significance on the acceptance of others as equals and concern for their welfare.

Value 4 (Obedience) emphasises normative behaviour that promotes close relationships.

Value 7 (respect for tradition) involves the subordination of self in favour of socially imposed expectations and preserving the existing social arrangements.

The four antisocial value indicators used to epitomise self-interest are:

Value 1 (Boldness, daring) this value emphasises the desire for pleasant arousal, excitement and novelty.

Value 2 (Pleasure) emphasises enjoyment and sensuous gratification for oneself.

Value 5 (Power) and 6 (Wealth) place value on social superiority and esteem. Emphasising the pursuit of one’s success and dominance over others.

The indicators used to represent the media’s values were measured indirectly. The learning of the value is according to Dong, Tan & Cao (1998:88) the prerequisite for the acceptance of the value. Learning is viewed as the summary of a viewer’s cognitive representation of the values learned. To establish the degree of importance attributed by the media to the values listed it was assumed that retrospective recognition of value themes by the youth offered some indication of the cognitive processing at the time of the exposure. Therefore, by asking to rate the degree of importance the media attributes to each of the values listed, the
juvenile is both recognising the value theme and establishing functionality of the value based on his or her observations of the media. Thus serving to establish the media's stance on each of the values as identified by the observer, as underlying values can be inferred through observation (Selnow 1990:71).

The indicators used to represent the youth's values were measured in a way that directly expressed their conceptualisation as guiding principles in the individual's life. Dong, Tan & Cao (1998:93) established that values perceived as functional are more readily accepted and assimilated, and that value acceptance is indicative of socialisation. Thus the perceived functionality of the values was measured by asking respondents to rate the degree of importance of each of the values in terms of achieving their personal goals. Since the respondents have only their own internalised system of values to tell them how to rate each of the values, this method of measuring the indicators is highly projective in nature. Yet the stimulus is far more structured than the ambiguous material ordinarily employed in projective tests. The degree to which the individual's value choices and his or her perception of the media's values were congruent, it was possible to regard the media value as shared.

The measurement technique used was rating as it allowed respondents to indicate that more than one of the values is equally important to them. Rating was preferred over ranking in this study, as it was felt that ranking violated assumption of independence of each value. Secondly ranking is more difficult and time consuming for the respondent. The response categories used for both the media's values and those of the juvenile's were "not at all", "not really, "somewhat" and "very". By doing this, indicators measured different aspects of the significance placed on the specific value.

Unlike the nature of the indicators, the natures of the response categories are not as apparent, changing in nature depending on the nature of the value. In order to compare both the media's stance on the specific value and the juvenile's stance on the same value in terms of congruence and in-congruence, adjustments were made to make the appropriate cells comparable to the A, B, C, and D groups. This was done as the attitudinal items contained more than dichotomous responses. The defined groups were equated with the ensuing cells as follows:
### Table 2.6
Group Definition for the Response Categories of the Antisocial Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media's Stance</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Juvenile's Stance**

Red = Group A, Green = Group B, Blue = Group C, Magenta = Group D

For the four antisocial values, the response category "Somewhat" and "Very" signified acceptance of the antisocial values therefore their nature is antisocial. The response category "Not at all" and "Not really" signified rejection of the antisocial values therefore their nature was regarded as pro-social.

### Table 2.7
Group Definition for the Response Categories of the Pro-social Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media's Stance</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Juvenile's Stance**

Red = Group A, Green = Group B, Blue = Group C, Magenta = Group D
For the four pro-social values, the response category "Somewhat" and "Very" signified acceptance of the pro-social values therefore their nature is pro-social. The response category "Not at all" and "Not really" signified rejection of the pro-social values therefore their nature was regarded as antisocial.

2.7 Validity and Reliability of the Measures

Validity may be defined as the extent to which a measurement truly represents an intended characteristic. It is the extent to which the differences in the scores reflect true differences among the individuals with regard to the specific characteristic that the researcher is seeking to measure rather than the result of constant or random error (Bailey 1994:67). Reliability may be defined as the extent to which a measurement consistently represents an intended characteristic (Lutz 1983:12). The issue of validity and reliability of measures determines what can be interpreted from the results, and the entire validity and reliability of the research itself. For if data are not reliable they cannot be valid and if they are not consistent they cannot measure any single characteristic. If this is then the case, the results are likely to be biased, and the research flawed.

To ensure both validity and reliability, the measures must not only measure what they are supposed to but also ensure that if a different researcher employed the same methods the same results would be produced. Validity of any measurement has two parts. Firstly the measuring instrument must measure the concept in question. Secondly the concept must be measured accurately (Bailey 1994:67). The reliability of a measure has to do with consistency. If the measurement does not change when the concept is being measured, then such measure is considered reliable (Bailey 1994:72). The technique used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire was that of test-retest, one of the better-known techniques (Mouton & Marais 1990:95). This was done during the pilot study when the questionnaire was pre-tested on two occasions.

In the self-reported delinquency measures, various studies have been undertaken to determine both the validity and reliability of the use of self-report as a measure of juvenile delinquency. Elliot and Voss (1974) compared the responses to specific self-report items with external criteria such as official police or court records. Clark & Tifft (1966:523) established that 81.5% of responses on self-report remained identical after a series of subsequent measures were used. Their findings disclosed that under-reporting was 3 times more common than over-reporting, even so self-
reporting of delinquent behaviour continues to be considered as accurate, and well suited for etiological research and thus its use warranted. The items and response categories selected for the self-report section were taken from studies such as: Magura (1979), Elliot & Voss (1974), Goff & Goddard (1999), which have ensured the validity and reliability of the self-report delinquency measures, through the incorporation of safeguards and the necessary testing of the items.

Besides the procedural safeguards built in to maximise the validity and reliability of the measures, the following checks were also included:

- Where the questionnaire was inconsistently and/or haphazardly completed, the questionnaire was eliminated from the study. A true reflection of the associations would not be possible to establish from incomplete information.

- Where the respondent admitted to committing all types of acts the maximum number of times, the questionnaire was eliminated. Such an individual would more likely be institutionalised. As a result of these reliability checks, seven questionnaires were eliminated from the study.

2.8 Methods of Analysis

The analysis of the data collected during the survey was divided up into two phases. In the first phase, the existence of variation in the nature of the values was established. This was accomplished by comparing the distribution among the different response categories for the eight value indicators. Frequency distributions were used for all eight sets of values. In the second phase, the media-juvenile values with the respective delinquency mean scores were matched. The mean delinquency score for each congruent and in-congruent value position were compared to assess the interaction between the two sets of values. In other words, the media values and delinquency mean scores were compared when the juvenile agreed with the pro-social and then the antisocial view. This form of analysis was used on all eight pairs of media-juvenile values. The mean delinquency score that was of prime interest was that of A & D, media – juvenile congruent antisocial position vs. media-juvenile congruent pro-social position. Analysis of variance was done on all eight values to further determine the significance of the differences, followed by the computation of the omega-square to ascertain the strength of the association.
As direction is predicted in this study, the one tailed “t-test” of significance of difference was used. This form of significance test was selected as the sample was randomly chosen and the t-test provided a means of incorporating both the size of the differences and the size of each group. This was done so as to guide the hypotheses of the group differences and to distinguish “real” difference from chance differences or differences due to error of measurement. By relying upon the significance test for the acceptance or rejection of the proposed hypotheses, an unbiased approach to the study was provided. The level of significance was set at 0.10 because of the exploratory nature of the study. The significance of the direct effects of each value variable and the interactive effect of the matched pairs of value items were measured by the supportive statistics from the analysis of the variance tests. As the matched value items are not dichotomous responses, adjustments were made to make up the appropriate cells, as set out in Table 2.6 and Table 2.7. Each matched pair of values was examined in terms of all possible combinations in order to test the hypotheses.

Though the t-test of significance are used to compare the means of two samples to determine if those means differ significantly, some researchers propose that it is an inefficient and potentially misleading method of analysis. Therefore, the use of analysis of variance, which is preferred by some researchers, was included as a method of analysis as it can test for any difference between several means in one unified procedure. While knowing that a difference between two samples is statistically significant and that there exists a reliable relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, the measure of association strength can tell how strong the reliable relationship is. Therefore, the omega-square statistic was used as a method of quantifying the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

2.9 Summary

This study was aimed at exploring the relatively unknown area of media socialisation. As a result of the sparse literature available on the subject it was necessary, prior to the study’s undertaking, to establish whether this area of thought merited further research. Therefore a pilot study was undertaken, before the study could proceed, in order to determine the study’s viability and to test the measuring instrument created for this study. A sample group of 50 students sharing the same characteristics of those that would make up the final sample group, and from the same geographical area as the intended study was used in the pilot study. Once
viability was established and the instrument was tested and re-tested, the survey method was selected to obtain the behavioural and attitudinal data. Data needed to establish the association between the media – youth value transmission and subsequent involvement in youth crime, and to test the hypotheses generated in order to obtain knowledge of the process of differentiated socialisation.

Quantitative in nature, this study concerned itself with the measurement of observations in numerical terms thereby determining the statistical probabilities of the relationship between mass media socialisation and youth crime. The approach used consisted of matching certain media values with comparable views on behalf of the youth, then analysing these two value stances as they relate to delinquency. The data for this analysis was obtained from a survey of High school pupils in the Johannesburg Metropolitan district during the 2001 academic year, through the use of a three page self-administered questionnaire. The subjects who were randomly selected from both government and private high schools were aged between 13 and 18. They came from all socio-economic backgrounds as well as racial and gender divisions. 500 pupils aged were randomly selected from 20 different schools. Of the 500 selected to complete the questionnaire, 493 were used in the study. 7 respondents were lost due to the reliability checks built into the study to ensure the study’s integrity and the validity and reliability of the findings.

The study’s dependent variable, delinquent behaviour, was measured by means of the juvenile’s self-report of his or her own involvement in delinquent acts. The media’s values matched with those of the youth’s, were the independent variables, and were measured by means of eight value types selected from the Schwartz (1994:22) motivational value types. The methods of analysis chosen for this study comprised of, a comparison of the frequency distribution of all sets of values so as to determine the variation of the nature of the values. This consisted of the use of percentages, and frequency tables. The second method of analysis included the matching up of the mean delinquency scores for each congruent and incongruent value position, making use of statistical analysis.

2.10 Conclusion

The methods used in this study assist in the inference of associations from the data collected. Yet to fully understand the implications and relevance of the findings one needs an understanding of the theoretical background from which the problem arose. The following two chapters comprise a descriptive analysis of
appropriate theoretical literature available on the subject. Chapter three examines the process of socialisation, particularly that of media socialisation. Exploring the process of value transmission, value inculcation, and the value - behaviour relation. Demonstrating how values may affect behaviour and lead to eventual involvement in delinquent behaviour. The general background of the problem is discussed and how the research problem relates to previous research findings and theories is demonstrated. Chapter four discusses the relevant theories of deviance, specifically the issue of differential association and socialisation. The theoretical basis of the study of juvenile delinquency is examined and the issue of mass media socialisation is considered in terms of the traditional theories.
3.1 Introduction

Rosengren & Reimer (1986) noted that traditional research on culture, socialisation, and mass communication has been carried out without much contact, but that there is an ever-increasing need for corroboration among the three areas of research. Humans, as social beings, maintain consistency and order in the everyday social world through socially imposed realities, cultural symbols, beliefs, norms and roles, bringing a similarity and common ground to what is considered natural ideas and behaviour. This similarity is achieved through socialisation which is a key determinant of behaviour and the manner by which the basic principles needed to survive, function and thrive, are taught. Socialisation is a developmental process that evolves over time, directed and influenced by a multitude of factors. The end result is that we become products of our culture, which provides us with a set of "rules" on how to behave and a set of "glasses" for seeing and interpreting the world (Mei Ching Ng 1998:71).

A crucial factor in the socialisation process is that of communication. It is through communication that individuals receive, process, interpret and internalise stimuli from socialising agents. Prior to the industrial revolution, people were dependent on information from interpersonal interaction. However, when the world changed from rural to industrial, mass communication became central to the world's functioning, linking major institutions into a dynamic social system. The mass media has become a means of marketing goods and services, providing entertainment and education while occupying a larger portion of our time than any other source of socialisation. Previously the family was the primary socialising influence, transmitting the basic personal and social reality perspectives, controlling what and when children learned about the world. Now the media has become an integral part of our everyday lives, with its powerful images and sounds and has become influential in
the transmitting of social values, playing a significant role in the socialisation process.

The media has become one of the most important connections between societal and individual culture, allowing for the internalisation of shared but differentiated sets of values (Rosengren & Reimer 1986:4). Its interactive nature influences each socialisation agent in turn. Regardless of the many benefits the media has brought about, the media continues to be the focus of much criticism. It has been accused of stimulating undesirable behaviour, promulgating objectionable material, and creating social problems. As the media is a solitary activity, many parents struggle to exercise control over it. When one consders that the peak viewing years are between 2 and 7 years of age, a critical stage in the moral development of a child, the media cannot be ignored. Neither can its influence on the socialisation process be overlooked. This chapter examines the socialisation process and the role of the mass media as a socialising agent.

3.2 The Socialisation Process

Socialisation refers to the process whereby the standards of any given society are transmitted from one generation to the next, with one of its most important functions being the maintenance of the social system. Every society or social group specifies certain outcomes, which are to be pursued. These outcomes are guided by goals, which motivate commitment of the members to sustained response participation and which develop member competency in order to maintain the group. Society is dependent upon a certain degree of consensus about goals that ought to be sought, as well as the means of attaining those goals (Clausen 1968:3). One of the ways of achieving this is through the integration of different value orientations in the same social system. This is done as shared value systems provide the structure that holds one’s culture and society together. Therefore, socialisation can be viewed as the process by which an individual learns the ways of a given society or social group to which the person belongs to, so as to be able to function in that society or social group. Socialisation allows for society to instruct the young on how to behave as members of the social group.

Of course, a common set of values within society does not guarantee how people will behave, but it does mould and shape their behaviour, giving direction to what they will do, while providing the means of social control by internally regulating an individual’s behaviour. Internal regulation ensures that the individual behaves in
socially appropriate ways, suitable to the interpersonal situation, and develops a sense of being connected to the larger social world to which the individual belongs. The development of self-control is an important part of the process and one of the primary goals of socialisation is the instilling of intrinsic motives for being good. This results in an individual who has internalised the norms of society, is able to distinguish between right and wrong and act accordingly, using the norms as a guide.

Every stage of the socialisation process consists of exposure to, and restriction of, social information. Socialisation can be seen as a form of graded access to information, where the individual is exposed slowly and in stages. Each of these stages affects the resolution of the issues presented by succeeding stages, while generating certain expectations which the child will bring with him or her into new socialisation settings. The socialising agents in the new setting will also have their own expectations, which they too direct toward the child. Therefore, as the child becomes more involved in more complex social interactions, he or she carries with him or her the role concepts that he or she has already developed and pursues correspondence in his or her new associations. The child seeks to associate with others with whom he or she has compatible self-other expectations, thus indicating how basic values, formed during the early socialising experiences, predominate in later socialisation (Thompson 78:26).

However, socialisation is not a smooth process and often the individual is subject to conflicting messages, especially when there exists a contrast between the values expressed and the values implicit in the actual behaviour. This may result in the rejection of the expressed value in favour of accepting the implicit value. These inconsistencies may result from a heterogeneous society where a variety of alternate value systems are offered in competition to one another. They may also be the result of rapid social change where conceptions of ideal behaviour differ significantly from generation to generation (Nye 1975:127). This is known as value ambiguity and it is the result of a disjunction between “what is”, “what was”, and “what ought to be”, having an effect on value inculcation by requiring a constant reconstruction of social reality. Socialising agents are often responsible for the transmission of these inconsistencies.
3.2.1 Socialising Agents

Any member of society may serve as a socialising agent when he or she influences the behaviour of another, even though he or she may not have intended such influence (Clausen 1968:148). Socialisation agents are responsible for promoting the socialisation process, passing on core values and a sense of responsibility, as well as skills and orientations (Croteau & Hoynes 1997:15). However, they do not exert their influence independently, but rather continually interact with each other and the individual, influencing the individual both directly and indirectly. During this process new agents are added to those that the child already has, becoming new role models (Elkin & Handel 1972:61). Thus the contents of the various forms of socialisation are not mutually exclusive, nor are the agents necessarily working in harmony, making the process exceedingly complex (White 1977:1).

Their roles vary between societies, as well as at different stages during an individual's life span. They play an important role as control agents during the internalisation process, as social control is achieved when self-control is mastered (White 1977:4). Socialisation agents and institutions select from the cultural environment what is to be transmitted and interpreted to the child, while transmitting outcomes and goals and transferring values from what has been selected. This irrevocably influences the content and the process of socialisation. Problems facing socialisation agents include a lack of communication of outcome expectations and a lack of connecting ideas about how ideal outcomes relate to concrete methods and activities (Lippid 1968:333). The result is that the goal orientation of the agents seems primarily a projection of their own personal needs, derived from the backgrounds of their own socialisation experiences. These goal orientations are then transmitted to the child, influencing his or her behaviour.

3.2.2 Socialised Behaviour

The behaviour, which results from the socialisation process, is a function of observation and perceived effectiveness (Strasburger 1995:24). It is dependent upon socialisation, the level of cognitive development and values taught, and is acquired through the process of imitation and identification. It is guided by belief (as individuals act in a context of convictions about the meaning of their actions), what acts are appropriate in particular settings, and what responses may be expected from others. Action also emerges from beliefs about the world and how one should respond to it (Siegel 1971:616). Behaviour is not only shaped by the
actions and verbalization individuals see others use (Bukatko & Daehler 1995:460), but also by the predominant norms and values of those to whom the individual is bonded (Zillmann, Bryant & Huston 1994:157). Behaviour can be learned from direct experience or by observing a model's behaviour and the consequence of the model's behaviour. Individuals' behaviour is often motivated by the desire for a positive outcome and the minimization of a negative outcome and, as such, the probability of behaviour imitation increases when the model is seen to be powerful or in control of his or her resources (Yawkey & Johnson 1988:10).

Attitude and social influence play an important role in behaviour formation. When overt behaviour is at odds with individual values for reasons of acceptability of the behaviour for significant others, the behaviour observed will be dependent on how successfully the individual can carry out their intention in the face of situational influences. Though behaviour continues through reinforcement, it begins to emanate from within once values become internalised (Windmiller 1980:22). Individuals begin to behave in accordance with ideals learned and internalised and acceptable behaviour is then generated from intrinsic factors. Individual value systems are founded on the internalisation of moral standards and are related to the accurate perception and acceptance of values. Internalisation is a crucial step in the development of morality.

3.2.3 Internalisation

Internalisation is the process by which an individual comes to accept the standards, without being explicitly instructed to do so (Cole & Cole 1996:G3). The individual's behaviour becomes independent of external means of control and more dependent on the underlying value system. Individuals behave in accordance with ideals learned and internalised. Responses adopted through internalisation are abandoned if the individual no longer perceives them as the best way to maximise their values. There exist five conditions conducive to internalisation. The first is a clear definition of the appropriate norm. The second is solidarity between the individual being socialised and the socialising agent.

The third condition is a permissive attitude on the part of the socialising agent toward a limited amount of regressive behaviour by the individual being socialised. The fourth involves a controlled reaction on the part of the socialising agent toward rebellious behaviour and the fifth is the rewarding for learning the role (Magura 1979:18). Individual value systems are founded on the internalisation of moral
standards. Socialisation has always been viewed as an adult-initiated process, however; the role that the child plays in the process has been seen to differ significantly throughout the years. As a result four models of socialisation developed, each with differing concepts of the basic nature and role of the child (Schaffer 1996:233).

3.2.4 Models of Socialisation

(a) *Laissez-faire model* – This model is based upon the writings of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who believed that each child is born with all the basic aspects of his or her personality intact and that, during subsequent development, these aspects unfold. The socialising agent, whose primary function is to provide a maximally permissive environment where the child can give free expression to spontaneous interests and activities, is thus seen as having a limited part to play. Socialisation is regarded as a self-initiated process. Rousseau’s views were adopted by educationalists such as Pestalozzi, Froebel and Neil (Schaffer 1996:233).

(b) *Clay moulding model* – In direct contrast to the *Laissez-faire model*, the clay-moulding model viewed the child as a passive participant, who, uninformed at birth, in time takes on the shape of the things that occurred during the impressionable years. Thus the focus falls primarily on the behaviour of the agent, and change is seen as the result of environmental input. (Schaffer 1996:234).

(c) *Conflict model* – Inspired by Freud’s writings, this model views children as innately antisocial, born with wishes and desires contrary to society. Thus the agent’s role is to compel the child to give up natural preferences and adopt modes of behaviour regarded as desirable by adults through the curbing of primitive impulses. Socialisation is seen as comprising of prohibitions, commands, threats and exhortations (Schaffer 1996:234).

(d) *Mutuality model* – A more modern approach is that of the mutuality model. The systems theory is one of the theories that have gained the most acceptance in this area. Unlike the previous three models, this model views the child as an active participant in the socialisation process, and mutual adaptation between agent and child is characteristic of the interaction (Schaffer 1996:234). All aspects of the child and of the developmental context are considered equally important and therefore need to be understood in their entirety. Though
primarily focusing on the influence of the agent's values, this study concurs with the view of the child as an active participant. This active participation culminates during adolescence.

3.2.5 Adolescent Socialisation

Adolescence is the most dramatic period of life, it is a period of change, re-organization, and development in knowledge and abilities. It is a period of training and preparation for future and adult roles. One of the life tasks at this stage is the acquisition of standards that will define the goals of life and specify the means of achieving these goals. Adolescence is an impressionable stage, during which attitudes and values are being formed and developed. The individual is being shaped personally and socially, participating and negotiating in his or her social world. The adolescent’s behaviour is becoming more dependent upon norms and values to which he or she has bonded (Zillmann et al 1994:157), and he or she is learning to behave in socially appropriate ways and to develop a sense of being connected to the larger social world. Interaction with others during this stage plays an important role in the shaping of his or her view of reality. Continuities in socialisation from childhood to adulthood are significant as childhood socialisation sets the limits to what can be accomplished (Elkin & Handel 1972:144).

By adolescence the nature of the socialisation process has changed and the child has become far more active in defining his or her own goals and in seeking the kind of socialisation experience that will help him or her to achieve them. The adolescent is also able to incorporate and integrate experiences from situation to situation and from setting to setting, becoming skilled at discerning not only what is wanted of him or her by any given socialising agent, but the degree of leeway that is given to him or her. He or she also discerns the congruity of any given demand with others made upon him or her and the costs of noncompliance with any particular influence attempt. They are able to manage relationships across settings as well as learn to restrain or give in to his or her dispositions differentially (Clausen 1968:133). Though development is over by late adolescence, socialisation is never complete and learning continues, thus allowing society a chance to start over again if mistakes have been made during the process. Levy (1952) proposed eight requisites for the continued functioning and socialisation of society.
3.2.6 Levy’s Eight Requisites

Levy’s (1952) eight requisites for the continued functioning and socialisation of society are:

1) The provision for adequate physiological relationship to physical setting. This includes information and motor skills.

2) Role differentiation and role assignment, comprising personal identity and self-system

3) Shared, learned, and symbolic modes of communication which includes language skills and cognitive attributes.

4) Shared cognitive orientation, comprising of attitudes, beliefs, opinions and idea systems.

5) Shared articulated goals, which consist of values.

6) The regulation of choice means, comprising ego development and self-system.

7) Regulation of affective expression which incorporate affective modes of functioning.

8) Effective control of disruptive forms of behaviour, comprising of moral modes of functioning.

The requisite of interest to this study is that of shared articulated goals. Students of socialisation have aimed to understand how norms and values are communicated to, understood by and internalised by the individual being socialised. However, the nature of the value itself has been of less concern than the process by which the value is learned (Zigler, Lamb & Child 1982:12). Yet research has shown that antisocial tendencies can be reduced or increased by the internalisation of beliefs and values learned during the socialisation process, bringing to light the fact that the nature of the value is as important as the process itself.
Values are viewed as cognitive representations of society’s demands and of the individual’s needs for competence and morality. They are a way of encoding and decoding self and others (Ball-Rokeach & Lodges 1996:280). Values develop from life experiences and interactions with one’s environment, thereby providing an approach for dealing with new options (Kahle 1996:135). Values are seen as preferences for desirable life states or behaviour and are organized in a value system along a continuum of relative importance. Value systems are relatively stable, as stability is necessary for the expression of coherence of the self over time and situation (Seligman & Katz 1996:55). But they are also dynamic in nature, changing according to the context, strengthening or weakening as they are fulfilled or unfulfilled, or reinforced.

Values can change over time (Dong, Tan & Cao 1998:319), taking into account that change depends on the context of the situation. Values begin by being socialised by early models and continue to change, as new models become important to the individual (Veroff 1983:xvii). Values are initially taught and learned in isolation from other values in an absolute manner. As the child matures, he or she increasingly encounters social situations in which several values come into competition with one another, requiring a weighing of one value against the other, and integrating the values into a hierarchically organized system. The behavioural outcome will be the result of the relative importance of all competing values that the situation has activated (Rokeach 1973:6). Their function is the maintenance of social cohesion through the provision of a structure that holds culture and society together. Values are formed through interaction and modeling and play an important role in the formation of attitudes.

Values influence life and development because they are incorporated within cultural schemes that underlie activities, and which give events their affective and moral meaning. Values form the basis upon which children develop their world-views and they determine what children experience and learn. Values are related to social issues, attitude formation and behaviour. They are one of the primary sources of internal control (Elliot, Huizinga & Agelton 1985:16). Value systems are founded on the internalisation of standards and are transmitted as goals that others expect the individual to meet. Once well established, value systems result in corresponding behaviour, which individuals come to expect of themselves as a result of what others expect of him or her (Drenan 1983:229). Values cause
individuals to consistently act and live in certain ways, as they serve as reference points in the self-regulation of behaviour, allowing the individual to compare his or her behaviour and then adjust the behaviour to be consistent with the values (Wojciszke 1989:230). While people often behave in a manner consistent with their values, behaviour is one of the most persuasive forces in the formation and maintenance of values (Thornberry 1998:479).

Values motivate action, serving the interests of some social entity, and function as standards for judging and justifying action. They are acquired through socialisation to one’s dominant group values and unique learning experiences (Schwartz 1994:21) and act as significant aides in the making of choices, arriving at decisions and the resolving of personal conflict. They are learned through observation and therefore through media presentation. The more an individual is exposed to a certain value, the more likely he or she is to accept the fundamental value. The more important a value is, the more accessible the value will be. Accessibility is further increased by frequent presentation of the value (Seligman & Katz 1996:73). However, values are not passively absorbed. The selection depends upon the degree of similarity in competence between self and the model, the valuation of the specific activity and the degree to which the individual sees him or herself controlling his or her own behaviour.

Social values are of importance in the socialisation process as they are often accepted without demand for proof. They are related to how people reason about social issues and to attitude formation and behaviour. They are formed through interaction and models serve as sources of socially desired and sanctioned behaviours. The nature of the value transmitted is an important factor in the child’s acceptance or rejection of the value but the manner in which the value is taught is often considered more important in determining whether the child will follow the value (Thorton & Voigt 1992:241). Acceptance of values involves three components: firstly, the message must be perceived as appropriate; secondly, the individual must be motivated to comply with the message; and finally, the individual must feel that the message has been self-regulated rather than imposed (Young 1995:406).

Kronhauser (1978:34) has found that a person never acts except in conformity to the norms of his or her culture. Behaviour is a product of human socialisation. Therefore, motivation to enact behaviour increases with the increase of normative
pressures. Beliefs, opinions, needs, goals and values determine behaviour and to influence behaviour requires the ability to influence these determinants. If socialisation was adequate in content, quality and intensity, individuals would be more conforming to the prevailing system and norms, reducing a lot of deviance resulting from poor socialisation. However, this is not possible as normative systems lack perfect integration, creating conflicting role expectations, and as an ongoing process, it is prone to error.

Furthermore, socialisation is never perfect because people are active participants, which allows the individual some resistance to the process. Social disorganization is present to some degree in all societies and certain criminogenic characteristics of culture exist, therefore the conditions necessary for perfect socialisation cannot be provided. Some of the culture’s criminogenic characteristics include its dynamic culture which results in change and fluidity in norms, the presence of alternative and conflicting values, impersonal social relationships, and culture’s multi-group nature that fosters duality of loyalty and ethics (Barron 1974:81). As a result, we find delinquency related to terminal core values which, when adopted, give rise to deviant self-image (Goff & Goddard 1999:47).

3.2.8 Socialisation and Youth Crime

Both the forms and the changing patterns of socialisation have been considered important in the progression of youth crime. Various studies, including Magura (1979), have proposed a correlation between youth crime and the core values of an individual, with the failure to internalise conventional belief systems seen as a major source of deviance. Lerman (1968:221) suggested that youths don’t act illegally as a result of their values, but they may tolerate illegal behaviour if it is compatible with their values. However, Goff & Goddard (1999) believe that core values adopted result in deviant self-images, which in turn result in delinquent behaviour, and that one’s dominant values can inhibit or enhance delinquent behaviour. Other researchers have suggested that delinquency is nothing more than the mere subscription to the values of the group.

Elliot, Huizinga & Ageton (1985) have indicated that the value hierarchy of delinquent and non-delinquent youths differs. Delinquent youths approve both conventional and non-conventional values, whereas non-delinquent youths only sanction conventional values, with delinquents placing substantial emphasis on action and excitement (Hagell & Newburn 1994:39). Romero, Sobral, Luengo &
Marzoo (2001) concur, adding that delinquent adolescents have characteristic value systems and that antisocial behaviour is associated with hedonistic values and a lack of interest in conventional and social values. Thornberry (1998) not only views delinquent values as major reinforceers of delinquent behaviour, but also as major reinforceers of delinquent associations. Children who are attached to deviant role models will not only learn to imitate the behaviour, but are more likely to internalise their unconventional values (Garner & Stein 1998:92).

Cole & Cole (1996) suggested that specific forms of socialisation are able to raise the levels of antisocial behaviour among adolescents. A person’s tendencies toward aggression and antisocial behaviour depend largely on the extent to which the culture is seen as encouraging such behaviours. Asquith (1996) highlighted the fact that changing socialisation patterns promote delinquent behaviour, while Muncie (1997) proposed that youth crime is due to different forms of socialisation rather than a lack of socialisation, and that the institutions of socialisation can promote a disposition to offending. When the agents violate the norms, they disinhibit the observer by giving them reason to believe that they too can break the rule (Shaffer 1994:430). Deficiencies in the teaching of law-abiding norms and values have been linked to delinquent behaviour (Thornton & Voigt 1992:241). Siegel & Senna (2000:165) have reported that even children living in deteriorated inner-city environments will not get involved in delinquency if socialisation experiences are positive and supportive. It is youths who suffer improper socialisation that are at risk of criminal behaviour. Thus socialisation is vitally important in both causation and the prevention of delinquent behaviour.

The role of personal values in explaining human behaviour has been the interest of social scientists for many years, with parents being regarded by most researchers as the most potent socialising force in a child’s life because of their long-term nature. However, now the media has occupied a long-term position in the life of the child, and is able to take over large parts of the socialisation process previously carried out both in informal groups and formal organizations (Rosengren & Reimer 1986:8). Therefore, the role of the media in instilling values needs to be explored.

### 3.3 The Media and Mass Communication

Mass media is an impersonal means of communication by which visual and/or auditory messages are transmitted directly to large, heterogeneous and anonymous audiences (Gerbner 1972:39). The media communicates various ways
of seeing the world and presents to the public basic societal values and norms, thereby helping to define our world for us, while providing models for behaviour and attitudes. Significance is attributed to the media simply because of its ability to create and define issues, provide common terms of reference and allocate attention and power. The mass media is one of the most notable connections between societal and individual culture during the socialisation process. It plays a role in the transmission, maintenance and reinforcement of societal and cultural consensus, while constructing a view of reality through its various forms because of its ability to provide images of experiences that most people are unlikely to ever experience.

Once meanings are shared between broadcaster and audience, the mass media bypasses social and interpersonal socialisation patterns, to directly control the individual (White 1977:102). The media's influence begins well before a child enters school and its characteristics include availability, accessibility, simplicity and persuasive ability. This is significant when one considers that the audience develops a sense of the social world from it, and its uniform set of social messages then becomes part of the viewer's social schema.

However, media messages are not fixed and the audience construes them through interpretation and the assigning of meanings. Individuals perceive its content and interpret its meanings in terms of previous socialisation experiences and unique personality characteristics. Though the activity time of thoughts and inclinations primed by the media are relatively short, repeated exposure does increase the probability that the ideas and inclinations will be activated at some stage (Bryant & Zillmann 1994:57). The different content and different perceptions of the individual mean different reactions to the media content.

The existing orientation of audience members also determines the selective retention of the media content. Research has shown that individuals are more open to messages, which maintain or reinforce personal values, than those which are incongruent (Roberts 1971:369). Therefore, exposure is always selective and a positive relationship exists between people's opinions and the type of content the individual selects. The problem lies in that the media's products often diverge dramatically from the real world, with concern that the media presents values that, when modeled by users, challenge conventional beliefs and practices. The
constructed reality portrayed is not an accurate representation, but rather a distorted and stereotyped one.

Most of the media influence is indirect, subtle and cumulative. So, as the cognitive deposits build up, the individual becomes more tolerant towards what he or she sees, thereby leading to the development of favourable attitudes. Though the media was not programmed to teach, and the audience does not expect to be taught, incidental learning does occur. The media promotes values simply by the individual’s attention to their existence, socialising us directly (through identification with characters), indirectly (by providing reference groups and the potential for anticipatory socialisation), and through secondary socialisation (by recasting and redefining the roles of those who are agents of socialisation) (Barrile 1983:312).

Selnow’s study of values in prime time television found that 42.9% of values emerged without description and minimal behavioural expression, with the underlying value being inferred through observation by extracting for oneself the rule that governs the event (Selnow 1990:71). Therefore, the media is a major source of socialisation as a result of its affirmation and reinforcement of core cultural values, telling us which acts, motives and values to cherish and which to abhor. This learning forms the base from which individuals construct a view of the world and is the basis for expectations and action. Therefore the media is a strong independent variable in the development of attitudes. Research has found that heavy viewers of television hold opinions that are more consistent with the media’s view of the world than those of light viewers (Barrile 1980:320). An important aspect of the media and value acquisition is the unintentional learning that does occur.

Kane, Taub & Hayes (2000:59) point out that a child’s lack of ability to discern between portrayal reality and actual reality may result in the child developing a misreading of society’s values from the media. Children process media content differently, as they are less able to comprehend characterizations, motivations and behavioural consequences. This raises concern as research has shown that, once an individual accepts the reality of a medium, he or she no longer questions or scrutinizes its validity. This results in an indiscriminate consumer responding to society in terms of a perceived media world, with true values being superceded by media values (Kane, Taub & Hayes 2000:59). The media provides children with behavioural scripts that can be retrieved at any time when the real situation is similar to the fictional event (Strasburger 1995:8). As children have little knowledge about the
real world in order to compare the two, this creates the possibility for problems to occur, particularly as children have the capacity to give themselves over completely to the world created by the media, often evoking strong emotional responses (Roberts & Schramm 1971:603).

By not segregating its audiences, the media is erasing the division between childhood and adulthood. It is exposing children to issues that are not suited to their age and capacity to deal with such issues. The media undermines behavioural distinctions by encompassing adults and children in a single information environment, often portraying ideas that are at variance with those taught or encouraged at home and in the school, creating confusion within the child. This is of importance when one considers that many of the media formats require no instruction to grasp its form, and when coupled with the child’s lack of self-control to deal with these issues, problems arise. Another area of concern is that children tend to remember things that are novel, actions that are rewarded, behaviour that is effective and content that appears real (Roberts & Schramm 1971:607). Research has also shown that regular exposure over long periods of time to the overall pattern of programming can cultivate a stable and common conception of reality (Strasburger 1995:85). However, behaviourists have emphasized the view that learning from a mediated presentation cannot occur without direct environmental reinforcement of the behaviour to be acquired (Messaris 1984:176).

Klapper (1960) sees the mass media as an agent of reinforcement rather than an agent of change and points out three mediating factors in this regard. The first is the individual’s existing opinions and interests. As people will expose themselves to mass media that is in line with their interests, the media will serve to reinforce those opinions, beliefs and interests. The second factor is group norms. Individual opinions are primarily shaped by norms of the group to which the individual belongs. Vivian (1991:317) has noted that society shapes media content and, as such, it will reflect the norms of the group, thereby acting as a reinforcing agent. The final factor is interpersonal dissemination of the media. It is a common practice for friends to tell friends about the media they may have missed and Klapper (1960:30) feels this intensifies the reinforcing capabilities of the original communication.

As a reinforcing agent, the media serves to enforce social norms, creating what Guan (1998:20) proposes as media dominance, which leads to cultural dominance as thoughts and values are “colonized” in varying degrees, altering the socialisation
process. While the media may be dominating the cultural environment, the contemporary social environment is also impacting the values which the media is transmitting. The media's strength lies in its content being set in well established, easily recognized and commonly understood formulae that allow for the audience to know that a standardized set of roles and actions will occur. Behaviour is acquired vicariously and the media plays an important role by providing examples, which are particularly influential when portrayed as normative, effective and pertinent.

The mass media may serve as socialising agent by default but it is none the less here to stay. It can be viewed as an influence working among other influences in a total situation, but the debate over whether media content is a crucial determinant of behaviour is far from over. However, time spent with the media is time spent accumulating values that may not represent the best of human nature, nor be in the best interests of our society. As Klapper (1960:159) puts it, if media content has an unhealthy effect upon even 1% of a nation's children, it becomes socially vital to inquire whether, and how, the situation can be amended.

Despite its positive contributions, a lot of criticism has been leveled at the media as a result of its often objectionable content. It is feared that it reinforces antisocial behaviour as conventional behaviour, predisposing individuals to participate in crime and delinquency. After all, it is an integral part of our lives that impinges on our values, creates new possibilities of action, and creates possible conflicts with older patterns of behaviour and values. As a result it is a common assumption that a causal connection exists between media portrayals of violence and crime and the perpetration and the conditioning of these acts by children. If non-fictional media crime reports increase peer-to-peer transmission of crimes in local social networks, as reported by Hawkins (1996:298), it is not hard to imagine that the media can serve to teach and reinforce criminal behaviour. Culture contributes more than any other factor in the way we think, feel and behave and, if part of our culture is criminogenic, it follows to reason that some will engage in criminal behaviour.

3.3.1 Media – Delinquency Correlation

The first research into the effects of the media was carried out in 1920. The Payne Fund studies findings were that films influenced attitudes, provided models for behaviour, shaping interpretations of life (Jones & Jones 1999:158). Thus the
commonly held assumption of a causal connection developed. This assumption has led to researchers such as Pittman (1958:234) suggesting that pre-delinquents readily identify with the presentation of criminal patterns and roles and use these to fill in their repertoire, providing them with that which is needed to participate in delinquent behaviour. Yin, Katims & Zapata (1999:170) stressed that excessive time spent in unorganized, unsupervised activities tends to introduce opportunities in which youths bond with antisocial values, consequently leading to delinquency. Others, such as Klapper (1960), have not gone as far as to consider media exposure as a crucial determinant of manifested behaviour or values, but rather view the media as serving special functions for those already maladjusted.

Contemporary research into media influence has found that children that identify with violent characters are more likely to use aggression in their own lives (Sege 1998:137) and that these aggressive habits - learned early in life - once established, become resistant to change and predictive of serious adult antisocial behaviour (Strasburger 1995:30). The Huesmann study found that childhood measure of aggression at the age of eight was a solid predictor of adult aggression and antisocial conduct at thirty, demonstrating a continuity in aggressive behaviour (Shaffer 1994:347). Baron & Byrne (1994) attribute exposure to media violence to similar behaviour among viewers. Jones & Jones (1999) also support the view that media violence reinforces the propensity for violence already existing within the individual.

Observing reinforcement of the model's behaviour is no longer believed to be necessary. Schickendanz, Schickendanz & Forsyth (1998:402) found that aggression can be learned even when the model's behaviour is not reinforced, provided the observer believes that such behaviour will lead to reinforcement. But one of the most significant changes in recent years has been a shift in the conception of the child's role from that of passive to that of active participant (Zigler, Lamb & Child 1982:15). As an active participant, media preference plays an important role, and is determined by the individual's personality and unique set of learning experiences, as well as the social categories the individual belongs to and the social relationships in the individual's life. However, viewing habits established in early childhood will influence viewing habits throughout life [Moscovitch: 1998], once again emphasizing the influence of continuity.
It has also been proposed that the mass media alters an individual’s tendency to commit crime, by firstly increasing the material value that we attach to crime by calling to our attention things we did not realize we wanted until we saw them attractively portrayed. Secondly, by suggesting to its audience that the things we always knew we wanted are more accessible than we had imagined; and finally, by increasing the tangible rewards of crime by making us envious of those who own desirable things without having to work hard.

Therefore, an individual’s existing orientation determines the selection and retention of media content (Klapper 1960:154), while influencing what the individual exposes him or herself to as well as the effects the media content will have on him or her (Klapper 1960:19). The meanings attributed to the various media content are interpreted in terms of previous socialisation experiences, as well as the individual’s unique personality characteristics. Thus, the different reactions to media content are the result of different types of content and different perceptions of the individual. The outcome of the process of media socialisation appears to be the reinforcement of the existing attitudes or behavioural tendencies of the individual. Attitudes and tendencies, which are instilled early in life, are most likely instilled by the media.

3.4 Mass Media Socialisation

Traditional socialisation theories proposed that socialisation can only be learned through interaction. The premise of these theories renders the media as an unimportant agent, despite the media’s significant role in the lives of children. However, such theories overlook two components of an individual’s interpretation of reality - socialisation and the media. Reality is a byproduct of the socialisation process and the media is significant in constructing reality for us. Therefore, the media, as an agent, is considerably more important than traditional theories have proposed. One of the theories that best attempted to demonstrate how the media could play a central role in socialisation is that of Goffman (1974).

In his Frame Analysis perspective, Goffman tried to determine if viewers could in fact learn frames from television content and then use these frames to structure everyday interaction. Goffman suggested that during socialisation, complex and holistic definitions of a strip of social action are learned, and that social objects, rules and actions are understood. These assist in the assessment of one’s relationship to others and the anticipation of certain consequences. By imposing a
frame on a strip of action, actions are perceived as meaningful and interrelated, enabling one to form expectations of future actions and plan one’s own actions in relation to the actions of others.

Socialisation becomes adequate once an individual is able to routinely define social actions in ways personally meaningful and socially appropriate. Goffman believed that the media’s dramatic content was structured in a way to encourage its audience members to identify with specific characters, to see what they see and experience events as they do. As such, the media can play an important role by equipping children with attractive means of creating fascinating, exciting, and worthwhile experiences for themselves. Once they have predictably learned to induce such experiences, it becomes possible for them to learn frames from these means just as they would from everyday situations. Furthermore, such learning cannot be consciously controlled or guided by the child. Goffman went on to define three stages of learning from the media.

3.4.1 Goffman’s Three Stages of Learning

1) Primitive Framing stage. In this stage, the very young child begins by relying on simple, overt cues for his or her framing. Their information processing at this stage is attracted and held by sudden changes in sounds and images. With uniformed development, the child learns to use cues to anticipate when various types of actions will occur. This is then followed by their learning to differentiate and label characters gradually, using lists of attributes to describe characters and the actions in which they engage. Ultimately, the child will learn to perceive and label sequences of actions as good or bad, right or wrong, using plots to interpret program content (Davis & Abelman 1988:267).

The problem that can arise during this stage is when the young child forms an intense and highly emotional identification with the media characters, while the parent is not providing the necessary models for action, or consistent cues for the interpretation of social activity. Under ambiguous conditions, the information resources of the media become central to the life of the individual. The result is that the media’s content is then used for this purpose and media characters substitute the parent. Consequently, the child will come to rely on the cues supplied by media content to direct and structure their real life experiences.
2) Routine Framing stage. During this stage, the child learns to use his or her recall of past actions, as well as his or her expectations of future actions to guide him or her in the present action. The frames imposed are based on cues recalled or anticipated but not necessarily physically present. Thus the child begins to discriminate between reality and fantasy and is able to evaluate actions and actors as good or bad. This stage marks the beginning of the ability to critically reflect on one's social situation and to structure experiences while controlling one's actions. The problems that arise during this stage include the media's lack of design to align children to everyday social situations and, as such, the frames learned do not prove useful or effective. As a result, a child may begin to perceive media-induced experiences as more real than everyday life, perceiving action as good if it is accompanied by attractive or interesting cues, or if it has important or dramatic consequences. Thus serious misconceptions may develop and go unquestioned, resulting in frustration and confusion when applied to everyday life (Davis & Abelman 1988:270).

3) Self-reflective Framing stage. This third and final stage generally occurs during adolescence, when the need to differentiate between multiple realities, and to anticipate good or bad consequences from complex sequences of action, arises. During this stage the child is required to interact effectively with strangers or in different social groups, learning to frame things from different points of view even when these new frames contradict the frames previously learned. For this stage to be successful, there is a need to develop a consistent set of values that can be applied in different social settings. Adolescence is a particularly difficult stage of development, when identities and attitudes are evolving, and thus flexible and susceptible to visual and auditory influences (Oldenburg 1999:404). The problem that may arise during this stage is when the adolescent comes to depend on the media for frames. The media may come to influence consciously held values and standards, resulting in simple sets of values that are uncommon and antisocial (Davis & Abelman 1988:272).

3.5 Summary

Our social existence is no longer tied to a small town/suburb/community; we are consumed by a social world of unbound proportions. We are exposed to more opinions, values, personalities and ways of life than any previous generation (Willis 1999:33). Our changing society, coupled with the weakening of institutions and rapid technological changes have resulted in disorganisation of the traditional
family norms and values, a value gap, and a shortage of firm bases for distinguishing right from wrong and for guiding individual moral choices. When the institutions of community, family and culture break down, individuals are left with a void that will be filled in an arbitrary manner, increasing the risk of adolescents becoming involved in problem behaviour. Research has shown that stronger commitment to values reduced the risk as traditional values protect against problem behaviours, with the greatest risk factor being the lack of commitment to any meaningful values. We have seen, from this chapter, the importance of values and how the media often fails to promote values that assist the individual to live effectively in society.

Media is a differentiated subsystem of society from which a lot of dissimilarity from society’s ideals can occur and be transmitted. The more complex the society, the more numerous the subdivisions, resulting in the development of subcultural differences in values. Thus some groups respond differently to the expectations of the society, influencing the agent’s values and what they transmit (Thompson 1978:32). Schickendanz, Schickendanz & Forsyth (1998) consider the media as one of the biggest influences on intellectual and moral development. Hamill (1999) regards the media as an asocial, consciousness-altering instrument that takes one out of the real world. In earlier times, the exposure to media occurred later in the individual’s life, as books and magazines required reading skills that were learned at school. The media therefore only had a modest role to play in childhood socialisation. Today the media is omnipresent from the cradle and has displaced much of the socialisation influence that came from parents (Vivian 1991:298).

The media has come to occupy a larger portion of our lives than other sources of socialisation. Children are becoming regular consumers of the media from as young as two or three – increasing, then decreasing slightly - during adolescence. Regardless of age, individuals respond to media content, learning from what they see, hear or read, with a 98% recall accuracy of information that they have learned via visual modes (Kane, Taub & Hayes 2000:63). Because of its interactive nature and arousing content, the media is influencing our values, making the media more and more deeply established as a social system, increasingly fulfilling the functions previously performed by the family, school and religion. The media is an environmental influence that surrounds, dominates and engulfs children for many hours of the day. It has become a significant socialising agent, whose influence
begins well before the child enters school. As a result, researchers such as Selnow (1990:64) argue that the media is eroding a sense of values among its audience.

Values are an important aspect of socialisation as they guide activities and assist in the resolution of conflicts and the decision making process. Values lead us to take particular positions on social issues. They predispose us to one ideology over another. They guide the presentation of self to others and assist in evaluation and judgement, instructing us how to rationalise. Values are employed to persuade and influence others and serve to maintain and enhance self-esteem. They are determinants of virtually all social behaviours. Values are key antecedents, consequences and correlates of human action and experience. The fundamental association between attitudes and behaviour is established early. Behavioural choices made as a result of a youth’s early commitment to conformity establish precedents upon which later behaviour choices are made (Thompson 1978:129). The impact of technology on values has been profound, but not as simple or direct as people assume. Nevertheless, any form of impact stands to widely influence an individual’s life, carrying with it considerable significance for society.

3.6 Conclusion

The social institutions of the family, school and religion have the greatest potential to influence children, but when these institutions break down they sacrifice their opportunity to establish the appropriate values, leaving individuals - particularly children - with a void that needs to be filled. In has stepped the media, the single largest leisure activity. Various studies have shown that children are affected by the media. They give time and attention to the media; they respond emotionally to the media and they learn from the media, raising the issue of the effects of media value transmission on juvenile behaviour. This chapter has examined the process of socialisation and its role in the development of deviance and shown why there is need for concern when the media becomes a predominant socialising influence. The belief that deviance may be the consequence of socialisation to deviant norms is not new, and in the following chapter traditional, contemporary and integrative theoretical aspects of deviance are examined, focusing on the issue of socialisation.
Chapter 4

Literature Review: Theoretical Aspects of Deviance

4.1 Introduction

In recent years we have come to see how solemn the problem of youth crime is. Today, serious crimes such as murder and rape, perpetrated by fifteen or sixteen-year-olds, are far from being uncommon (Shoemaker 1990:ix). In a youth orientated society such as ours, deviance is relative, subject to interpretation and hardly new. Concern has always been shown for juvenile behaviour that deviates from society's norms, and the issue of juvenile delinquency has been the interest of researchers and scholars for many years. The result has been an abundance of literature on juvenile criminology, with varying explanations for deviance.

One of the long held beliefs among sociologists and criminologists has been that the failure to internalise a belief system of socially accepted norms is a major source of deviance. This chapter explores the theoretical basis of the study of juvenile delinquency and the issue of socialisation in terms of various theories. It examines traditional social structure theories and social process theories, as well as contemporary integrative theories. The focus of this chapter falls on the social process perspectives, as they emphasise the social relationships and social processes, such as socialisation, that exist within the environment. Socialisation is a social process with significant learning components. The theories discussed in this chapter examine either the process or product of socialisation and can successfully be applied to the issue of mass media socialisation.

4.2 Social Process Perspective

The social process perspectives believe that an individual's interactions with key elements of the socialisation process heighten the possibility of delinquency by determining the individual's behaviour. The social process perspective has three main branches (Siegel & Senna 2000:166). The first branch is that of the learning
theories, which proposes that delinquency is learned through interaction with others. The second is the social control theories. These theories suggest that delinquency is the result of a weakened attachment to social institutions. The final branch is that of the developmental theories, which maintains that personal characteristics guide development and influence behaviour while changing over time. Only two of the three branches of the social process perspective will be discussed in this chapter, namely the social learning and social control theories.

4.2.1 Differential Association Theory

It was the Great Depression that gave rise to Sutherland’s Differential Association Theory. Criminology at the time was dominated by doctors and psychiatrists and the popular belief was that criminal behaviour was inborn or the result of feeblemindedness. More and more people who had never previously displayed criminal tendencies were now committing criminal acts. It was this observation that shaped Sutherland’s theory. In 1934, Sutherland stated that any individual can be trained to adopt and follow any pattern of behaviour and that the failure to follow prescribed patterns of behaviour was the result of inconsistencies in the influences directing the individual, rather than the result of any intrinsic part of the person. Fundamental to the explanation of crime was the existence of conflict between cultures (Sutherland 1934:51 – 52). These statements became the basis of the Differential Association Theory.

The principal assumption was that all behaviour is learnt and not genetically programmed, as previously believed. Learning occurs primarily in small informal group settings, developing from collective experiences and specific situational events (Shoemaker 1990:151). Sutherland argued that every individual would at some time have contact with, or exposure to, criminal and non-criminal behaviour patterns, values and attitudes, but that it was the stance of one’s associations that would result in an individual becoming criminal.

The basic premises of the theory (Sutherland & Cressey 1978: 80-83) are:

- Criminal behaviour is learned. The belief was that crime and delinquency are not the result of an individual’s genetic programming but rather the result of an individual’s use of previously acquired experiences in the commission of crime and delinquency.
• The learning of criminal behaviour occurs in interaction with others through a process of communication. The process of communication may occur through verbal or non-verbal forms, either directly or vicariously.

• The learning process occurs primarily in intimate, informal group settings, stressing the importance of personal relationships on norms and values. It is the personal impact that is able to change the behaviour orientation of the individual. Cloete (1982) notes that learning occurs in the intimate group through socialisation.

• When criminal behaviour is learned, the learning includes the techniques, specific motivations and drives. The individual is taught the technique of how to commit the crime as well as the motives, attitudes and rationalisations that go with it, hence "why" it is to be done.

• The specific motives and drives are learned, from the definitions of the legal codes, as favourable or unfavourable. Therefore the attitudes toward the law determine the motives and drives of individuals. In our society, an individual is surrounded by others who regard legal codes as rules to be observed, while at the same time being surrounded by others who view the violation of laws as favourable. Shoemaker (1990:152) points out that these attitudes are not consistent or entirely favourable or unfavourable, but rather mixed and conflicting, transient in nature, with simultaneous exposure to delinquent and non-delinquent norms and behaviour.

• Actual participation in crime and delinquency arises from the possession of these motives, attitudes and rationalisations that come about as a result of excess definitions favouring the violation of the law. Therefore, an individual becomes criminal because of contacts with criminal patterns and isolation from non-criminal patterns (Glick 1995:162).

• Differential associations vary in terms of frequency, duration, priority and intensity. Sutherland defined frequency as the number of contacts, and duration as the length of the contact with the deviant definitions. The belief was that the earlier in life the inculcation occurred, the greater the likelihood that the definition would persist later on in life and thus be given higher priority by the individual. Associations formed in early childhood take precedence over the
influences of later associations. Intensity involves factors attached to the association, such as the source’s prestige and emotional reactions accompanying the definition, as well as the power of the influence.

- The process of learning criminal behaviour by association with criminal and non-criminal patterns involves the same mechanisms involved in other learning. Consequently, the learning of criminal behaviour is not restricted to the process of imitation, thereby emphasising personal responsibility of the individual in the learning process.

While criminal behaviour is an expression of needs and values, those needs and values do not explain it. The goals of delinquents and non-delinquents are the same; it is only the means of achieving those goals that are different.

Vold (1958:236) defined differential association as the process by which criminal behaviour is learned through differentiated social organisation. According to Shoemaker (1990:151) the concept refers to the excess of attitudes favouring law violation attained in association with others. Differentiated social organisation, as referred to by Vold, represents the differently organised environmental settings with different kinds of social organisations, where some will support attitudes favouring law violation, some will be neutral, and others will oppose attitudes favouring law violation. Shoemaker (1990:151) pointed out that at a community or societal level, norms, values and behaviour patterns are differentially organised to make it more or less likely that an individual will come into contact with, and be influenced by, criminal values.

The idea of differential association is that both individuals and groups are exposed to associations with people who differ in the importance they attribute to law-abiding or criminal behaviour. The result is that the individual will either lean toward or away from crime, depending on their associations’ cultural standards, especially those with whom they spend frequent and long periods of time. While it is believed that all behaviour is learned, the difference between criminal and non-criminal behaviour is what is learned. The two things that are learned during differential association are the techniques for committing the behaviour, and the definitions that support that behaviour. Once a certain definition exists, the individual becomes susceptible to any similar definition. Therefore, an individual with excess criminal definitions becomes open to new criminal definitions.
The Differential Association theory examined the criminal and the behaviour, and explained the process of how an individual became delinquent by focusing on the content of communication and the definitions provided by one's associations. The theory also examined the process of socialisation by concentrating on the values acquired from significant others. Values were viewed by the theory as an important determinant of behaviour, with conflicting values regarded as a cause of crime and a product of a society that creates numerous values among different groups. Identification with these variant and conflicting values was seen as the root of the problem, with emphasis falling on group commitments. The theory also examined the social environment as a setting for criminal behaviour. It explained why individuals exposed to the same social environment differed in their susceptibility to criminal behaviour, by maintaining that a person's potential to criminality depended upon the frequency, duration, priority and intensity of the deviant definitions.

Several criminological studies, such as those by Cressey (1952) and Hirschi (1969), reportedly found minimal support for the influence of associates in the learning of criminal behaviour, bringing into question the importance of one's associates. Sutherland's theory has also been faulted with being too broad and vague, failing to account for specific types of crime, and not taking into consideration personality factors. Sutherland's overemphasis of social transmission at the expense of individual receptivity has been regarded as another of the theory's shortcomings. Despite the criticisms aimed at the Differential Association Theory, Sutherland's theory has been subject to a considerable amount of testing and research, and most evidence lends support to the theory's validity (Glick 1995:164).

Differential association has also been one of the few theories to provide a theoretical basis for devising practical preventative programmes (Swart 1991:168). The emphasis on the significance of group commitments offers a plausible explanation for the differences in the occurrences of crime in both different ethnic groups and social classes. However, many continued to feel that Sutherland's ambiguous statements left shortfalls. The result was the development of the Social Learning approach, which expanded and modified Sutherland's theory by incorporating components of Skinner's (1953) operant conditioning principles.
4.2.2 Social Learning Theory

In the 1960's, behavioural psychological theories gained popularity with their belief that previously untreatable behavioural problems could in fact be treated with newly developed behavioural therapies that focused on new and more efficient ways of learning. Behaviour was seen as a product of present and past events, with the probability of reinforcement and punishment determining whether the frequency of the behaviour would increase or decrease. Positive or negative reinforcement was believed to strengthen behaviour, while positive or negative punishments would weaken it. Whether the behavioural pattern persisted depended upon past and present rewards and punishments, as well as the rewards and punishments of alternative behaviour.

This view originated from the Operant Learning Theory and became central to the social learning theories. The Operant Learning Theory believed that an individual's behaviour would have an effect on his or her environment, which would subsequently have an effect on the individual. Thus behaviour was believed to be shaped and maintained by its consequences, while learning occurred as a result of the consequences associated with the behaviour. In the Social Learning Theory, the concepts of imitation and modelling are of significance to the learning process, suggesting that learning can occur through the observation of the behaviour of others, and is acquired through direct conditioning, imitation or modelling. This is a deviation from the Operant Learning Theory that strictly believed that learning could only occur through behaviour and consequence. Consequently, the Social Learning Theory brought the social environment into the process of learning, proposing that the techniques and attitudes of delinquent behaviour are learned through significant others. Thus the youth is viewed as essentially being born good but having learnt to become bad from others.

The theory further proposed that individuals take on the behavioural repertoire of their associations, but also seek out associations who share their behavioural interests. Therefore, associating with delinquents or with individuals who hold and/or reinforce delinquent values increases the chances of delinquent behaviour. The imitation and maintenance of the behaviour will depend upon the anticipated rewards and punishments for the behaviour, which are based upon expectations of earlier observed outcomes of the behaviour and the conditions associated with those outcomes. Deviant behaviour is expected when it has been differentially reinforced over alternative behaviour and is defined as desirable or justified.
The Social Learning Theory viewed delinquency as a direct result of socialisation into a deviant value system, where the individual learns to believe that the conduct is acceptable and positively valued, and rewards are perceived as outweighing potential costs or punishments. It is through the group setting, however, that the behaviour will be learned and modelled. Circumstance does, however, dictate whether the behaviour will be facilitated or inhibited. Therefore, differential association (the interaction and identification with groups) comes first, as these groups provide the environments in which exposure to definitions, imitation of models and social reinforcement take place. This is then followed by the actual consequences of the specific behaviour, which determine the probability that use will be continued, and at what level. There are variations in the extent to which an individual holds deviant and pro-social definitions and these are variations in the extent to which these beliefs and behaviours are reinforced.

Definitions are learned through reinforcement contingencies operating in the socialisation process, and function as facilitative or inhibitory discriminative stimuli that signal that certain behaviour is appropriate or inappropriate. This provides the motivation for the behaviour. Reward or punishment contingencies shape both one’s attitudes and overt behaviour over time and provide motivation to engage or refrain. Therefore violations of group norms are seen as a result of failed socialisation or insufficiently learned moral dictates of the group norms.

There exist common assumptions among all of the Social Learning theories (Williams & McShane 1994:210-211). These are:

- Human behaviour is organised around the search for pleasure and the avoidance of pain.

- Reinforcement increases the frequency of behaviour, while punishment decreases the frequency of behaviour.

- Criminal behaviour, like any other behaviour, is learned through material and social reinforcements and is a product of past and present experiences. As a result, all individuals have different sets of learned behaviour and expected consequences.

- Social reinforcements act as factors in both the learning of deviant behaviour and in the setting of values that define behaviour as good or bad, desirable or
undesirable. These social reinforcements come from the social environment, which provides various behavioural models that can be imitated.

- Social values act as cues that signal whether a particular behaviour will be reinforced or not. These cues assist in the learning of crime when they signal that a reward is forthcoming, or provide the rationalisations that avoid the punishment of behaviour.

- Criminal behaviour is therefore behaviour that has been differentially reinforced through social values and material rewards, which may be provided by the crime itself, in the individual's subcultural environment.

The most recognised proponents of the Social Learning approach were Burgess and Akers (1966) with their Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory. In their theory, the social environment was regarded as the most important source of reinforcement and that most learning of deviant behaviour was the result of social interaction. The definitions of behaviour, which refer to verbal behaviour and the general beliefs about a range of general behaviours, are the moral components of social interaction that express whether something is right or wrong (Williams & McShane 1994:208). Once these definitions are learned they form the cues about the consequences that can be expected from the behaviour; thus the individual learns the deviant behaviour and the definitions that go along with it. Learning can be direct, through conditioning, or indirect, through imitation. It is strengthened through reinforcement or weakened through punishment.

Burgess & Akers (1966) revised Sutherland's nine-statement theory into seven statements using behavioural concepts and propositions. Their seven-statement theory proposes that:

- Deviant behaviour is learned according to the principles of operant conditioning in both non-social situations and social interactions through reinforcement.

- The principal part of learning occurs in those groups which comprise or control the individual's major source of reinforcements, and is a function of the effective and available reinforcers and the existing reinforcement contingencies.
• The specific type of behaviour learned and its frequency are a function of the effective and available reinforcers, and of the deviant or non-deviant direction of the norms, rules and values, which in the past have accompanied the reinforcement.

• The probability that a deviant act will be committed is increased in the presence of normative statements, definitions and verbalisations that, during the process of differential reinforcement, have acquired discriminative value. The amount, frequency and probability of its reinforcement determine the strength of the deviant behaviour. The tendency of association with deviant patterns is important in that it affects the source, amount and scheduling of reinforcement.

Akers (1998) went on to broaden and refine the Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory by integrating the processes of differential association with those of differential reinforcement and other principles of behavioural acquisition, continuation and cessation from the behavioural learning theories. Akers (1998) felt that the same learning processes operating in a context of social structure, interaction and situation produce both conforming and deviant behaviour. Deviant and criminal behaviour is learned and modified through all the same cognitive and behavioural mechanisms as conforming behaviour. The difference lies in the direction of the process, content and outcome of the behaviour learned. The content of the learning includes simple and complex behavioural sequences and definitions that become discriminative for engaging in deviant and criminal behaviour.

Akers (1998) included four elements, which he felt shaped behaviour, into his theory. The first element is that of differential association, which includes the learning of definitions favourable or unfavourable to the legal norms through a process of social interaction. Conceptually, it is the same process as set out in Sutherland’s theory. The learning mechanisms were believed to operate in a process of differential association, directly and indirectly, through verbal and non-verbal communication, interaction and identification with others. The relative frequency, intensity, duration, and priority of associations affect the relative amount, frequency and probability of reinforcement of conforming or deviant behaviour, as well as exposure of individuals to deviant or conforming norms and behavioural modes.
The extent to which an individual can control with whom he or she associates, is affected by the frequency, intensity and duration of those associations and by how rewarding or aversive the associations are. Principal learning through differential associations is with those persons or groups that comprise or control the individual’s major source of reinforcement, most striking behavioural models and most effective definitions.

Closely related to the first element is the second element in shaping behaviour, namely definitions. These comprise an individual’s own attitudes, orientations, and evaluative aspects of what is wrong and right. They include general norms and values, as well as specific beliefs that direct an individual to a particular act.

Differential reinforcement is the third element and in this element, actual and/or anticipated consequences of engaging in specific behaviour shape the behaviour. Rewards tend to reinforce the behaviour while punishments deter. With this primary learning mechanism, behaviour is a function of the frequency, amount, probability of experienced and perceived rewards and punishments, and imitation, in which the behaviour of others and its consequences are observed and modelled (Akers 1998:52). Overt and covert stimuli act as cues for the behaviour to occur. Furthermore, the probability that the behaviour is learned and performed, as well as the frequency with which it is committed, is a function of past, present and anticipated differential reinforcement for the behaviour and discriminative stimuli present in the given situation.

The final element is that of imitation. Akers believed that observation of a revered role model’s behaviour may lead to imitation, thereby shaping the individual’s own behaviour. Differential reinforcement and imitation produce both overt behaviour and cognitive definitions that function as cues for behaviour. Thus, the probability of criminal or conforming behaviour occurring is a function of the variables operating in the underlying social learning process. Individuals are more likely to commit criminal behaviour when they differentially associate with others who commit, model or support violations of social and legal norms, and the violate behaviour is differentially reinforced over behaviour that conforms to the norms. Furthermore, the likelihood increases when the individual is exposed to and observes more deviant than conforming models and his or her own learned definitions are favourable toward committing deviant acts (Akers 1998:51).
Akers (1998: 53 – 54) included behavioural feedback effects into his concept of differential reinforcement by hypothesising that the balance of past and current associations, definitions and imitation of deviant models, and the anticipated balance of reinforcement in particular situations, produce or inhibit the initial deviant acts. However, the effects of these variables continue with the repetition of the acts, with imitation becoming less important than it was during the first commission of the act. After initiation, the actual social and non-social reinforcers and punishers affect the probability that the acts will or will not be repeated and at what level of frequency.

Overt behaviour and definitions favourable or unfavourable to it are affected by the positive or negative consequences of the initial acts. If the initial act is more rewarded than alternative behaviour, the favourable definitions will be strengthened and the unfavourable will be weakened, and the likelihood that the deviant behaviour will be repeated under similar circumstances increases. Progression into more frequent or sustained patterns of criminal or deviant behaviour is promoted when negative formal or informal sanctions or norm-abiding definitions do not offset reinforcement, exposure to deviant models and norm-violating definitions. It is not necessary for definitions favourable to law violation to always precede deviant acts but the probability of deviant acts does increase in the presence of favourable definitions.

The Social Learning Theory’s central concern is the individual’s behaviour, offering a remedy for deviant behaviour by explaining how individuals become involved in criminal behaviour. The use of the Social Learning approach allows for the possibility of learning directly from people around an individual, as well as from secondary sources such as the media (Williams & McShane 1994:206). The three theories discussed thus far form two of the three main branches of the Social Process perspective (Siegel & Senna 2000:166). The Social Process perspective examines the relationship between socialisation and delinquent behaviour, proposing that it is the elements of society, within which the child develops, that have a profound influence on the child’s behaviour.

The belief is that the delinquent youth’s personality and behaviour - which falls into conflict with conventional society - is moulded by social relationships and social processes. Criminal behaviour is explained in terms of processes, which are operating at the moment of the occurrence of the crime, or in terms of the
processes operating in the earlier history of the criminal. The differential association that the social learning theories proposed, is that delinquency is learned through interaction with others. The social control theories argue that delinquency is the result of a weakened attachment to social institutions, concentrating on the process by which the social bond is weakened rather than the structural reasons for the existence of the social bond (Williams & McShane 1994:190). Once again the focus is on a social process, hence its categorisation as a social process perspective.

4.2.3 Social Control Theory

The Social Control Theories procured support from conservative criminologists after the popularity of the Labelling Theory began to abate and the Conflict Theory took on a radical approach. The central focus of the Social Control Theories was what kept individuals from committing crime. It soon became known as a socialisation theory, as the basic thought was that the most important method of control was that of socialisation. Socialisation was thought to be designed to help us function in society and, as such, would keep one from committing crime.

This branch of theories proposed that delinquency is the result of a weakened commitment to one’s major social institutions. This weakened commitment allows for the youth to feel free to perform delinquent behaviour. The central belief is that the individual is inherently bad, impulsive and egocentric and that it is through the assistance of the social institutions that the individual learns to control him or herself.

All of the Social Control theories proposed that people need cherishing, and differences in cherishing result in variations in one’s attachment to others and one’s commitment to an ordered way of life. It was believed that inner and outer controls exist and these described attachment and commitment. Inner control was used to refer to the individual’s conscience, which is expressed as feelings of guilt, while external control referred to the social pressures on an individual and is expressed as shame. It was felt that any situation in which one’s moral bond with others is relaxed would promote crime.

There are basic assumptions common to all the Social Control theories and these are (Shoemaker 1990:173-174):
• Crime and delinquency is to be expected, considering all the pressures and enticements toward it. Therefore, all individuals must be held in check and controlled if delinquent and criminal inclinations are to be repressed.

• Delinquency is regarded as a deficiency in social or psychological attachment, or an absence of a working personal or social control mechanism.

• There exists a consensus in society associated with the various institutions, concerning conventional beliefs and norms.

One of the earliest proponents of the Social Control Theory was Walter Reckless (1961). His multiple-factor theory proposed that, in order to “contain” or prevent delinquency, certain factors must be present in a child’s life. These become known as inner and outer containment. In his Containment Theory, Reckless (1961) emphasised the product of socialisation, suggesting that if the socialisation agent is not aligned with societal norms, the agent could pass on antisocial values as normal and conforming. Delinquent behaviour was ultimately related to the strength of the temptation, the ease with which the delinquent act could be realised, the risk of being caught and finally, the degree to which the juvenile felt restraint from committing the act because of his or her commitment to conformity.

Reckless’s (1961) premise was that a strong inner control (which he defined as the individual’s conscience and which includes self-control), a positive self-image, and a sense of responsibility, would ensure the elimination of normative criminal behaviour. While external control (which he defined as the social pressures by the community to keep an individual’s behaviour in line with accepted norms and standards, and which includes discipline, supervision, and opportunities to engage in healthy activities) would keep individual behaviour in line and reinforce the community’s norms and values. Therefore, the chances of yielding to criminal behaviour were deemed slight by Reckless (1961), when both inner and outer controls are strong. In the event of the outer control becoming weak, the chances remained negligible. However, chances would increase once the inner control became weak, even if the outer controls were strong. The greatest likelihood of crime is when both inner and outer controls are weak.

In his theory, Reckless (1961) viewed behaviour as a product of the interaction between environmental pressures, environmental pulls and internal drives.
Environmental pressures were believed to influence an individual's life in such a way as to cause deviance, while environmental pulls diverted an individual from socially acceptable life patterns (Munnilk 1991:199-200). Environmental pressures consist of factors such as poverty, unemployment, and limited opportunities, while environmental pulls consist of factors such as prestige, subculture, media propaganda and suggestion. Internal drives refer to an individual's motives, frustrations, disappointments and inferiority complexes. Internal and external controls serve as "buffers" between the environmental pressures and the internal drives. The extent to which the "buffers" succeed also plays a determining role in whether or not the individual's behaviour will be criminal or not.

Reckless's theory was criticised for being obscure, failing to address the issue of chronological causality and not sufficiently distinguishing between the different types of crimes. Hirschi (1969) tried to lessen the criticisms levelled at the earlier Social Control theorists by refining certain of the elements of Reckless's theory. Hirschi's theory focused on the socialisation process, proposing that behaviour couldn't simultaneously conform to the norms of the smaller group and be deviant according to the larger society. It is simply deviant, as society governs the perspective from which behaviour is viewed.

He accredited conventional behaviour to the power of internalised norms, viewing delinquency as the result of weak internalisation of conventional values and norms, but also as the result of the existence of conflict or inconsistencies in these values. He believed that there exists a bond between the individual and conventional society: the stronger the bond to society the greater the internalisation of social norms by the individual and the less likely the individual is to deviate from those norms. Hirschi maintained that there exist in society numerous opportunities and pressures to commit crime, yet deviant behaviour only occurs when one's social bond weakens, and there is an absence of social control. He rejected the idea that motivation was necessary for deviant behaviour to occur.

The central premises of Hirschi's Social Containment theory are that (Hirschi 1969:18-26):
- Human behaviour is "self-interested" as its characteristic nature is geared toward self-preservation and gratification. Therefore, it must be restrained and regulated for the benefit of all.
• Moral order comprises the rules and regulations for living within society and individuals are bound to this order through socialisation and institutions of society. The bond to society’s moral social order has elements that maintain and strengthen conformity. These elements are present in varying degrees.

In Hirschi’s Theory, an individual’s bond to society has four components, which help to control one’s behaviour. A weakness in any of the four elements increases the freedom to engage in deviant behaviour. A deficiency or absence in any of the elements affects the other elements, as they reciprocate with each other to produce differing degrees of effect. The four elements are (Hirschi 1969:16-26):

• Attachment – this refers to an individual’s emotional bond, empathy and sense of obligation towards the other members of society. It is the strength of one’s ties to significant others and institutions. Attachment is the moral link to others and the internalisation of norms. Hirschi proposed that a lack of attachment to others frees an individual from moral constraints, as we are moral beings only to the extent that we have internalised the norms of society and act according to the wishes and expectations of others (Hirschi 1969:18). If an individual does not care about the wishes or expectations of others, he or she is not bound by the norms and is therefore free to deviate. The essence of internalisation lies in the attachment of the individual to others.

• Commitment – refers to the time and energy invested to the commitment of conventional values. Individuals spend time and energy in certain conventional activities and their investments in a conventional lifestyle would be endangered if the individual were to engage in criminal conduct. Therefore, the individual must consider the risks and costs of deviant behaviour when deciding to deviate (Hirschi 1969:20).

• Involvement – flows from commitment and is the intensification of one’s commitment to conventional values, and the participation in conventional behaviour. Hirschi believed that an individual spending considerable time and energy in conventional activities would not have the time or energy to engage in illegal activities (Hirschi 1969:22).

• Belief – arises when one attributes moral value to the conventional norms and regards laws and rules as right and acceptable. Hirschi felt that a common
value system existed within society, but that the extent to which individuals believed they should obey the rules of society varied. The less an individual believed that he or she should obey the norms, the more likely he or she would violate them (Hirschi 1969:26).

The four components of Hirschi’s theory are positively related to conformity in the following manner: the more closely an individual is tied to conventional society in attachment, commitment, involvement and belief, the more likely the individual will be closely tied in other ways. Such an individual will be involved in conventional activities, accepting the conventional norms of desirable behaviour (Hirschi 1969:27). Insofar as a child respects his or her elders, he or she will accept their rules. However, if the child’s respect is undermined, the rules lose their obligatory character, diminishing the efficiency in producing conformity. It was proposed that delinquency was not caused by beliefs that require delinquency, but rather by the absence of beliefs that forbid delinquent behaviour. Motivation to crime is constant across all individuals but in order for it to occur, it is necessary for causal chains to converge at a given moment in time.

Hirschi’s research showed that juveniles with positive attitudes were linked to non-criminal behaviour and those who were positive about their own abilities and competence were more inclined to believe in the value of society’s laws (Conklin 1986:214). While one’s social support system may increase the possibility of deviant behaviour, Hirschi noted that a child must somehow acquire criminal tendencies to be susceptible to crime later on in life, raising the question of how the criminal tendencies are acquired. The Differential Association Theory was one of the earliest traditional approaches to deal with the acquisition of criminal tendencies. The three theories discussed thus far form two of the three main branches of the Social Process perspective (Siegel & Senna 2000:166). Seeing that the two main branches provided valuable explanations for the occurrence of crime, Thompson (1978) incorporated the Social Control and Differential Association/ Learning theories to formulate his theoretical framework and his Differential Socialisation Model, which formed the basis of this study.

4.2.4 Thompson’s Differential Socialisation Model

Central to Thompson’s model is the process of learning socially relevant values and attitudes through interaction with significant others. In this model, behaviour is viewed as learnt and as a result, previously acquired experiences are used in the
commission of crime and delinquency. The learning of behaviour transpires primarily in intimate, informal group settings in interaction with others through a process of communication that may be verbal or non-verbal, direct or vicarious.

The model stresses the importance of personal relationships on norms and values, as it is the personal impact that is able to change behaviour orientation of an individual. Learning occurs in intimate groups through socialisation and learning includes the techniques and specific motivations and drives, irrespective of the nature of the attitudes and values learned (Thompson 1978:38). Of fundamental importance in the process of socialisation is the cultural values transmitted by the agent and operating within any given situation. In Thompson's (1978) model the socialising agent is viewed as a subsystem of society in which dissimilarity from society's ideals can occur and be transmitted from the socialising agent to the child. Essentially, this differentially prepares the child for affiliation with, and participation in, the larger society. The effects are fundamental and long-lasting, and encompass diverse contents with respect to commitment to conformity. Thus the agent's influence may be directly involved in the causation of delinquency by being one of the potential sources of differentially learned commitments to conformity (Thompson 1978:41).

The model proposed that the agent's values reflect different degrees of congruence with societal ideals. The subjective stances range from socially valued positions, which are in accordance with societal prescriptions, to socially devalued positions, which are generally not prescribed or are even contrary to those of the larger society (Thompson 1978:10). This is a modification on the traditional assumption that socialising agents are universally intent on teaching socially prescribed values - their conventionality is rather a variable in and of itself, leading to the possibility of differential socialisation. The socialising agent's views are then communicated to, and ingrained in, the child during the complex process of socialisation, irrespective of the nature of the views. Consequently, if the agent is not aligned with societal prescriptions, it can pass on antisocial views as normal conforming views (Thompson 1978:12). Thus variation in the agent's values and attitudes is proposed as a source of differential influence upon the child's conformity.

Fundamental associations between attitudes and behaviour are established early. Behavioural choices made as a result of a juvenile's early commitments to
conformity establish precedents upon which later behaviour choices are based (Thompson 1978:129). The model suggests that juveniles can be differentially socialised by the agent to the extent that when the juvenile's values are congruent with that of the agent, and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour can occur as a result of the weakened or missing commitment to conformity. Thus, as the agent's views on conformity vary, it is expected that there will be different effects on the child's commitment to conformity and ultimately his or her behaviour. This predicts a link between congruently weak agent and juvenile commitment to conformity and subsequent involvement in delinquent behaviour.

The use of Thompson's model allows for the identification of the influence of antisocial values on a juvenile's behaviour when the juvenile agrees, as compared to the same influence when the juvenile disagrees. The influence of pro-social values on juvenile behaviour can also be identified under the same conditions of congruence and incongruence. Whether or not the juvenile concurs with the agent's view has mitigating influence, irrespective of the nature of the agent's stance, thus both the nature of the stance and how the agent-juvenile stance compare are important issues when explaining delinquency. Thompson incorporated various aspects of each of the two theories to formulate his model. The approach of incorporating various perspectives into one theory is known as the integrative approach, which entails combining two or more perspectives into one theory to provide a more complete and unified explanation of the phenomenon being examined.

### 4.3 Integrative Perspective

The study of deviance and crime has traditionally been characterised by a multitude of seemingly unrelated and competitive theories. This made the field seem fragmented and in need of theoretical integration. As crime is a complex and multi-determined phenomenon with various variables playing a role in its causation, it makes sense to incorporate the various variables into a single theory of crime, thereby providing a broader explanation. Apart from Thompson (1978), De Lamater (1968), Elliot, Ageton & Canter (1979) and Thornberry (1987) were just some of the contemporary and integrative theorists to examine the issue of socialisation and deviance.
4.3.1 John De Lamater’s Nature of Deviance

Though not essentially a social process theory, De Lamater’s (1968) theory on deviance does briefly deal with the issue of deviant socialisation, an issue that is of relevance to this study. In his theory on the nature of deviance, De Lamater (1968) proposed that deviants might not be originally socialised into conventional society, but that they are often socialised into a deviant subculture with deviant norms and values. Alternatively, socialisation was inadequate or lacking because the child’s parents made no attempts to train the child systematically, or there was a lack of available adults to serve as effective agents. These factors result in a self-image developed in terms of the standards of those around the child. Thus the deviant is one who has learned contra-conventional means and/or goals, as well as the supporting attitudes and values, during their initial socialisation and through the normal process of social learning.

However, once such attitudes and values become consistent with the individual’s identity, such attitudes and values become stable and difficult to change. De Lamater did propose that there are certain individuals that are initially socialised into conventional, socially approved norms and values, but that some event or experience led them to commit the initial deviant act. This leads to intense value conflict and often the act is kept secret. As a result, the individual is not exposed to any negative actions, making it seem that the reward exceeds the cost. Thus the individual begins to tentatively engage in deviant behaviour, each time gauging the reaction of those around him or her.

4.3.2 Elliot, Ageton & Canter’s Integrated Theory of Delinquent Behaviour

Elliot, Ageton & Canter (1979) combined the Social Control, Differential Association and Social Learning theories to form an integrated theory on juvenile delinquency. Using the basic framework of the Social Control Theory, they proposed that delinquent behaviour is the direct result of weak ties to conventional normative order. Furthermore, when transition from childhood to adulthood is not smooth, the result is a weakening of one’s integration into and commitment to social groups, which increases the likelihood of delinquency. Thus bonding to conventional groups and institutions is believed to insulate an individual from involvement in delinquent behaviour, while bonding to deviant groups facilitates and sustains delinquent behaviour. The normative orientation of the group is of importance, as is
the failure to achieve valued goals. These are believed to weaken one's ties to conventional order and contribute to delinquency.

Incorporating certain premises of Sutherland's differential theory, Elliot, Ageton & Canter (1979) went on to suggest that delinquent behaviour presupposes a pattern of social relationships through which motives, rationalisations, and techniques are learned and maintained. Delinquent behaviour was seen to have social meaning and therefore it required the support of social groups if it were to persist. The integrated theory stressed that by the time a child reached adolescence he or she would have been sufficiently exposed to criminal forms of behaviour to acquire some potential for such acts. The critical issue is therefore how the potential for such acts is transformed into actual delinquent acts for some and not for others. It was at this stage that Elliot, Ageton & Canter (1979) incorporated aspects of the social learning approach.

They felt that not all learned behaviour is performed because of the discrepancy between what an individual has learned and what an individual can do. Direct and vicarious reinforcements were regarded as important determinants of behavioural patterns. The delinquent peer group was considered essential for the performance and maintenance of behavioural patterns. Performance was believed to be contingent on the weakening of the individual's commitment to conventional norms and their participation in social contexts supportive of delinquent acts. Therefore the theory proposed that as result of an individual's different early socialisation experiences, individuals have variable degrees of commitment to and integration into conventional social groups. These variable degrees of commitment influence an individual's involvement in delinquent behaviour.

4.3.3 Thornberry's Interactional Theory

In Thornberry's (1987) Interactional Theory, human behaviour is believed to occur through social interaction with people and institutions and that it is through this interactive process that behavioural outcomes are formed. The primary mechanisms by which adolescents are bonded to conventional society are represented by an individual's attachment to parents, commitment to school and belief in conventional values; a premise adopted from social control theories. Attachment, commitment and belief are thought to reduce delinquency by connecting the individual to conventional institutions and individuals. When any of
these elements are weakened behavioural freedom increases, allowing for a wider array of behaviour. Thus delinquency is seen as a result of the weakening of social constraints over an individual's behaviour. However, for this freedom of behaviour to be channelled into actual participation in delinquency, an interactive setting in which delinquency is learned, performed and reinforced is required. Therefore, association with delinquent peers and the formation of delinquent values forms this interactive setting whereby freedom of behaviour is channelled into actual participation.

Incorporating premises from the Differential Association and Social Learning theories, Thornberry (1987) went on to propose that individuals take on the behavioural repertoire of their associations while also seeking out associations who share in their behavioural interests. Values were believed to precede the formation of peer groups and that it is the socialisation of adolescents into deviant value systems that leads to the initial association with delinquent peers. In his studies Thornberry noted that the beliefs of adolescents, aged between 11 and 13, that delinquent behaviour was acceptable and positively valued was emerging at this stage but not yet fully articulated. This led him to the view that beliefs are more of an effect than cause and produced by behaviour and associations and that as values emerge, they have a feedback effect on the youth's behaviour and associations.

It proposes that youths that do not grant legitimacy to conventional values are more apt to associate with delinquent friends. Such friendships are likely to further weaken the youth's beliefs in conventional values. As social control theorists have noted, youths that do not believe in conventional values are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviour. Furthermore, initially weak bonds in early adolescence lead some youth to high delinquency involvement, which further weakens conventional bonds, making it extremely difficult to re-establish bonds to conventional society at later stages. The result is that associations, delinquent values and delinquent behaviour reinforce each other over time, increasing the probability for continued deviance.

Thornberry regards parental influence as a means of social control because of the parent's ability to control the child's behaviour, adding that parents that have strong bonds with their children are more likely to lead their children toward conventional activities and beliefs. However, the overall strength of parental
effects weakens by the time the child reaches 15 to 16 years of age as the family declines in relative importance, while the adolescent's own world takes on increasing significance. It is also the time during which involvement in delinquency is at its highest and delinquent values are more fully articulated, having a stronger effect on other variables. Therefore serious delinquent youths form belief systems that are consistent with their deviant lifestyle.

Where Thornberry's (1987) Interactional Theory differs from most social process theories is in the belief that delinquency is not the outcome or consequence of a social process but rather part of the developmental process interacting with other social factors over time, determining an individual's ultimate behavioural repertoire. While initial incentive may come from the weakening of an individual's bond to conventional society, living in social settings in which deviant values and attitudes can be learned and reinforced supports the onset of the delinquent behaviour. This process is believed to develop over the individual's life cycle.

The importance of the socialisation process has not gone unnoticed by other perspectives. Aspects of the process have been incorporated into theories that do not necessarily fall within the social process perspective. Various early traditional theories, which went on to become frameworks for contemporary and integrative theories, mentioned the socialisation process or certain aspects of the process in their theories. These included the Anomie and subcultural theories, which fall under the Structural perspective.

4.4 Structural Perspective

The structural perspective views criminal behaviour as a form of adaptation to the conditions prevailing within the environment. It proposes a link between the environment's social system or social structure and crime. Proponents of this perspective argue that it is the prevailing norms, rules and codes of conduct that compels individuals to commit crime.

4.4.1 Merton's Anomie Theory

Anomie was a term used to refer to the inconsistencies between societal conditions and individual opportunities for growth, fulfillment and productivity within a society (Shoemaker 1990:99). A breakdown of social norms results in a disturbance in the balance between aspiration and goal achievement and norms no longer control
the activities of its social members. This was believed to create a state of normlessness, where moral conviction lacked and individuals did not respond to social controls. The focus of Merton's (1938) Anomie theory was on social-structural inequalities and socially blocked opportunities in society that created a strain in certain segments of the society, pushing the individual in those segments toward deviance. Though primarily emphasising the social structure's role in deviance, the socialisation process was included in this social structural theory.

Durkheim, who first penned the term anomie, believed that without clear rules to guide individuals, they would not be able to find their place in society and would struggle to adjust to changing social conditions, resulting in dissatisfaction, frustration, conflict and deviance (Williams & McShane 1994:88). Deviance was defined as any form of behaviour that did not follow the pattern of commonly accepted values, which the members of society shared in or were socialised into. It was proposed that these values form a frame of aspirational reference, constituting a "design" for group living, teaching individuals the things they should strive for (cultural goals) and the appropriate ways of achieving those goals (societal means). Thus importance was placed on the values transmitted during the socialisation process. Merton’s Anomie theory continued to exert influence in the criminological field well into the 1950's, and the subcultural theories, which came about during that time, shared Merton’s basic premise. Only now the focus fell more on juvenile delinquency, specifically gangs.

4.4.2 Subcultural Theories

In the subcultural theories, culture was regarded as the accepted standards of behaviour that are passed from one generation to another, a basic function of the socialisation process. Subcultures were defined as any behavioural pattern that diverged from that of the dominant culture. The focus was the formation of gangs, and the study of culture. Delinquency was thus viewed as an expression of one's subcultural standards and values, behaviour consistent with the set of subcultural norms within which the individual lives. On an individual level, it was proposed that deviant or criminal behaviour was learnt in association with others, through the process of socialisation. Behavioural norms of deviant subcultures, derived from norms of the dominant culture, are distorted or reversed. Thus the product of socialisation was emphasised.
Cloward and Ohlin (1960) concluded that the subculture in which the individual lives is what promotes an atmosphere conducive to the learning of delinquent behaviour. The younger youths learn by watching the older youths, who in turn learn by watching the adults. Adults are the role models that teach criminal behaviour as a means of achieving success, transmitting the skills needed. Inappropriate socialisation, where individuals have the opportunity to become aware of possibilities for law violation, opportunities to acquire knowledge and skills, and become indoctrinated in the normative justifications of the behaviour, is a significant factor in delinquent behaviour. This kind of socialisation usually occurs in areas with integrated criminal organisations, where risks and rewards of illegal activities compare favourably with those of conventional behaviour. Formal control systems in these areas take a tolerant stance toward a certain level of illegal activity, and individuals are subject to the conflicting role expectations.

Though the process of socialisation has been stressed in various theories of deviance, the socialisation agent in question has primarily been the family. Yet from the previous chapter it is clear that the mass media is playing a greater role than ever in the socialisation process and this can no longer be ignored. While none of the theories presented in this chapter make reference to the media, the premises from the various theories can successfully be applied to the mass media as a socialising agent.

4.5 Theories of Deviance and Mass Media Socialisation

Traditionally the family was the primary socialising agent and the school, church/mosque/synagogue/temple and the larger community elaborated its role, but now the media has become a "third parent", significantly influencing the socialisation process. Reckless, a social control theorist, considered the mass media as an environmental pull, which has the ability to divert an individual from socially acceptable life patterns. This ability to divert an individual, coupled with the lack in one's environment of a strong set of values to act as guiding standards, means that the media's role and values, which are often deviant in nature, can go unchallenged. The frequent presentation of such roles and values can therefore be seen as a diversion from socially acceptable life patterns. Both sociologists and criminologists have linked deficiencies in the teaching of law-abiding norms and values to delinquent behaviour (Thornton & Voigt 1992:241). Thus the mass media, as a social institution, may be contributing to delinquency rather than promoting pro-social behaviour, as dysfunction begins to interfere with the socialisation process.
Other social control theorists proposed that an individual’s commitment to conformity is what restrains the individual from committing delinquent acts and without such commitment, the probability of delinquency increases. Santrock (1996:497), who found that the failure to distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour is a predictor of delinquent behaviour, supports this social control premise. It is this issue that becomes of relevance when dealing with media socialisation. The mass media, with its sensational information, overemphasises certain aspects, in particular its use of crime and violence as themes.

As a result, the line between acceptable and unacceptable behaviour is regularly distorted, and its presentations are not always entirely aligned with societal norms. It is a factor, which the social control theorists believe, could result in the passing on of antisocial values as normal and conforming. Thus the media as an agent could possibly be passing on antisocial values, impacting the individual’s commitment to conformity and influencing his or her behaviour, an issue which this study addresses. Furthermore, adolescents who have weak bonds with conventional institutions will not have internalised values for conventional behaviour and will more likely be involved in problem behaviours (Garner & Stein 1998:103).

From the Differential Association perspective, Sutherland believed that the transfer of values and definitions could not be achieved through the reading of books or the watching of movies, and that secondary groups such as the media were insignificant. He could not have anticipated the ever increasing mediated way of life that exists today. The theory does not specify who one’s associates need be, but focuses instead on the definitions provided by those associations, allowing for the application of the theory to the media. Sutherland proposed that criminal behaviour is learnt through means of communication and today the most influential means of communication is that of the mass media. The media has become the most frequent leisure pursuit that has the potential to direct attention. Its influence is persuasive and pervasive and has become deeply established as an integral part of our everyday lives. The media has also become the most effective way of teaching values, for the following reasons:

(a) The recurrence of values across the various mediums and the different programming - Mass media content has a fairly uniform set of social messages that are continually repeated. When one considers the amount of time children spend in the presence of the media and that exposure begins before the child
enters school, it is evident that frequency and duration, as set out in Sutherland’s Differential Association Theory are of significance when applied to the media.

(b) Values that are dramatically presented evoke emotions - Jones & Jones (1999:179) empirically state that the media has the ability to stimulate emotions and physiological responses. This coupled with the fact that models are frequently portrayed as powerful and in control of their resources, suggests that identification is more likely to occur, which leads to acquisition of social behaviours (Yawkey & Johnson 1988: 10). This ascribes to Sutherland’s definition of intensity.

(c) Value exposure begins in early childhood - Leland (1998:4) points out that peak viewing years are those between the ages of 2 and 7. As values can be inferred through observation without description and minimal behavioural expression (Selnow 1990:71), those learned in early years and exposed over time cultivate stable and common conceptions, which become resistant to change and persist over time. This conforms to Sutherland’s representation of priority.

One of the premises of Sutherland’s theory was that the greater the exposure to deviant definitions, the greater the likelihood of delinquency. Research by Bryant & Zillmann (1994:45) has shown that events witnessed in the media result in ideas of similar meaning being activated and in turn activating other related ideas and actions. When one considers that the most common type of media content is dramatic, low taste content that stresses violence, brutality, sexual gratification and melodrama, one cannot ignore the excess of deviant definitions that is so readily portrayed. If Sutherland’s premise stands, increased exposure to media definitions are likely to be accompanied by increased delinquency, a premise which this study also aims to examine.

While Sutherland considered the media’s role in differential association as insignificant, it is evident that this is no longer the case. With the media constantly portraying crime and criminal techniques as conventional and exposing children to ideals that conflict with those of the home and school, the media must now be considered a source of conflicting and deviant definitions, of differential association. Though Sutherland overlooked the media’s significance, Glaser (1956)
put forward the idea that identification was key to learning, and included identification with the media in his theory.

Differential Identification was a re-conceptualisation of Sutherland’s theory, integrative in nature, drawing heavily on the works of Mead. The focus lay on the interaction in which the choice of models occurs, as well as with the individual's role in rationalising his or her conduct. Glaser treated crime as a form of voluntary behaviour. He proposed that, during any period of time, prior identifications and present circumstances dictate the selection of the persons with whom an individual identifies. Prior identifications that have been pleasing persist, but the immediate circumstance affects the relative ease of alternative identifications.

Glaser proposed that through the course of life, we identify with both criminals and non-criminals. Criminal identifications can occur firstly through direct experience in criminal groups. Secondly, it can occur through the portrayal of positive reference to criminal roles in the media and finally, criminal identification can occur through negative reaction to forces opposed to crime. In his theory, Glaser (1956:440) stated that a person pursues criminal behaviour to the extent that he or she identifies with real or imaginary persons from whose perspective his or her criminal behaviour seems acceptable.

Thus Glaser’s concept stressed the importance of group membership and social roles in shaping one’s behaviour, while allowing for the influence of reference groups to which an individual looks to for evaluation and approval, whether or not he or she is in direct contact with such groups. This put more emphasis than Sutherland did on groups other than face-to-face associations. The belief that the adoption of values predisposing an individual to criminal or law-abiding behaviour is the result of identification with a real or imaginary person, is key to this study.

The Social Learning Theory, on the other hand, suggested that behaviour is the product of the repertoire of one's associations and that the frequency of the reinforcement determines the strength of the behaviour. When one considers that more time is spent on the media than any other activity except for sleep (Barber 1988:4), the issue of media norms and values becomes relevant. The behavioural repertoire displayed in the media is at times questionable and when so much time is attributed to the media, reinforcement of such behaviour and values does not
seem in the best interest of youths. The question that arises is whether youth are taking on the media's behavioural and value repertoire and at what result.

If expectations are based on earlier observed outcomes and exposure to the media begins very early in life, then it would seem that the mass media is socialising its audience into a deviant value system, if its value system is predominantly antisocial. Research has shown that delinquents are exposed to more modelling of delinquent behaviour than non-delinquents are (Elliot, Huizinga & Ageton 1985:49) and that adolescents acquire their beliefs and involvement in problem behaviour from role models, through observation, imitation, social reinforcement, and positive expectations of future involvement in such behaviours.

When one considers that antisocial attitudes, behaviour, and values are readily available in the media and too often overemphasised, the effects of this type of modelling need to be addressed. Particularly as recent studies on value transmission have shown that adolescents that live in a social context where unconventional behaviours are prevalent and socially supported, are more likely to engage in problem behaviours (Garner & Stein 98:91). This concurs with De Lamater's view of a delinquent being socialised into a deviant subculture. Therefore, if delinquency is indeed a direct result of socialisation into a deviant value system, then the media may unintentionally be responsible for this type of deviant socialisation. With the media's use of heroes and villains that randomly use deviant means of achieving their goals, one needs to determine whether the individual is learning to believe that such conduct and values is acceptable and positively valued.

De Lamater also proposed that delinquency is likely to occur when socialisation is inadequate or lacking or there is a lack of available adults to serve as effective agents. He felt that these factors result in a self-image developed in terms of the standards of those around the child. When the most prevalent presence in the child's life is the media, it stands to reason that the self-image developed will be in terms of media standards, particularly since the media provides examples of what is normative, effective and pertinent, thereby transmitting the perceived norms of society. This creates the impression of value consensus. The media serves to define our world for us, to legitimise social order, confer status and enforce norms. Because of its fairly uniform content, these norms become part of the viewer's social schema. People develop a sense of the social world from this schema and it
contributes to the patterns by which people live their lives (Vivian 1991:317). As the media addresses a large cross-section of the population and its overall content - regularly exposed over time - cultivates stable and common conceptions of reality, a perception of unanimity is created, setting the scene for anomie to exist.

Goff & Goddard (1999:48) view delinquency as a symptom of an adolescent's orientation toward success and status, an unlawful means of fulfilling desired values, the rational choice for the individual whose desired goals are unattainable through the socially acceptable means. The media may be seen to contribute to this state through its undifferentiated accessibility. It exposes youth to values not suited to their age, capacity to deal with or opportunities available, as such they may follow non-approved means (Innovation) to achieve those goals.

While Merton (1938) did not consider conformity as a deviant mode of adaptation, it may very well be, if the goals and the means we're socialised to strive for are antisocial, or not in the best interests of society. Merton took it for granted that the values we are socialised into are in the best interest for society. When we examine the media (one of the most influential socialising agents of our time) we see that certain elements and behaviours are often singled out, highlighted and overemphasised over others. Often that which is singled out does not represent the best of human character, so wrong values and practices can go unchallenged and persist. This makes conforming to consensual norms criminogenic in itself.

Durkheim strongly believed that a lack of clear rules to guide the behaviour of individuals would result in dissatisfaction, frustration, conflict and deviance. Previously values were clearly prescribed but now with the media and its vast span of information, much of which is contradictory, the onus is on the individual to formulate his or her own values. Will this lack of clear rules to govern and guide the behaviour of individuals pave the way for the kind of dissatisfaction, frustration, conflict and deviance that Durkheim predicted?

From a subcultural approach, a set of behavioural patterns that have become conventional among a certain group in the culture is regarded as a subculture. Deviant behaviour is a drawcard that attracts audiences and brings in money and as a result has become a focal point of media coverage. Antisocial behaviour is in our films, computer games, music and even newspapers. Both heroes and villains readily use violence as the first and most effective means of dealing with problems.
They use criminal techniques as means of achieving their ends, providing an abundance of social models that encourage and socially affirm inappropriate behaviour. Deviant behaviour has become conventional in the media and in view of the above definition, the mass media can be considered as a subculture whose norms and values are conducive to the learning of delinquent and criminal behaviour.

There are three factors, according to subcultural theorists, interacting within the subculture, that give rise to delinquency. These factors are: the presence of conflicting values and role expectations; a tolerant stance by the formal control systems in the subculture; and the risks and rewards of deviant behaviour being compared favourably to those of conventional behaviour. If we consider the media as a subculture, we see that all three of these factors are present. The formal control systems represented in the media are often displayed as being tolerant toward deviant behaviour, at times even overlooking it completely. Policemen are portrayed as overlooking drug offences to gain information on other types of crimes, and those in authority are often portrayed as taking bribes, creating the impression of a certain amount of tolerance toward, and involvement in, deviant behaviour by the formal control system.

Deviant behaviour is often compared favourably with that of conventional behaviour and at times even more so. There are media reports of criminals gaining status, wealth and power, and getting away with their crimes when their cases are dismissed in court or they are found not guilty. At the same time there are media reports of hardworking individuals who worked hard for their wealth, status and power and obtained these through conventional behaviour and then went on to lose it all. This elevates the favourability of deviant behaviour in the eyes of the audience, and creates further conflicting values and role expectations, which are already in existence because of the wide spectrum of information that is so readily available.

4.6 Summary

Regularly news stories appear of crimes committed by juveniles, yet this is a problem that has existed for many years. The result was the development of causal explanations of delinquency through the identification of contributory factors associated with the behaviour. The areas of interest and the era of the time influenced all the studies conducted, the methods used and the conclusions
reached through the ages. The biological and psychological schools sought the causes of delinquency within the individual. The sociological schools focused on the environment within which the individual acts, as well as the factors acting within the social organisation and social processes.

Socialisation is a social process that is regarded as central to the behaviour of individuals. Several theories have in some manner or other addressed this process. There is the Differential Association Theory of Sutherland (1934), that viewed behaviour as learned in interaction with others through the process of socialisation, involving communication of a mixture of norms and values, which either favour law-abiding or law-violating behaviour. Crime is deemed as the result of frequency, duration, priority and intensity of an excess of law-violation definitions. Thus one's associations' cultural standards are considered crucial to the learning of criminal behaviour, hence the examination of the role of the mass media, one of the most influential means of communication and most prominent associations of juveniles today.

The Anomie theory, presented by Durkheim and later extended by Merton (1938), believed that the values transmitted during the socialisation process were part of the problem. In his theory, Merton proposed that all individuals are socialised into a common system of values, which individuals often do not have the access or opportunity to achieve. This creates a strain, pushing those individuals towards deviant behaviour as a means to reconcile desire-fulfilment and aspiration-goal achievement. The Anomie theory remains relevant to the issue of the media. The media's undifferentiated accessibility is often not suited to the age and capacity of juveniles, thereby socialising them into values that they have little chance of attaining. Of even greater concern are the types of values that the media is inculcating as a common system of values. It is a notable fact that a lot of that shown in the media does not reflect the best of human nature. Consequently, wrong values and perceptions go unchallenged, making the possibility of conforming criminogenic in itself.

The subcultural theories also examined the socialisation process but strove to reconcile structure with process, combining the Differential Association and Anomie theories. Delinquency was viewed as an expression of an individual's subcultural standards and norms. While criminal behaviour was considered learned through associations, stressing the process, it is also the result of being judged by
values, which one has not been socialised into, stressing the product. Hence values deemed useful by one subculture of the society fall into conflict with the dominant culture, as they are not regarded as appropriate by the dominant culture.

Deviant behaviour, though not regarded as appropriate by the dominant culture, is what attracts the audiences to the media. Thus deviant behavioural patterns and values have become conventional in the media and those socialised by the media will inevitably fall into conflict with the dominant culture. Furthermore, the subcultural theorists considered inappropriate socialisation, where an individual is made aware of the possibility of law violation, as part of the cause of delinquent behaviour. The huge extent of media access means that the opportunity of becoming aware of possible law violation is very real, bringing up the issue of inappropriate socialisation by the media.

One theory that chose to focus on why individuals didn’t commit criminal acts, rather than why they did, was that of the Social Control theories. They believed that individuals are inclined to commit crime because of all the opportunities and pressures that exist in society and what was of interest was what kept individuals from committing criminal acts. Once again socialisation featured predominantly in this area as socialisation was considered the most important means of social control that society has. The internalisation of conventional norms and values was believed to have the power to control behaviour and if the internalisation was weakened through conflicting or inconsistent values, delinquency would result. While socialisation was viewed as a means of social control, the Social Control theorists added that, if the socialising agent is not aligned with the social norms, it could pass on antisocial values as normal and conforming. Though the media was thought of as an environmental pull in the 60’s, today the media is considered as a third parent and therefore a socialising agent. An agent not entirely aligned with societal norms, often promulgating conflicting and inconsistent values.

The Social Learning Theory chose to incorporate the environment into the learning and socialisation processes. The theory suggested that it is through imitation and modelling of significant others that behaviour is learned. Observation is a key factor in the process but the maintenance of the behaviour will depend upon the anticipated rewards and punishments. Delinquency is viewed as a direct result of socialisation into a deviant value system, where the individual has learned that the behaviour in question is acceptable and positively valued. The solution to the issue
of delinquency was seen to lie in the socialisation of the individual into conformity with societal norms. With the number of hours spent in the company of the media, the media is undoubtedly a significant other in the lives of juveniles today. The questionable content that at times appears in the media raises the issue of what kind of social learning is in fact taking place.

4.7 Conclusion

As seen from the various theories of deviance examined in this chapter, socialisation has been regarded over the decades as an important determinant of behaviour. Yet, whenever the issue of socialisation is examined, the focus has automatically fallen on the family. But times have changed and the media has now taken a central role in the lives of youths. Various forms of mass media and the messages it promulgates constantly bombard the youth. The result is that the media's role in the socialisation process can no longer be ignored. This study analyses one aspect of the socialisation processes namely that of value transmission. It attempts to demonstrate an association between the values portrayed and the youth's behaviour, using the above-mentioned theories as foundations. It explores whether congruently weak agent and juvenile commitment to conformity does influence subsequent involvement in delinquent behaviour. The study's findings are presented in the subsequent chapter.
Chapter 5

Research Findings:
The Results of the Mass Media Socialisation and Juvenile Delinquency Study

5.1 Introduction

The aim of this study was to examine the influence of media values on juvenile behaviour, as the study proposed an association between the values portrayed by the media and a youth's subsequent involvement in delinquent and/or criminal behaviour. The establishment of such an association was undertaken by means of a survey questionnaire. The data obtained from the questionnaire formed the basis of the research findings. Two variables were being examined namely that of media-juvenile values, the independent variable, and delinquency, the dependent variable.

One of the variables measured in the study, the independent variable, was on a nominal scale while the other, the dependent variable, was on an interval scale. Therefore in order to establish a relationship between the two variables, the significance of the difference between these two variables required testing, as significant differences are indicators of a significant relationship. There are two methods of testing this significance and they are, the use of the t-test and the one way analysis of variance. While establishing the significance between the influence of values and delinquency is of prime concern of this study, measuring the strength of the association of the relationship added further credence to the establishment of a relationship between the two variables.

This chapter examines the variation in the nature of the values, a precursor for the establishment of a relationship between that of values and delinquency, while taking into account the strength of the relationship. The findings from the survey study are presented in this chapter in terms of the aforementioned factors.
The underlying assumption of the Differential Socialisation model is that values reflect one’s commitment to conformity and that these commitments vary rather than being perfectly aligned with social goals and ideals. This study proposes that it is this variation on the part of the media and the juvenile, which is related to the type of behaviour that the juvenile exhibits. In order to examine this it must first be established if variation does in deed occur. The distribution for the different response categories for the four antisocial value indicators are presented in Tables 5.1 – 5.4 and the four pro-social value indicators are presented in Tables 5.5 – 5.8 in terms of frequencies.

**Table 5.1**
Frequency Distribution for the Media and Juvenile Boldness Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Media</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value 1 - Boldness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value 1 - Boldness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178 (36%)</td>
<td>105 (21.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 (27%)</td>
<td>140 (28.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 (22%)</td>
<td>140 (28.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 (15%)</td>
<td>108 (21.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63% of respondents felt the media attributed some degree of importance to this value. 49.7% of the respondents themselves attributed some degree of importance.

**Table 5.2**
Frequency Distribution for the Media and Juvenile Pleasure Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Media</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value 2 - Pleasure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value 2 - Pleasure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206 (42%)</td>
<td>158 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129 (26%)</td>
<td>161 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 (20%)</td>
<td>111 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 (12%)</td>
<td>63 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68% of respondents felt the media attributed some degree of importance to this value. 65% of the respondents themselves attributed some degree of importance.
### Table 5.3

**Frequency Distribution for the Media and Juvenile Wealth Value Stance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Media</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
<th>Value 3 - Wealth</th>
<th>Value 3 - Wealth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>243 (49.3%)</td>
<td>202 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>164 (33.3%)</td>
<td>183 (37.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>51 (10.3%)</td>
<td>61 (12.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>35 (7.1%)</td>
<td>47 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82.6% of respondents felt the media attributed some degree of importance to this value
78.1% of the respondents themselves attributed some degree of importance

### Table 5.4

**Frequency Distribution for the Media and Juvenile Power Value Stance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Media</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
<th>Value 4 - Power</th>
<th>Value 4 - Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>195 (40%)</td>
<td>187 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>168 (34%)</td>
<td>163 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>79 (16%)</td>
<td>83 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>51 (10%)</td>
<td>60 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74% of respondents felt the media attributed some degree of importance to this value
71% of the respondents themselves attributed some degree of importance

From the above tables it is evident that the respondents’ perception of the media's stance on the above antisocial values varies, as does their own personal stance on the same values, though the patterns of variation differ. 71.9% of the respondents feel the media attributes some degree of importance to the above antisocial values while 65.95% of the respondents themselves attribute some degree of importance to the same values.
Table 5.5
Frequency Distribution for the Media and Juvenile Honesty Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Media</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value 5 - Honesty</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value 5 - Honesty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>71 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>109 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>156 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>157 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36% of respondents felt the media attributed some degree of importance to this value. 34% of the respondents themselves attributed some degree of importance.

Table 5.6
Frequency Distribution for the Media and Juvenile Tradition Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Media</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value 6 - Tradition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value 6 - Tradition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>49 (9.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>61 (12.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>174 (35.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>209 (42.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22.3% of respondents felt the media attributed some degree of importance to this value. 18% of the respondents themselves attributed some degree of importance.

Table 5.7
Frequency Distribution for the Media and Juvenile Obedience Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Media</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value 7 - Obedience</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value 7 - Obedience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>48 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>90 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>193 (39.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>162 (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28% of respondents felt the media attributed some degree of importance to this value. 26.5% of the respondents themselves attributed some degree of importance.
Table 5.8
Frequency Distribution for the Media and Juvenile Responsibility Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Media</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 8 - Responsibility</td>
<td>Value 8 - Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>Not really</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 (17%)</td>
<td>94 (19.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 (31%)</td>
<td>156 (31.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 (25%)</td>
<td>126 (25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134 (27%)</td>
<td>117 (23.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
<td>493 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48% of respondents felt the media attributed some degree of importance to this value. 50.7% of the respondents themselves attributed some degree of importance.

From the above pro-social value tables, it is evident that the respondents' perception of the media's stance on the above pro-social values varies, as does their own personal stance on the same values, though the patterns of variation differ. 33.57% of the respondents feel the media attributes importance to the above pro-social values while 32.3% of the respondents themselves attribute importance to the same pro-social values.

Graph 5.1
Media – Juvenile Value Stance Distribution

Value Stance Distribution

- Congruently Prosocial (15.0%)
- Positively Discrepant (23.0%)
- Negatively Discrepant (18.0%)
- Congruently Antisocial (44.0%)

The observation from the above tables and graph is that both the media and the juveniles' values lean predominantly more toward antisocial stances, but in all eight cases there is sufficient variation, as the model predicted, to justify the investigation into the interaction between media-juvenile values and delinquent behaviour.
5.3 The Relation between Values and Delinquency

To assess the interaction between values and juvenile delinquency, the sets of values were matched and cross-tabulated. The mean delinquency scores for all cells of the table were then compared for each of the eight values. As the matched value items contained more than dichotomous responses, adjustments were made to make the appropriate cells comparable to the A, B, C, and D groups as set out by the Differential Socialisation Model. Thus the defined groups of A, B, C, and D were equated with the following cells:

- Group A – cells 11 and 22
- Group C – cells 21, 31, 32, 41, and 42
- Group B – cells 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, and 34
- Group D – cells 33 and 44

Table 5.9
Response Category Group Definition

5.3.1 Relation between the Antisocial Values and Delinquent Behaviour

5.3.1.1 Value 1 - Boldness

In Table 5.10, the cells are defined by the cross-tabulation of the importance attributed by the media and juveniles on the value of Boldness. The cell entries are the mean delinquency scores for the cases in that cell. Thus in cell 11 (upper left cell), there were 71 juveniles who attributed great importance to boldness and who felt the media did the same. Their mean delinquency scores were 11.25. At the other end (cell 44), 49 juveniles attributed no importance to the value of boldness and felt the media did the same, their mean delinquency score was 1.37. The two intermediate cells of 22 and 33 have intermediate delinquency score values. This
direct relation between delinquency and the level of importance attributed to the antisocial value typifies the predicted association.

**Table 5.10**
Mean Delinquency Scores as per Media and Juvenile Boldness Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Stance</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juvenile Stance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>799/71</td>
<td>139/11</td>
<td>101/13</td>
<td>67/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>381/44</td>
<td>636/77</td>
<td>70/11</td>
<td>52/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143/33</td>
<td>107/27</td>
<td>173/74</td>
<td>33/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54/30</td>
<td>53/20</td>
<td>22/9</td>
<td>67/49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the six hypotheses and answer the four actuating questions, the four by four table must be equated with the defined groups of A, B, C, and D in terms of the predictions made. Group A (where the media attributes importance to the antisocial value and the juvenile does the same) consists of cells 11 and 22. Thus Group A consists of the sum of cells 11 and 22.

Group D (where the media attributes little importance to the antisocial value thus taking a more pro-social stance, and the juvenile does the same) consists of cells 33 and 44, therefore Group D is the sum of cells 33 and 44. Group B (where the importance attributed by the media is diminishing while that of the juvenile’s is not) is therefore the sum of cells 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, and 34. Group C (where the importance attributed by the media is significant while that of the juvenile’s is diminishing) is thus the sum of cells 21, 31, 32, 41, 42 and 43. Using these definitions the following relationships were observed:
**Value 1 – Boldness**

$$H1: \quad A > D$$

$$(11+12) > (33+44)$$

$$9.69 > 1.95 \ (t = 23.45, \text{ significant})$$

$$H2: \quad B > D$$

$$(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (33+44)$$

$$7.83 > 1.95 \ (t = 19.6, \text{ significant})$$

$$H3: \quad C > D$$

$$(21+31+32+41+42+43) > (33+44)$$

$$4.66 > 1.95 \ (t = 7.97, \text{ significant})$$

$$H4: \quad B > C$$

$$(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)$$

$$7.83 > 4.66 \ (t = 6.1, \text{ significant})$$

$$H5: \quad A > C$$

$$(11+12) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)$$

$$9.69 > 4.66 \ (t = 12.8, \text{ significant})$$

$$H6: \quad A > B$$

$$(11+12) > (12+13+14+23+24+34)$$

$$9.69 > 7.83 \ (t = 3.65, \text{ significant})$$

All six of the hypotheses were supported by the study’s findings, and the t – test of significance at a probability level of 0.1 demonstrated significant effects for all six hypotheses. Therefore, using the defined mean score for each group the order of the four groups are as follows: $$A > B > C > D$$

**5.3.1.2 Value 2 - Pleasure**

In Table 5.11 the cells indicate the cross-tabulation of the importance attributed to the pursuit of pleasure as expressed by the media and the juvenile. The mean delinquency scores in the rows demonstrate the effects for the juvenile while the mean delinquency scores in the columns display the effects of the media. In cell 11 (upper-left cell), there were 107 juveniles who attributed great importance to the pursuit of pleasure and who felt the media did the same. Their mean delinquency scores were 8.22. At the other end (cell 44), 26 juveniles attributed no importance to the value of pursuing pleasure and felt the media did the same, their mean delinquency score was 1.04.
Table 5.11
Mean Delinquency Scores as per Media and Juvenile Pleasure Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Stance</th>
<th>Juvenile Stance</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880/107</td>
<td>136/18</td>
<td>149/18</td>
<td>70/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>456/48</td>
<td>640/65</td>
<td>107/18</td>
<td>36/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125/30</td>
<td>46/16</td>
<td>110/58</td>
<td>24/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62/21</td>
<td>23/10</td>
<td>10/08</td>
<td>24/26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the cell definitions of Table 5.9, the following relationships were observed for the above value stance:

**Value 2 – Pursuit of Pleasure**

**H1:** A > D  
\((11+12) > (33+44)\)  
\(7.92 > 1.59 \) \((t = 15.07, \text{ significant})\)

**H2:** B > D  
\((12+13+14+23+24+34) > (33+44)\)  
\(6.07 > 1.59 \) \((t = 13.18, \text{ significant})\)

**H3:** C > D  
\((21+31+32+41+42+43) > (33+44)\)  
\(5.5 > 1.59 \) \((t = 7.38, \text{ significant})\)

**H4:** B > C  
\((12+13+14+23+24+34) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)\)  
\(6.07 > 5.5 \) \((t = 0.98, \text{ not significant})\)

**H5:** A > C  
\((11+12) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)\)  
\(7.92 > 5.5 \) \((t = 4.94, \text{ significant})\)
H6: \( A > B \)
\((11+12) > (12+13+14+23+24+34)\)
\[ 7.92 > 6.07 \ (t = 4.04, \text{ significant}) \]

All six of the hypotheses were supported by the study's findings, and the \( t \) - test of significance at a probability level of 0.1 demonstrated significant effects for five of the six hypotheses. Hypothesis four did not demonstrate a significant level of effect. Never the less, using the defined mean score for each group the order of the four groups are as follows: \( A > B > C > D \)

5.3.1.3 Value 3 - Wealth

In Table 5.12 the cells indicate the cross-tabulation of the importance attributed to wealth as expressed by the media and the juvenile. The cell entries are the mean delinquency scores for the cases in that cell. Thus in cell 11 (upper left cell), there were 159 juveniles who attributed great importance to wealth and who felt the media did the same. Their mean delinquency scores were 8.52. At the other end (cell 44), 12 juveniles attributed no importance to the value of wealth and felt the media did the same, their mean delinquency score was 0.92. The mean delinquency scores in the rows demonstrate the effects for the juvenile while the mean delinquency scores in the columns display the effects of the media.

Table 5.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Stance</th>
<th>Juvenile Stance</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1355/159</td>
<td>46/17</td>
<td>38/16</td>
<td>16/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190/40</td>
<td>982/122</td>
<td>29/13</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80/23</td>
<td>38/15</td>
<td>20/18</td>
<td>01/05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67/21</td>
<td>15/10</td>
<td>01/04</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the cell definitions of Table 5.9, the following relationships were observed for the above value stance:

**Value 3 - Wealth**

**H1:** \[ A > D \]
(11+12) > (33+44)  
\[ 8.32 > 1.03 \ (t = 9.85, \text{significant}) \]

**H2:** \[ B > D \]
(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (33+44)  
\[ 1.98 > 1.03 \ (t = 3.8, \text{significant}) \]

**H3:** \[ C > D \]
(21+31+32+41+42+43) > (33+44)  
\[ 3.47 > 1.03 \ (t = 7.87, \text{significant}) \]

**H4:** \[ B > C \]
(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)  
\[ 1.98 < 3.47 \ (t = 6.48, \text{significant}) \]

**H5:** \[ A > C \]
(11+12) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)  
\[ 8.32 > 3.47 \ (t = 12.44, \text{significant}) \]

**H6:** \[ A > B \]
(11+12) > (12+13+14+23+24+34)  
\[ 8.32 > 1.98 \ (t = 12.94, \text{significant}) \]

All six of the hypotheses were supported by the study’s findings, and the \( t \)-test of significance at a probability level of 0.1 demonstrated significant effects for all six hypotheses. Therefore, using the defined mean score for each group the order of the four groups are as follows: \( A > C > B > D \)

### 5.3.1.4 Value 4 - Power

In Table 5.13 the cells indicate the cross-tabulation of the importance attributed to power as expressed by the media and the juvenile. The mean delinquency scores in the rows demonstrate the effects for the juvenile while the mean delinquency scores in the columns display the effects of the media. In cell 11 (upper-left cell), there were 129 juveniles who attributed great importance to power and who felt the media did the same. Their mean delinquency scores were 10.03. At the other end (cell 44), 21 juveniles attributed no importance to the value of power and felt the media did the same, their mean delinquency score was 0.76.
Table 5.13
Mean Delinquency Scores as per Media and Juvenile Power Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Stance</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1294/129</td>
<td>197/28</td>
<td>62/20</td>
<td>08/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141/26</td>
<td>890/108</td>
<td>25/16</td>
<td>10/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/24</td>
<td>71/19</td>
<td>55/33</td>
<td>04/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60/18</td>
<td>46/13</td>
<td>19/10</td>
<td>16/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the cell definitions of Table 5.9, the following relationships were observed for the above value stance:

**Value 4 – Power**

**H1:**  
A > D  
(11+12) > (33+44)  
9.21 > 1.31 (t = 15.49, significant)

**H2:**  
B > D  
(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (33+44)  
2.19 > 1.31 (t = 4, significant)

**H3:**  
C > D  
(21+31+32+41+42+43) > (33+44)  
4.04 > 1.31 (t = 13.65, significant)

**H4:**  
B > C  
(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)  
2.19 < 4.04 (t = 10.28, significant)

**H5:**  
A > C  
(11+12) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)  
9.21 > 4.04 (t = 14.36, significant)

**H6:**  
A > B  
(11+12) > (12+13+14+23+24+34)  
9.21 > 2.19 (t = 18, significant)
All six of the hypotheses were supported by the study's findings, and the t-test of significance at a probability level of 0.1 demonstrated significant effects for all six hypotheses. Therefore, using the defined mean score for each group the order of the four groups are as follows: \( A > C > B > D \)

5.3.2 Relation between the Pro-social Values and Delinquent Behaviour

5.3.2.1 Value 5 - Honesty

In Table 5.14, the cells are defined by the cross-tabulation of the importance attributed by the media and juveniles on the value of Honesty. The cell entries are the mean delinquency scores for the cases in that cell. Thus in cell 11 (upper left cell), there were 81 juveniles who attributed no importance to honesty and who felt the media did the same. Their mean delinquency scores were 11.25. At the other end (cell 44), 24 juveniles attributed great importance to the value of honesty and felt the media did the same, their mean delinquency score was 1.75. The two intermediate cells of 22 and 33 have intermediate delinquency score values. This direct relation between delinquency and the level of importance attributed to the pro-social value typifies the predicted association.

To test the six hypotheses and answer the four actuating questions, the four by four table must be equated with the defined groups of A, B, C, and D in terms of the predictions made. Group A (where the media attributes no importance to the pro-social value, thus taking an antisocial stance and the juvenile does the same) consists of cells 11 and 22. Thus Group A consists of the sum of cells 11 and 22. Group D (where the media attributes importance to the pro-social value and the juvenile does the same) consists of cells 33 and 44; therefore Group D is the sum of cells 33 and 44. Group B (where the importance attributed by the media is significant while that of the juvenile's is not) is therefore the sum of cells 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, and 34. Group C (where the importance attributed by the media is diminishing while that of the juvenile's is significant) is thus the sum of cells 21, 31, 32, 41, 42 and 43. Using these definitions the following relationships were observed:
### Table 5.14
Mean Delinquency Scores as per Media and Juvenile Honesty Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Stance</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>10.22</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828/81</td>
<td>188/30</td>
<td>151/27</td>
<td>73/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124/32</td>
<td>953/97</td>
<td>135/24</td>
<td>58/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85/25</td>
<td>50/17</td>
<td>114/50</td>
<td>16/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65/19</td>
<td>10/12</td>
<td>05/08</td>
<td>42/24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Value 5 – Honesty

**H1:** \( A > D \)
\[(11+12) > (33+44)\]

\[10.01 > 2.11 \ (t = 15.8, \text{ significant})\]

**H2:** \( B > D \)
\[(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (33+44)\]

\[4.85 > 2.11 \ (t = 11.42, \text{ significant})\]

**H3:** \( C > D \)
\[(21+31+32+41+42+43) > (33+44)\]

\[3 > 2.11 \ (t = 5.23, \text{ significant})\]

**H4:** \( B > C \)
\[(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)\]

\[4.85 > 3 \ (t = 8.81, \text{ significant})\]

**H5:** \( A > C \)
\[(11+12) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)\]

\[10.01 > 3 \ (t = 17.52, \text{ significant})\]

**H6:** \( A > B \)
\[(11+12) > (12+13+14+23+24+34)\]

\[10.01 > 4.85 \ (t = 12.9, \text{ significant})\]
All six of the hypotheses were supported by the study's findings, and the t-test of significance at a probability level of 0.1 demonstrated significant effects for all six hypotheses. Therefore, using the defined mean score for each group the order of the four groups are as follows: \( A > B > C > D \)

5.3.2.2 Value 6 - Tradition

In Table 5.15 the cells indicate the cross-tabulation of the importance attributed to tradition as expressed by the media and the juvenile. The mean delinquency scores in the rows demonstrate the effects for the juvenile while the mean delinquency scores in the columns display the effects of the media. In cell 11 (upper-left cell), there were 165 juveniles who attributed no importance to tradition and who felt the media did the same. Their mean delinquency scores were 8.37. At the other end (cell 44), 15 juveniles attributed importance to the value of tradition and felt the media did the same, their mean delinquency score was 0.53.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Stance</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1382/165</td>
<td>71/21</td>
<td>61/18</td>
<td>54/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63/23</td>
<td>1105/136</td>
<td>50/15</td>
<td>33/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14/17</td>
<td>09/08</td>
<td>09/19</td>
<td>20/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/04</td>
<td>09/11</td>
<td>07/09</td>
<td>08/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the cell definitions of Table 5.9, the following relationships were observed for the above value stance:
**Value 6 - Tradition**

H1: \[ A > D \]
\[ (11+12) > (33+44) \]
\[ 8.26 > 0.5 \ (t = 11.94, \text{significant}) \]

H2: \[ B > D \]
\[ (12+13+14+23+24+34) > (33+44) \]
\[ 3.28 > 0.5 \ (t = 25.27, \text{significant}) \]

H3: \[ C > D \]
\[ (21+31+32+41+42+43) > (33+44) \]
\[ 1.49 > 0.5 \ (t = 4.71, \text{significant}) \]

H4: \[ B > C \]
\[ (12+13+14+23+24+34) > (21+31+32+41+42+43) \]
\[ 3.28 > 1.49 \ (t = 13.77, \text{significant}) \]

H5: \[ A > C \]
\[ (11+12) > (21+31+32+41+42+43) \]
\[ 8.26 > 1.49 \ (t = 14.72, \text{significant}) \]

H6: \[ A > B \]
\[ (11+12) > (12+13+14+23+24+34) \]
\[ 8.26 > 3.28 \ (t = 12.15, \text{significant}) \]

All six of the hypotheses were supported by the study’s findings, and the \( t \) – test of significance at a probability level of 0.1 demonstrated significant effects for all six hypotheses. Therefore, using the defined mean score for each group the order of the four groups are as follows: \( A > B > C > D \)

### 5.3.2.3 Value 7 - Obedience

In Table 5.16 the cells indicate the cross-tabulation of the importance attributed to obedience as expressed by the media and the juvenile. The mean delinquency scores in the rows demonstrate the effects for the juvenile while the mean delinquency scores in the columns display the effects of the media. In cell 11 (upper-left cell), there were 103 juveniles who attributed no importance to obedience and who felt the media did the same. Their mean delinquency scores were 9.84. At the other end (cell 44), 21 juveniles attributed importance to the value of obedience and felt the media did the same, their mean delinquency score was 1.
Table 5.16
Mean Delinquency Scores as per Media and Juvenile Obedience Value Stance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Stance</th>
<th>Media Stance</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Somew hat</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1014/103</td>
<td>147/31</td>
<td>77/19</td>
<td>58/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57/29</td>
<td>1171/130</td>
<td>112/27</td>
<td>29/09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somew hat</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60/23</td>
<td>36/19</td>
<td>49/33</td>
<td>13/04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/07</td>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>07/11</td>
<td>21/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the cell definitions of Table 5.9, the following relationships were observed for the above value stance:

**Value 7 – Obedience**

**H1:** A > D

(11+12) > (33+44)  
9.38 > 1.3 (t = 16.16, significant)

**H2:** B > D

(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (33+44)  
4.19 > 1.3 (t = 24.08, significant)

**H3:** C > D

(21+31+32+41+42+43) > (33+44)  
2.02 > 1.3 (t = 3.6, significant)

**H4:** B > C

(12+13+14+23+24+34) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)  
4.19 > 2.02 (t = 15.5, significant)

**H5:** A > C

(11+12) > (21+31+32+41+42+43)  
9.38 > 2.02 (t = 20.44, significant)

**H6:** A > B

(11+12) > (12+13+14+23+24+34)  
9.38 > 4.19 (t = 14.83, significant)
All six of the hypotheses were supported by the study's findings, and the t-test of significance at a probability level of 0.1 demonstrated significant effects for all six hypotheses. Therefore, using the defined mean score for each group the order of the four groups are as follows: \( A > B > C > D \)

### 5.3.2.4 Value 8 - Responsibility

In Table 5.17 the cells indicate the cross-tabulation of the importance attributed to responsibility as expressed by the media and the juvenile. The mean delinquency scores in the rows demonstrate the effects for the juvenile while the mean delinquency scores in the columns display the effects of the media. In cell 11 (upper-left cell), there were 55 juveniles who attributed no importance to responsibility and who felt the media did the same. Their mean delinquency scores were 12.22. At the other end (cell 44), 52 juveniles attributed importance to the value of responsibility and felt the media did the same, their mean delinquency score was 1.71.

#### Table 5.17

**Mean Delinquency Scores as per Media and Juvenile Responsibility Value Stance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Stance</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Not really</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672/55</td>
<td>252/29</td>
<td>122/18</td>
<td>28/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not really</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206/32</td>
<td>624/59</td>
<td>189/24</td>
<td>18/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115/25</td>
<td>60/19</td>
<td>417/106</td>
<td>03/06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79/22</td>
<td>20/14</td>
<td>03/06</td>
<td>89/52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the cell definitions of Table 5.9, the following relationships were observed for the above value stance:
Value 8 – Responsibility

H1: \[ A > D \]
\[ (11+12) > (33+44) \]
\[ 11.37 > 3.2 \ (t = 21.5, \text{significant}) \]

H2: \[ B > D \]
\[ (12+13+14+23+24+34) > (33+44) \]
\[ 5.94 > 3.2 \ (t = 8.84, \text{significant}) \]

H3: \[ C > D \]
\[ (21+31+32+41+42+43) > (33+44) \]
\[ 4.09 > 3.2 \ (t = 3.71, \text{significant}) \]

H4: \[ B > C \]
\[ (12+13+14+23+24+34) > (21+31+32+41+42+43) \]
\[ 5.94 > 4.09 \ (t = 5.14, \text{significant}) \]

H5: \[ A > C \]
\[ (11+12) > (21+31+32+41+42+43) \]
\[ 11.37 > 4.09 \ (t = 16.93, \text{significant}) \]

H6: \[ A > B \]
\[ (11+12) > (12+13+14+23+24+34) \]
\[ 11.37 > 5.94 \ (t = 10.86, \text{significant}) \]

All six of the hypotheses were supported by the study’s findings, and the t-test of significance at a probability level of 0.1 demonstrated significant effects for all six hypotheses. Therefore, using the defined mean score for each group the order of the four groups are as follows: \[ A > B > C > D \]

5.3.3 Four Group Mean Score Comparison

On the basis of the direction of ordering for all eight values, the mean score for Group A (congruently antisocial position) was in all cases higher than that of Group D (congruently pro-social position), as well as that of Groups B (negatively discrepant position) and C (positively discrepant position). In two of the eight values, juveniles who held positively discrepant positions had higher delinquency scores than those who held negatively discrepant positions. This was the case for the values of wealth and power.

How the four groups of value stances compare with one another in terms of their mean delinquency scores can be summarised as follows:
Table 5.18
Four Group Mean Score Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value 1 - Boldness</td>
<td>A &gt; B &gt; C &gt; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 2 - Pleasure</td>
<td>A &gt; B &gt; C &gt; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 3 - Wealth</td>
<td>A &gt; C &gt; B &gt; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 4 - Power</td>
<td>A &gt; C &gt; B &gt; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 5 - Honesty</td>
<td>A &gt; B &gt; C &gt; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 6 - Tradition</td>
<td>A &gt; B &gt; C &gt; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 7 - Obedience</td>
<td>A &gt; B &gt; C &gt; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value 8 - Responsibility</td>
<td>A &gt; B &gt; C &gt; D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 ANNOVA and the Relation between Values and Delinquency

Though the t-test of significance are used to compare the means of two samples to determine if those means differ significantly, some researchers propose that it is an inefficient and potentially misleading method of analysis. As the t-tests for pairs of means are not entirely independent of each other, the probability of a Type 1 error increases (Lutz 1983:392). Lutz states that the use of analysis of variance is preferred as it can test for any difference between several means in one unified procedure (Lutz 1983:392). Analysis of variance is based on a comparison of two independent estimates of the variance in the populations.

The one estimate examines the differences between the sample means the other examines the scores differences within the samples and combines them into a pooled estimate of the common variance in the populations (Lutz 1983:393). The estimate will therefore be a reliable indicator of the population variances regardless of whether the sample means are the same or different (Lutz 1983:393). There are no upper limits on how large the F value can become as the score
magnitude, sample sizes and the number of samples being compared all influence this (Diekhoff 1996:254).

At the .01 level of significance: $F = 3.83$, $df = 3$ and 490, $p < .01$. This applies to all eight of the values. The summary tables for this analysis for each of the eight values are as follows:

**Table 5.12**

ANOVA Summary Table for Delinquency as per the Value Boldness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4519.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1506.56</td>
<td>162.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>4539.78</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9059.45</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test statistic (162.34) exceeds the tabular statistic (3.83)

**Table 5.20**

ANOVA Summary Table for Delinquency as per the Value Pleasure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2360.21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>786.74</td>
<td>57.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>6699.24</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9059.45</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test statistic (57.43) exceeds the tabular statistic (3.83)
Table 5.21
ANOVA Summary Table for Delinquency as per the Value Wealth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4076.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1358.85</td>
<td>133.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>4982.91</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9059.45</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test statistic (133.35) exceeds the tabular statistic (3.83)

Table 5.22
ANOVA Summary Table for Delinquency as per the Value Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>5407.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1802.46</td>
<td>241.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>3652.06</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9059.45</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test statistic (241.29) exceeds the tabular statistic (3.83)

Table 5.23
ANOVA Summary Table for Delinquency as per the Value Honesty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>5155.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1718.38</td>
<td>215.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>3904.31</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9059.45</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test statistic (215.34) exceeds the tabular statistic (3.83)
Table 5.24
ANOVA Summary Table for Delinquency as per the Value Tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4637.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1545.76</td>
<td>170.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>4422.16</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9059.45</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test statistic (170.99) exceeds the tabular statistic (3.83).

Table 5.25
ANOVA Summary Table for Delinquency as per the Value Obedience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>5801.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1933.77</td>
<td>290.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>3258.13</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9059.45</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test statistic (290.36) exceeds the tabular statistic (3.83).

Table 5.26
ANOVA Summary Table for Delinquency as per the Value Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4943.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1647.92</td>
<td>196.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>4115.68</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9059.45</td>
<td>492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test statistic (196.18) exceeds the tabular statistic (3.83).
5.5 The Strength of the Relation between Values and Delinquency

Statistically significant differences between two samples may or may not be an important difference as the significance means only that the observed difference is greater than one would expect on the basis of sampling error alone (Diekhoff 1996:253). In large samples, even small insignificant differences between the sample groups can show up as statistically significant. T-tests for pairs of means are not entirely independent of each other, increasing the probability of a Type 1 error. F-tests have no upper limit on how large F can become thereby only telling us whether or not the differences among the sample means are significant.

While knowing that a difference between two samples is statistically significant and that there exists a reliable relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, the measure of association strength can tell how strong the reliable relationship is (Diekhoff 1996:216-217). A method of quantifying the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables is through the use of the omega-square statistic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>omega-square</th>
<th>Strength of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boldness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pleasure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.27(b)
Omega-Square Measure of Association Strength for the Antisocial Values used with the t-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>omega-square</th>
<th>Strength of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The omega-square was applied to each of the six hypotheses individually for each of the four antisocial values.

Table 5.28(a)
Omega-Square Measure of Association Strength for the Pro-social Values used with the t-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>omega-square</th>
<th>Strength of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.28(b)
Omega-Square Measure of Association Strength for the Pro-social Values used with the t-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Omega-square</th>
<th>Strength of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The omega-square was applied to each of the six hypotheses individually for each of the four pro-social values.

Table 5.22
Omega-Square Measure of Association Strength used with ANNOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Omega-square</th>
<th>Strength of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boldness</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Differential Socialisation Model, which forms the basis of this study, proposes that variation in the nature of one’s values occurs reflecting a variation in the individual’s commitment to conformity. Contrary to traditional view, the socialising agent’s values are not always aligned with societal goals and ideals and this misalignment gets passed on to the child, thereby playing a role in the child’s subsequent involvement in youth crime. In examining the role of the mass media in the socialisation process and its relation to youth crime, the same factors were considered as those of the Differential Socialisation Model. First it was necessary to determine whether variation in the nature of values occurred and then explore the relation between values and delinquency.

Variation in the nature of values was first looked at. Questions nine and fourteen in the questionnaire were utilised for this part of the analysis. By comparing the responses of question nine with those of question fourteen, frequencies were then applied to determine if variation existed and the nature of the variation. The findings were reported in Tables 5.1 – 5.8 and the results clearly showed the existence of variation. The congruently antisocial value stance position demonstrated the greatest numbers followed by that of the positively discrepant position, the negatively discrepant and finally the congruently pro-social position. The existence of variation in the nature of the respondents’ values warranted further investigation into the delinquency scores among the four groups for each of the values in order to explore the relationship between values and delinquency.

The same questions used in the first part of the analysis were used to establish relationship and determine strength of that relationship. To ascertain a relationship between the two variables, firstly the mean scores for each of the four groups of each value were compared and differences were statistically calculated by means of the t-test of significance. The findings were reported in Tables 5.10 – 5.17 and summarised in Table 5.18. The findings showed that the congruently antisocial position had the highest mean scores in all of the eight values while the congruently pro-social position had the lowest mean scores. The mean scores for the negatively and positively discrepant positions varied. To further test this relationship, analysis of variance was carried out on all eight values. The findings of which were reported in Tables 5.19 – 5.26, demonstrating that the test statistics exceeded the tabular statistics.
The data from the survey study provided evidence for the existence of a relationship between values and juvenile delinquency. To measure the strength of that relationship the omega-square measure of association was then calculated. Tables 5.27 – 5.29 summarise the findings of this measure and showed a moderate to strong association. The findings were therefore able to show support for the existence and strength of a relationship between media-youth value stances and delinquent behaviour.

5.7 Conclusion

The study’s central theoretical statement that youth can be differentially socialised by the media to the extent that when the youth’s values are congruent with that of the media and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour can occur as result of the weakened or missing commitment to conformity. This proposed influence of media values on juvenile behaviour and the association between the values portrayed by the media and juvenile delinquency was examined in this chapter by investigating the variation in the nature of the media’s values. Then exploring how these values relate to the involvement in juvenile delinquency under the conditions of media-child value agreement and media-child value disagreement. The six hypotheses set out by this study were tested in attempts to demonstrate the existence of value transmission from media to child and the relation of this factor to subsequent involvement in delinquent behaviour. The data generated from the survey part of this study was matched, cross-tabulated, compared and presented in tables. Interpretation of the findings and the establishment of whether variation on the part of the media and youth’s values are related to the type of behaviour that the youth exhibited are discussed in the following chapter.
Interpretation of Findings: The Study of Mass Media Socialisation and Juvenile Delinquency

6.1 Introduction

Criminologists and sociologists alike have stressed the importance of the socialisation process on the developing child, but their focus has fallen primarily on the family's role and influence on the process. While the family's role continues to be of primary importance, the media's role can no longer be overlooked. The enormity of the media's reach, coupled with the stimulating presentation of a variety of norms, values, attitudes and behaviours, makes it an influential presence during the learning and socialisation processes. Most media research has concentrated on the issue of violence, overlooking the equally important, yet more subtle, influence of media values.

Values account for our activities and decision-making processes; they are the key antecedents, consequences and correlates of human action and experience. Therefore, the aim of this study was to investigate the association between media values and juvenile behaviour, under the belief that an agent's values reflect different degrees of congruence with societal ideals. This involves subjective stances, ranging from socially valued positions (which are in accordance with societal prescriptions), to socially devalued positions (which are generally not prescribed or are even contrary to those of the larger society). It proposes that, when the socialising agent's views are communicated to, and ingrained in, the child during the complex process of socialisation, irrespective of the nature of the views, the agent can pass on antisocial views as normal, conforming views (if this same agent is not entirely aligned with societal prescriptions).

An agent passing on antisocial views as normal and conforming weakens the child's commitment to conformity and negatively influences his or her behaviour.
The existence of such an association was analysed by first examining the variation in the nature of the media's values and then examining how these values relate to the involvement in juvenile delinquency under the conditions of media-child value agreement and media-child value disagreement. The study's findings were presented in the previous chapter. This chapter examines the implications and interpretations of these findings by discussing the patterns and relations found.

6.2 The Indicators

Finding data to test the Differential Socialisation Model was one of the study's concerns. There was a need to find measures that allowed for the comparison between media data and youth data, thereby measuring congruence and incongruence, and that also allowed for the comparison of mean delinquency scores at the same time. It was therefore decided that the juvenile's self-report of his or her own delinquent behaviour would measure the dependent variable, namely juvenile delinquency. This involved the direct questioning of the youth about his or her activities in the last 12 months, using fourteen indicators that could be classified as either minor or serious offences. The response categories for each of the delinquent acts were: "never", "once or twice", "several times", and "often", and provided a rough indication of the frequency of involvement in both serious and minor offences. Steps were taken to maximise the validity and reliability of the variable and this was evident in the low rate of incomplete questionnaires. The use of this basic indicator as a measure of delinquency provided an estimate of the number of delinquent acts committed by the respondent during a particular time frame, taking into account the seriousness and the specific nature of the act.

In order to explain the occurrence of the delinquent behaviour, values were selected as the independent variables. As values are theoretical constructs - latent variables - they had to be measured indirectly by means of one or more indicators. Therefore, eight values were selected from Schwartz's (1994) motivational types of values. Each value fits into one of the ten types of value paths set out by Schwartz. To analyse the influence between media and youth values, it was necessary to match the values. This was done by matching the response category items from the media data to that of the juvenile value data in terms of the direction of the pro-social and antisocial value stances. As learning is viewed as the summary of a viewer's cognitive representation of the values learned, it was assumed that retrospective recognition of value themes by the youth offered some indication of the cognitive processing at the time of the exposure. Therefore, by asking to rate
the degree of importance the media attributes to each of the values listed, the juvenile was both recognising the value theme and establishing functionality of the value based on his or her observations of the media. This serves to establish the media’s stance on each of the values identified by the observer, as underlying values can be inferred through observation.

The same indicators used for the media were used to represent the youths’ values and were measured in a way that directly expressed their conceptualisation as guiding principles in the individual’s life. Dong, Tan & Cao (1998:93) established that values perceived as functional are more readily accepted and assimilated, and that value acceptance is indicative of socialisation. Thus the perceived functionality of the values was measured by asking respondents to rate the degree of importance of each of the values, in terms of achieving their personal goals. Since the respondents have only their own internalised system of values to tell them how to rate each of the values, this method of measuring the indicators is highly projective in nature. Yet the stimulus is far more structured than the ambiguous material ordinarily employed in projective tests. The degree to which the individual’s value choices and his or her perception of the media’s values were congruent, made it possible to regard the media value as shared. Analysis of delinquency showed support for the face validity of all of the eight value indicators. There was unanimous support for the traditional model of agent-child relation in the explanation of delinquency, thus placing confidence in the indicators’ ability to assess the significance of the Differential Socialisation Model.

6.3 Media – Youth Values and Delinquency

The focal point of the present study was the reciprocatory effects between the media and the youths’ stances on the various values and the delinquent behaviour of the youth. The objective was to assess the effects of variation in value stances and the relation between the two sets of values, which was reflected by media-youth congruence and media-youth incongruence on each value stance. Akers (1996), in his social learning theory, proposed that there are variations in the extent to which an individual holds deviant and pro-social values. As the media is impacted upon by the contemporary social environment, inconsistencies that exist in the socially accepted value systems, particularly those between verbally sanctioned and actively sanctioned values, are often manifested by the media (Klapper 1960: 215), which is then reflected as different degrees of agreement with
the societal values. The values portrayed by the media range from pro-social values to antisocial values and this variation was clearly seen in the study's findings.

71.9% of the respondents felt that the media attributed some degree of importance to the four antisocial values, while 65.9% of the respondents themselves attributed some degree of importance to the four antisocial values. For the four pro-social values, 33.6% of the respondents felt the media attributed some degree of importance, while 32.3% of the respondents personally attributed some degree of importance. Not only did variation occur between antisocial and pro-social value stances, but also between each value. 49.7% of the respondents attributed some degree of importance to boldness while 78.1% attributed importance to the value of wealth, demonstrating the existence of individually held value variation. These findings are in line with Shaw & McKay's (1969) belief that a child is exposed to a variety of standards and behaviour rather than a pattern that is relatively consistent and conventional. This has an effect on the individual socialisation experience, which Elliot, Ageton & Canter (1979) and Thompson (1978) attribute to variable degrees of commitment to, and integration into, conventional groups. It is further predicted to have influence on the subsequent involvement in delinquent behaviour.

The underlying assumption of the Differential Socialisation model - and this study - was that values reflect one's commitment to conformity and that these commitments vary rather than being perfectly aligned with social goals and ideals. Furthermore it proposed that it is this variation on the part of the media and the juvenile that is related to the type of behaviour that the juvenile exhibits. The study successfully demonstrated the existence of variation and went on to assess the effects of this variation in value stances by examining the relation between the two sets of values, which was reflected by media-youth congruence and media-youth incongruence on each value stance. Traditional research on socialisation proposed only two alternatives to the socialisation process.

The first is agreement with the socialising agent, which research has associated with optimal socialisation. It is assumed to promote conformity and law-abiding behaviour at all times. The social control theory proposed that socialisation that was adequate in content, quality and intensity would produce individuals that would be more conforming to the prevailing system and norms, reducing a lot of deviance resulting from poor socialisation. In this study Group D, the congruently pro-social position, represented agreement with the "conformity-promoting" agent
and was therefore theoretically and practically used as the reference point for all comparisons. In this group, the media was considered as portraying a pro-social stance, with the youth also holding a pro-social stance. It was believed that the least amount of delinquency would occur as the result of the media’s positive influence and the absence of conflicting values. Unlike the traditional belief that law-abiding behaviour is the natural outcome of this situation, the study’s findings found that Group D was far from being delinquent free.

The mean delinquency scores for this group ranged from 0.5 to 3.2. Even so, it was observed from the four-group comparison that Group D had the lowest mean score of the four groups for all eight values. Though not entirely law-abiding, delinquency was minimal in this instance, demonstrating that socialisation is never perfect, because man is an active participant that allows the individual some resistance to the process. Furthermore, social disorganisation is present to some degree in all societies and certain criminogenic characteristics of culture exist. Therefore, the conditions necessary for perfect socialisation cannot be provided, as normative systems lack perfect integration, creating conflicting role expectations, and as an ongoing process it is prone to error. This is in line with Elliot, Ageton & Canter’s (1979) view that bonding to conventional groups, institutions and values will not necessarily insulate one from involvement in delinquent behaviour.

The second alternative offered by traditional research is the rebellion of the youth against the socialising agent. This view is traditionally associated with inadequate socialisation, and seen to promote delinquent behaviour. In this study Group B, the negatively discrepant position, was used to represent this "rebellious" position. In this group, the media was considered as portraying a pro-social stance while the youth held a more antisocial stance. In all eight cases, findings of Group B showed more consistent, and significantly larger, mean delinquency scores than Group D. The mean delinquency scores for this group ranged from 1.98 to 7.83, supporting the traditional view that inadequate socialisation is associated with greater delinquency than optimal socialisation. However, this incongruent position does not necessarily indicate rebellion by the youth. Adolescents become acutely aware of contrast between values expressed by adults and those implicit in their behaviour. This realisation often leads them to reject the formally espoused values and act in accordance with what they judge to be the covert values (Inkeles 1969: 627).

Youths are therefore more likely to perceive the media’s stance as more antisocial than pro-social because of its dramatic low taste content. As a result it is unlikely
that the media's positive influence will be able to counter the juvenile's antisocial stance, because of the juvenile's overall impression of the media. Furthermore, the juvenile will more likely reject the media's attempt at inculcating pro-social values, which the findings seem to support. These findings are in line with Nye's (1958) prediction that the existence of conflicting values increases the probability of delinquency. These varying value positions have undoubtedly been transmitted to the youth on a regular basis, resulting in an effect on the child's commitment to conformity and ultimately his or her behaviour, as the child will act upon these values under the belief that they are those of society.

The underlying belief of the two aforementioned alternatives is that the socialising agent is almost universally supportive of conventional values (Thornberry 1987). Thus agreement with, and internalisation of, one's socialising agent's stance ensures that socialisation is perfect and that social norms are obeyed (Kronhauser 1978). However, research has since shown that socialisation is far from perfect and error free and that an agent's own commitment to conformity varies. This fact was clearly illustrated in this study's own findings. Therefore, the Differential Socialisation Model of Thompson (1978) proposed two other alternatives, which have been used in the present study.

The first alternative proposed a condition in which the socialising agent holds a value stance that can be considered as antisocial, contrary to the traditional belief that socialising agents are instinctively and universally aligned with societal norms and values. What the traditional approach overlooked was that the socialising agents in our society have themselves experienced a great range of socialising influences and as result the agent will ultimately decide on his or her own degree of variation from the normative style (White 1977:101). This decision can mean holding a value stance considered as antisocial by the dominant society. The relation between deficient socialisation and youth crime has been held as a common assumption for a long time (Muncie 1997, Sonnekus 1991). In this study, Group A represents the differentially socialised position, where the media holds a value stance considered antisocial and the youth agrees with that value stance. This position was believed to represent the direct socialisation of deviant or antisocial values, and it was expected to have the highest mean delinquency scores, as adolescents who have not internalised values for conventional behaviour are more likely to be involved in problem behaviours.
The findings of this study showed a large number of delinquent cases for each of the eight values. The mean delinquency scores for this group ranged from 7.92 to 11.37. The four-group comparison revealed that Group A had the highest mean score of the four groups for all eight values, greater than that of Group D in all instances. This provides evidence for the need to extend the traditional approach, yet supports the view that youths that do not grant legitimacy to conventional values are more apt to engage in delinquent behaviour, epitomising Delamater’s (1968) deviant socialisation. When the media is seen to support or accept less than conventional values, it is expected that this will provide an ample environment in which youth crime could develop. This support or acceptance may come from emphasis placed on values that promote individualism, or through the overlooking of values that promote collectivism and pro-social behaviour. Thompson’s (1978) model suggested that youths could be differentially socialised by the agent to the extent that, when the youth’s values are congruent with that of the agent and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour can occur as a result of the weakened or missing commitment to conformity. This belief was supported by the present study’s findings.

This study empirically suggested that socialisation could not be assumed to equate promoting of conformity to the larger society with the promulgation of prosocial values and behaviour. The present data suggests that socialisation of antisocial values from agent to child, in this instance from media to youth, can occur, and that there exists a moderately strong relation between this factor and deviant behaviour on the part of the youth. With the existence of this probability, the logical possibility of the media’s negative influence being mitigated must be considered as well. As the agent’s antisocial position is expected to have different effects upon the youth’s behaviour (depending on whether the youth agrees with the agent’s stance or not) (Thompson 1978:109), so it is also to be expected that the agent’s prosocial stance will have different effects upon the youth’s behaviour.

Hence, the second alternative offered by the Differential Socialisation Model is that of where the socialising agent’s non-conventional value stance is mitigated and the youth develops a value stance more closely aligned with that of the societal norms. Socialisation is not a function of a single socialising agent but that of various agents working in the life of the individual. Agents that are not mutually exclusive, but also not necessarily working in harmony, all contribute in a haphazard way to the process (White 1977:1). As a result, the influences of one agent may be mitigated by the influences of another, irrespective of whether those influences are
pro- or antisocial. In this study, Group C, the positively discrepant position, represents this situation, where the influence of the media's non-conventional values stance is somehow mitigated and the youth develops a more pro-social value stance. It was observed from the four-group comparison that Group C had a consistently lower mean score than that of Group B (with exception of the wealth and power value items) and of Group A. This illustrates the influence of agreement or disagreement and of the nature of the values with which the agreement or disagreement is expressed (Thompson 1978:109).

When comparing the findings of Group B and C, it is evident that disagreement in a positive direction, namely that of the youth taking a more pro-social position, is less strongly related to delinquency than disagreement in a negative direction, where the youth takes on a more antisocial position. This further demonstrates that the influence of the agent is not supreme but that it can be mitigated by the youth's own disagreement with the agent's position. This finding is in line with contemporary research which has shifted it's view of the child being a passive participant in the socialisation process, to that of an active participant in the process (Zigler, Lamb & Child 1982:15). However, when compared with Group D, Group C has higher mean delinquency scores in all eight of the value indicators. This is in line with Nye's (1958) belief that conflict or disagreement is a factor in the contribution to delinquency. The findings further suggest that some negative influence from the agent's antisocial position has had some effect on the youth in spite of the youth's disagreement, though considerably lower than that of the congruently antisocial and the negatively discrepant positions.

The Control Theory was the conceptual foundation of Hirschi's (1969) research, which addressed some of the same issues dealt with in this study. Hirschi's (1969) view was that juveniles with less than conventional ethical standards are free to commit delinquent acts and consequently more likely to have higher mean delinquency scores. The findings of this study concur with Hirschi's (1969) conclusion and one could infer that inadequate or insufficient commitment to conformity was characteristic of delinquent youths, while strong or numerous commitments to conformity restrained the other youths. The question that remains is how the differences in these commitments originate. The Cultural Deviance Theory's premise - that disconcerted relations between youth and parent increases the chance of exposure to criminal influences and the probability that the values and skills conducive to delinquency will be learned through sources other than the family - offers a possible explanation.
Though parental relations were not examined in this study, one can infer from the lack of parental supervision and the little time the youths spend with their parents, that the juvenile-parental relationship is not at its optimum. 69% of all respondents' media usage is never supervised by a parent and 60% of the respondents spend less than four hours per day interacting with their parents. This is an ideal environment for the exposure to, and influence of, values conducive to delinquency. Particularly when such influence is entering the home at such a high frequency, 86% of all respondents spend more than five hours per day interacting with the media, whose values, as defined and determined by this study, lean predominantly toward an antisocial stance. Hirschi (1969), like other traditional theorists, regarded the socialising influence of the agent as above reproach - a one sided view. If one is to momentarily assume a causal relationship between media-youth values and delinquency, which this study has not set out to establish, there are three possible explanations for this relationship.

Firstly, the media's approval of, in some instances, or neutrality, in other instances, toward delinquency may serve to encourage delinquent behaviour. Secondly, the media may be contributing to the youth's delinquency without explicitly encouraging such behaviour. Finally, the antisocial values may in fact be occurring in response to delinquency, rather than causing it. What this study suggested was that youths can learn deviant values directly from the media, without the media being unequivocally antisocial and blatantly encouraging delinquency. It does so, possibly contrary to its own intentions. The media may in fact be contributing to youth crime by failing to instil explicitly conventional commitments to conformity and pro-social values, a view consistent with the modified Differential Association perspective. However, one should not overlook the existence of disagreement, which may serve to mitigate both antisocial and pro-social influences. The degree of disagreement may pose an additional influence, depending on the direction of the opposing media-youth value stances.

On the basis of the observed patterns, it has been concluded that, not only do media values show variation in terms of their degree of conventionality, but that this variation in conventionality tends to be related to variation in the youth's involvement in delinquent behaviour. There is evidence to suggest that patterns of media-child agreement or disagreement have an important mitigating effect upon both conventional and unconventional media influence. Under conditions of optimal socialisation, which was exemplified by media-child agreement on socially prescribed values, the least amount of delinquency was observed. When either the
media or the youth held less than socially prescribed value stances, and media-child disagreement occurred, there were varying degrees of increased delinquent involvement. When both the media and child concurred on unconventional values, interpreted as differential socialisation, there tended to be further augmentation in levels of delinquent involvement. There was fairly consistent support for the interpretation provided by Thompson's (1978) model that there is an interactive relation between the nature of the agent and child's values and delinquent behaviour. The study has therefore met with some success in demonstrating that differential socialisation in one, potentially alternative route, can lead the youth to develop socially de-valued values, and thus become more susceptible to the temptations to participate in delinquent behaviour.

6.4 Exceptions Where Support for the Hypothesis was Lacking

It should be noted however, that not all eight of the value indicators supported the six hypotheses or the relative group ordering. In value two, the pursuit of pleasure, while the mean delinquency scores supported all six of the hypotheses, for hypothesis four the difference was found not to be significant. This indicated the possibility of random error, or a weakness in the item itself. The weakness in the item could be the result of multiple interpretations of the concept “pleasure”. With values three and four, wealth and power respectively, Group B replaces Group C as having the lowest mean delinquency scores. The pattern of the other six value indicators suggested that media-youth conflict in the form of “rebellion” on the part of the youth contributed more to delinquency than when the conflict develops from when the media assumes a more antisocial position and the youth a more pro-social position.

However, in these two instances, the delinquent pattern is reversed. Dong, Tan & Cao (1998:93) established that values perceived as functional are more readily accepted and assimilated. Power and wealth are generally perceived by most as functional, creating a contrast between the values expressed and the values implicit in the actual behaviour. This may indicate the result of the youth rejecting the expressed value in favour of accepting the implicit value. The reverse findings of Groups C and B do not necessarily indicate a contradiction to the model but point out the need for further study in the area of conflict generated from “rebellion”, and “conflict” generated from the mitigation of influence.
6.5 Media-Youth Values and the Mediating Factors

The main objective of the study was to demonstrate, through logical interpretation, an association between media values and juvenile delinquency, and the present study was able to do this with some success. It revealed that media values show variation in terms of their degree of conventionality and that this variation in conventionality tends to be related to variation in the youth's involvement in delinquent behaviour. However, one cannot forget that the mass media functions among and through a combination of mediating factors and influences working together in a total situation. Some of the possible mediating factors noted by this study included: gender, age, socio-economic background, amount of media exposure, type of media exposed to, influence of other socialising agents, perception of reality, and social approval. Though these factors were not isolated and statistically examined, they remain of interest, particularly to future research; therefore the mediating factors were compared using the four-group model used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juvenile Values</th>
<th>Media Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first mediating factor was that of gender. Grobbelaar (1991:8) concluded that boys have a greater propensity for delinquent behaviour than girls do, thus gender could account for the high delinquency scores. 51% of the sample was comprised of boys and Group A was predominantly made up of male respondents, thus the effect of gender in media-youth value transmission requires further study.

The second mediating factor is that of age, as it is often closely correlated with a child's emotional and intellectual capacity, and susceptibility (Cole & Cole 96:448), which could thereby influence the socialisation process. Groups A and B, which had the highest mean delinquency scores, primarily consisted of respondents in the age group 13 to 15 years of age. This indicates that age susceptibility could in fact be a mediating factor in media-youth value transmission.

A third mediating factor was that of the family's socio-economic level, which might influence the type of mass medium that the youth has access to, and the levels of
exposure to the media. Unfortunately, the findings of this study were inconclusive in regard to socio-economic influence. The three socio-economic divisions of lower, middle and upper income were found across all four of the groups, with no specific pattern visible. This does not rule it out as a mediating factor but highlights the possibility that this factor requires a different form of analysis in order to determine its role in media-youth value transmission.

A fourth mediating factor is that of frequency of media usage, which can influence the acceptance of values (Dong, Tan & Cao 1998:87). Research has shown that heavy viewers hold opinions that are more closely associated with the media than those who are light viewers (Barrile 1980:320). 14% of the respondents were classified as light viewers and they mainly made up groups D and C. 37% of the respondents were classified as heavy viewers and they largely belonged to group A, where the media-youth value stance was congruent. This denotes a relation between the frequency of media and media-youth value inculcation, supporting the view that the more an individual is exposed to a certain value, the more likely he or she is to accept the fundamental value.

The influence of other socialising agents may be one of the most important mediating factors operating within the media socialisation process. Other agents may account for the youth's values being at variance with that of the media's, as well as accounting for the youth's values being congruent with that of the media's. Research has shown that individuals are more open to messages which maintain or reinforce personal values than those which are incongruent (Roberts 1971:369). Unfortunately, the findings of this study were inconclusive in regard to the role of other socialising influences. Though exposure to peer and school influence was predominantly classified as medium exposure (5 – 8 hours per day), and family and school exposure influence was predominately classified as low exposure (1 – 4 hours per day), the exact nature of their influence could not be established. This would require a separate – perhaps longitudinal – study that examines this aspect of influence.

A sixth mediating factor is that of an individual's perception of media reality. Once an individual accepts the reality of a medium, he or she no longer questions or scrutinises the validity of the content, and real world values are replaced with media values (Kane, Taub & Hayes 2000:59). 63% of the respondents felt that media portrayals reflected reality and 33% of those respondents fall within the category of group A. Kane, Taub & Hayes (2000:59) pointed out that a child's lack of ability to
discern between portrayal reality and actual reality may result in the child developing a misreading of society's values from the media. This is because children process media content differently and are less able to comprehend characterisations, motivations and behavioural consequences. It raises the concern that once an individual accepts the reality of a medium, he or she no longer questions or scrutinises its validity and the result is an indiscriminate consumer - one that responds to society in terms more characteristic of the perceived media world than of true values (Kane, Taub & Hayes 2000:59). Another mediating factor dealing with media portrayal is that of an individual's tolerance of media content. Strasburger (1995:10) noted that individuals who are more tolerant of what they see in the media are more likely to develop attitudes favouring the issues portrayed. Naturally, in examining this factor, one would need to take the type of content into consideration but a glance at media tolerance and the patterns among the four groups revealed that 86% of the respondents were tolerant of what the media portrayed. Of those, approximately 47% made up group A.

Social approval is the last mediating factor noted within this study. Both Kornhauser (1978) and Young (1995) noted that group approval is an overriding need created by socialisation and that once a message is perceived as appropriate, the individual is motivated to comply with the message, thereby accepting the value. Respondents were asked firstly that, if something was shown often in the media, then it was an indication that it was socially approved. Secondly, respondents were asked if the media influenced their view of what is socially acceptable. Approximately 60% of the respondents reported that if something was shown often in the media it was an indication that it was socially approved and that the media influenced their view of what is socially acceptable. Of those, 40% comprised group A. From these preliminary findings it is clearly visible that there are a variety of possible mediating factors that could be influencing the media-youth value transmission process and that could be of interest in the examination of the role of mass media socialisation.

6.6 Summary

Some of our culture’s criminogenic characteristics include its dynamic culture, which results in change and fluidity in norms, the presence of alternative and conflicting values, impersonal social relationships, and culture’s multi-group nature that fosters duality of loyalty and ethics (Barron 1974:81). While the most common way we form our beliefs is to rely on what external authority tells us to believe, we
are now faced with the burden of informational overload that creates conflicting and ill-defined value systems. The result is the development of delinquency related to terminal core values which, when adopted, give rise to deviant self-images. Furthermore, when the process is incomplete or negatively focused, socialisation can produce adolescents who feel little attachment to a law-abiding lifestyle. The model used as the basis of this study suggested that youths could be differentially socialised by the agent. So that when the youth's values are congruent with that of the agent and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour can occur as a result of the weakened or missing commitment to conformity.

Thus, as the agent's views on conformity vary, it was expected that there would be differing effects on the youth's commitment to conformity and ultimately his or her behaviour. From what has been observed, there is evidence to suggest that the media's views vary in respect to conventional norms and values. Furthermore, the media's antisocial value stances, while not being explicitly criminal, appear to be conducive to youth crime on the part of the youth being socialised. The direct effects of the media's values were shown to be significant by the analysis of variance in all eight values, as were the values held by the youth. It appears that the youth's own value stance is in and of itself a stronger predictor of youth crime, as youths who held values not aligned with society's best interests had higher mean scores than those youths whose values were aligned with society's best interests. How the variation in the media's values related to delinquent behaviour under the conditions of media-youth agreement and media-youth disagreement, was unveiled by the interactive effects between the media and the youth's value stances.

6.7 Conclusion

A great part of socialisation occurs through the process of modelling. As we learn through observation, that which is observed and communicated through all kinds of interaction becomes internalised, leaving room for differentiated consequences. Even if the agent seems to support society's values but has hidden feelings of dissatisfaction, frustration, disillusion or disagreement, the proposed values may be contradictory to the child, differentially influencing the nature of the child's perceptions and commitments. As behaviour is learnt from direct experience and observation and dependent on the predominant norms and values, this differential influence will impact the child's behaviour. These premises were supported by the study's findings, which also sustained the notion that mass media socialisation plays
a role in juvenile delinquency through the values it transmits. An overview, limitations and recommendations based on the findings of the present study are examined in the following chapter.
Chapter 7

Summary and Conclusion:
The Role of Mass Media Socialisation in Juvenile Delinquency

7.1 Introduction

The complex process of socialisation is considered a key determinant of behaviour, crucial for the well-being of the child and the community to which the child belongs. It is during this process that the techniques needed to survive, function and thrive in society are taught. However, when it comes to the basic perspectives on personal and social reality, it is commonly assumed that these perspectives are learned within the parent-child relationship. As a result, the family has been typically accorded a place of primary importance in the explanation of socialisation. But another influence has been lurking in the background. One that consumes more time and attention than any other socialising agent does, and that has the ability to permeate into every aspect of life – the mass media. The media is no longer just a means of entertainment. It has become one of the most important connections between societal and individual culture, a significant source of values with the ability to impact the thoughts, feelings, and behaviour of individuals.

Media influence upon children has generally been assumed to be significant, with powerful, long lasting consequences. However, traditional explanatory attempts have predominantly dealt with the effects of media violence on juvenile behaviour, focusing on the priming effects, the issue of arousal, decreasing inhibition and modelling. The result has been a relative neglect of empirical analysis of media socialisation as it relates to delinquent behaviour, a matter that the present study attempted to rectify. In order to examine the mass media's socialisation relation to delinquent behaviour, a modification in the traditional assumption that socialising agents are universally intent on teaching socially prescribed values was required.
This chapter reiterates how traditional theories have overlooked the important element of the media’s commitment to conformity which, through socialisation, may have differential effects upon a child’s behaviour. It shows how this study has attempted to broaden the traditional model and highlights the study’s main aims, premises and hypotheses. It provides an overview of the study, while demonstrating how the present study has produced evidence suggesting that differential socialisation by the media may be an alternative route by which a child may develop socially devalued values and become susceptible to delinquency.

7.2 Shortcomings in Traditional Models and Research

As social beings, we maintain consistency and order in everyday life through socially imposed realities, cultural symbols, beliefs, norms and roles. This process of internalising one’s cultural norms and values is known as socialisation, the process by which social behaviour is acquired and developed. Socialisation results in the ability to distinguish between right and wrong and to act accordingly, while upholding the social order. Central to the socialisation process is the internalisation of core values, which guides an individual's behaviour. In socialisation research we see that any member of society may serve as a socialising agent when he or she influences the behaviour of another, even though he or she may not intend such influence. Psychologists, sociologists, and criminologists have stressed the importance of the socialisation process on the developing child. One of the common assumptions of socialisation research is that value transmission begins within the context of the family.

This assumption overlooks the fact that, in the family’s socialising environment, one of the most important linkages between societal and individual culture is present from an early age, competing for the child’s attention. That linkage is the mass media, and with up to 55 hours per week being spent in the presence of the media, researchers should not be overlooking the media’s role and influence on the process. Various studies have confirmed the powerful effects media models have on behaviour and that observational learning takes place regardless of whether the viewer is rewarded or not for imitation. Yet despite these studies, the role of the media as socialising agent continues to be largely ignored.

Another aspect of socialisation that is typically not mentioned in research is the probability that some agents socialise children in a deviant manner. Yet throughout the socialisation process, uniformity along socially approved guidelines and
conformity to pro-social standards and ideals may be the exception rather than the rule, despite society’s attempts to regulate and control its agents. This is often the result of numerous sources of differentiated cultural content that arise from different origins and subcultural groups, which is then socialised by intentional and unintentional means. These sources of differences, as well as the child’s uniqueness, contribute to a potentially non-conforming outcome of the socialisation process. They bring different historically determined expectations, ways and concepts, which may get synthesized and diverge from societal prescriptions. The mass media, which exists within the contemporary social environment, faces these challenges, which further impacts the values that it transmits.

Since socialisation occurs through “modelling” of what is observed and the internalisation of what is communicated, inconsistencies that exist in the socially accepted value systems, particularly those between verbally sanctioned and actively sanctioned values, are often manifested. These inconsistencies are then reflected as different degrees of agreement with the societal values. As a result, differences in values will develop out of necessary adaptations to social circumstance, leaving room for differentiated consequences. Thus the potential for deviation through direct socialisation is not restricted to overtly criminal patterns or blatantly antisocial values. With all the potentials for differentiation arising from unregulated forces of socialisation, it appears safe to assume it a mistake to equate socialisation with conformity, as socialisation is a broad process that creates diversity. Though values are held as a major influence on human behaviour and are seen to alter as a result of socialisation, criminological literature and research on the subject is sparse. This study attempted to rectify this condition.

Instead of assuming that a socialising agent fully adheres to social prescriptions and is universally intent on instilling pro-social values, this study proposed that an agent’s commitment to conformity varies in the degree of congruence with societal expectations and prescriptions. Furthermore, as the agent’s influence during socialisation is crucial, the variation in the agent’s commitment can be transmitted to the child. Therefore the mass media, as a socialising agent, might be directly involved in the etiology of delinquency, by being a potential source of differentially learned commitment to conformity, as the agent’s conventionality is a variable in itself. Variation in values is a major source of differential influence, and once these values are internalised, they influence a child’s conformity. Subsequent
involvement in delinquency is predicted, particularly when there exists congruently weak agent and child commitment to conformity and pro-social stances.

Thus it was the view of this study that some delinquent youths act upon unconventional values that are learned from, and congruent with that of, the socialising agent. This differs from the traditional view that delinquents act in opposition to conventional values, as well as the agent's values. This study does not deny that different youths can vary in their degree of internalisation of, and agreement with, an agent's values, due to their unique characteristics and different circumstances. Nor does it deny that any degree of conflict between agent and youth can contribute to delinquency, irrespective of the nature of the agent's views. This study does, however, propose that the nature of the agent's value stance, as well as the patterns of the agent-child agreement or disagreement in these stances are considered equally important in the attempt to explain delinquency.

7.3 Overview of Study

With the appearance of youths, some as young as seven, in our courts and the ever increasing number of arrests made of persons under the age of 18, youth crime has undoubtedly become an issue that requires urgent addressing. Particularly when one takes into account that childhood and adolescence are formative stages of development and that that which becomes anchored during this period has the potential to remain fixed later on in life (Muncie 1997:41). Various researchers (Barron 1974, Hawkins 1996, Goff & Goddard 1999) have stressed that society and culture contribute more than any other factor to the way we think, feel and behave, and that values that are informally and unsystematically inculcated in youth during the socialisation process are significant to youth crime. Thus the field of socialisation was selected as the topic for this study. Though extensive literature exists on the socialisation process, traditionally the family has been considered the child's primary socialiser. However, in recent years the media has increasingly fulfilled the functions previously performed by the family, school and religion. With this in mind, research on the media's role in socialisation was found to be lacking.

A literature survey revealed various beliefs that the internalisation of antisocial values and attitudes, as well as the presence of antisocial models could increase antisocial tendencies, making the role of the media more significant, as deviance is often a selling point in the media. Both the Differential Association and Social
Process theories proposed that when definitions favourable to deviant behaviour exceed the frequency and intensity of definitions to conform, the probability of criminality increases. Furthermore, these theories proposed that criminals are socialised into the criminal world through the learning of values conducive to crime. The question that arose was: what happens when these values, that are conducive to crime, are brought into the home by the media? It was this question that the study sought to indirectly address. The study’s central theoretical statement thus became that youths could be differentially socialised by the media to such an extent that, when the youth’s values are congruent with that of the media and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour would occur as a result of the weakened or missing commitment to conformity.

By examining the variation in the nature of the media’s values and determining how these values relate to the involvement in juvenile delinquency under the conditions of media-child value agreement and media-child value disagreement, this study proposed to investigate the association between media values and juvenile behaviour. This was achieved using an approach based on Thompson’s (1978) Differential Socialisation model. The model proposed that the agent’s values reflect different degrees of congruence with societal ideals, with subjective stances ranging from socially valued positions, which are in accordance with societal prescriptions, to socially devalued positions, which are generally not prescribed - or are even contrary - to those of the larger society (Thompson 1978:10).

The socialising agent’s views are then communicated to and ingrained in the child during the complex process of socialisation, irrespective of the nature of the views. Consequently, if the agent is not aligned with societal prescriptions, it can pass on antisocial views as normal conforming views (Thompson 1978:12). The use of Thompson’s model allowed for the identification of the influence of antisocial values on a youth’s behaviour when the youth agrees, as compared to the same influence when the youth disagrees. This also allows for the identification of the influence of pro-social values on juvenile behaviour under the same conditions of congruence and incongruence. The approach entailed matching certain values on the part of the media with comparable values on the part of the youth, then analysing the two-attitudinal stances, thereby determining how they relate to delinquent behaviour.
To achieve this, four possible matched value stances were formulated. Group A represented the congruently antisocial position, where both media and youth stances were antisocial. This group would encompass the notion of Differential Socialisation, demonstrating the media’s antisocial position having a direct effect on the juvenile’s behaviour, the premise central to the study’s theoretical statement. If established, it would add credence to the theory that direct transmission of antisocial values from media to juvenile exists and that this transmission is linked to subsequent involvement in delinquent behaviour. As a result, it was anticipated that Group A would have the highest mean delinquency scores. Group B represented the negatively discrepant position. Here the media’s value stance was pro-social, while the youth’s was antisocial.

Traditional research would attribute this to the positive influence of the media being counteracted by the juvenile’s own antisocial values. However, a more likely explanation would be that inconsistencies between values expressed and those implicit in the media model’s behaviour would lead to this discrepancy. It was a firm belief of the researcher that any positive media influence would be unable to counter the juvenile’s antisocial stance because of the juvenile’s overall impression of the media. With deviance as a major theme in the media, the juvenile would more likely reject the media’s attempt at inculcating pro-social values because of the inconsistencies between verbally sanctioned and actively sanctioned values. Group C represented the positively discrepant position. In this stance the media value stance was antisocial, while the youth’s was pro-social. It was anticipated that the degree of delinquency found in this group would be the result of the positive values being mitigated by the media’s negative influence.

The existence of conflicting values would play a role in increasing the probability of delinquency. Group D represented the congruently pro-social position, where both the media and the youth’s value stances were pro-social. Based on literature available, it was expected that this group would have the least amount of delinquency, due to the media’s positive influence and the absence of conflicting values. These four groups were seen to represent the various possibilities in the socialisation process, and it was felt that by comparing these four value stances, an understanding of the media’s role in differential socialisation would develop. It identifies one of the ways the media may unwittingly be contributing to juvenile delinquency. In order to substantiate the central theoretical statement, six testable hypotheses were formulated using these four groups.
The first hypothesis required establishing whether the congruently antisocial position had higher mean delinquency scores than the congruently pro-social position. The second, whether the negatively discrepant position had higher mean delinquency scores than the congruently pro-social position. The third, whether the positively discrepant position had higher delinquency scores than the congruently pro-social position. The fourth, whether the negatively discrepant position had higher mean delinquency scores than the positively discrepant position. The fifth, whether the congruently antisocial position had higher mean delinquency scores than the positively discrepant position. The final hypothesis required establishing whether the congruently antisocial position had higher mean delinquency scores than the negatively discrepant position. By examining the relation between groups A, B, C, and D, it was believed that it would be possible to demonstrate a link between the transmission of antisocial values from media to child and subsequent involvement in delinquency.

Thompson's (1978) theory proved sound and the probability of whether the same model could be applied to the media as a socialising agent and be as relevant today as it was then, became a matter of interest. Consequently, a pilot study on a limited number of subjects from the same population as that for which the eventual study was intended was undertaken. The purpose was to investigate the feasibility of the proposed study, to detect possible flaws in the measurement procedures and measurement instrument and in the operationalisation of the independent variables. The findings of the pilot study revealed that when juveniles' values are congruent with that of the agent, and both sets are socially devalued, delinquent behaviour as measured by mean delinquency scores was high. This lends support to the central theoretical statement, therefore it was determined that a further, more extensive study was warranted.

As the research project was an exploratory field study, the goal of which was the exploration of the relatively unknown area of media socialisation, hypotheses were generated. This was done in order to obtain knowledge of the process of differentiated socialisation, thereby gaining insight into how differential socialisation may act as a contributing factor in juvenile delinquency. Quantitative in nature, the study concerned itself with the measurement of observations in numerical terms in order to determine the statistical probabilities of the relationship between mass media socialisation and juvenile delinquency. It combined both theoretical research from literature and empirical research from practical investigation. The
information required consisted of behavioural and attitudinal data and as such the survey method was selected as the simplest way to obtain such data.

The sample consisted of 500 randomly selected high school pupils from the Johannesburg Metropolitan District. They were given a self-administered questionnaire to complete, with various safeguards built in to maximise the validity and reliability of the measures used. Indicators for the independent variables were constructed for eight matched pairs of value items, which were analysed in terms of content and agent-child congruence and incongruence. Measures of the dependent variable were derived from self-reports of involvement in delinquent behaviour in terms of frequency and seriousness of offence. Due to the reliability checks built into the study, the final analysis of this study was done on 493 high school pupils. The analysis consisted of measuring matched sets of agent-child value items as they related to delinquent behaviour.

The analysis of the data collected during the survey was divided up into two phases. In the first phase, the existence of variation in the nature of the values was established. This was done through a comparison of the distribution among the different response categories for the eight value indicators, using frequency distributions for all eight sets of values. In the second phase, the media-juvenile values with the respective delinquency mean scores were matched, with the mean delinquency score for each congruent and in-congruent value position compared in order to assess the interaction between the two sets of values. As direction was predicted in this study, the one tailed "t-test" of significance of difference was used. As t-tests for pairs of means are not entirely independent of each other, the use of analysis of variance was included. While these statistical tests were useful in demonstrating a reliable relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, the strength of association was measured using Omega Square, thereby providing an indication of how strong the reliable relationship was. Analysis of the interactive effect was necessary to measure direction as well as magnitude of group differences.

The findings clearly showed the existence of variation, as well as the congruently antisocial position having the highest mean scores in all of the eight values, while the congruently pro-social position had the lowest mean scores. The mean scores for the negatively and positively discrepant positions varied. For most of the values, each of the six hypotheses was supported, with significant difference, and the test
statistics exceeded the tabular statistics. Furthermore, the data from the survey study provided evidence for the existence of a moderate to strong relationship between values and juvenile delinquency. On the basis of the observed patterns, it has been concluded that, not only do media values show variation in terms of their degree of conventionality, but that this variation in conventionality tends to be related to variation in the youth’s involvement in delinquent behaviour.

There is sufficient evidence to suggest that patterns of media-child agreement or disagreement have an important mitigating effect upon both conventional and unconventional media influence. Under conditions of optimal socialisation, exemplified by agent-child agreement on socially prescribed values, the least amount of delinquency was observed. When either the agent or the youth held less than socially prescribed value stances, and agent-child disagreement occurred, there were varying degrees of increased delinquent involvement. When both the agent and child concurred on unconventional values, interpreted as differential socialisation, there tended to be further augmentation in levels of delinquent involvement. There was fairly consistent support for the interpretation provided by Thompson’s (1978) model that there is an interactive relation between the nature of the agent and child’s values and delinquent behaviour. The study has therefore met with some success in demonstrating that differential socialisation is one potentially alternative route by which the youth can develop socially de-valued values and thus become more susceptible to the temptations to participate in delinquent behaviour.

7.4 General Limitations

Any study undertaken, particularly in a relatively unexplored area of research, is not without its limitations. One of the limitations recognised during the course of this study was the assumption that media-youth congruence reflected direct socialisation of the agreed upon value stance. In fact, the possibility exists that the youth arrived at the same stance as that of the media through the influences of the other socialising agents in the youth’s life. Thus, specific value congruence may not be reflective of media-youth socialisation. However, when one considers the amount of time spent in the presence of the media, as compared with the amount of time spent with the other socialising agents, it is reasonable to assume that the mass media has had a greater significant influence on the youth values.
This factor, coupled with available literature addressing socialisation and the influence of the media, provides the rationale for making the former assumption. Furthermore, the association between socialisation influences and behaviour rests upon theorizing rather than empirical demonstration (Thompson 1978:130). However, the study's findings did show support for the existence of such an association, as well as a moderate to strong relation of the proposed association. Therefore, instead of demonstrating a causal link at an empirical level, it did allow for logical interpretation of the observed associations.

Another limitation recognised is the issue of information being obtained from a single source. Some researchers feel that data that is to be correlated should preferably be independently gathered, as single source data is believed to provide little evidence of whether perceptions are right or wrong. While some might argue for the need for more research using multiple sources such as parents, school and peers, the researcher felt that using a single source would be both appropriate and sufficient. Adolescence is not only a period of formal inculcation of social values, but also a time during which major confrontation between values and reality occurs. With values able to emerge without description, with minimal behavioural expression, and inferred through observation by extracting for oneself the rule that governs the event, a single source is sufficiently qualified to report on such matters.

At this stage the nature of the socialisation process has also markedly changed. The child is now more active and, as such, no other source would be more able to report on the importance attributed by the respondent to the value than the respondent himself. Furthermore, the socialisation process is unique for each individual and each individual's characteristics play a role in the process, as does an individual's perception. Therefore, no one other than the individual being socialised would be able to give his or her impressions on the importance attributed to the values by the socialising agent. As such, the single source, which is the adolescent being socialised, was believed to be best equipped to report on his or her socialising experiences. To overcome this limitation, necessary checks were put in place in an attempt to ensure the integrity of the data gathered.

A third limitation noted by this study is the possibility of mediating factors working within the situation. The media functions among and through a combination of mediating factors and influences, working together in a total situation. Although some of the possible mediating factors acting within the total situation were
mentioned, their significance was not statistically determined. This limitation would have had serious implications had the study aimed to establish a causal link, as overlooking mediating factors would have influenced the study’s findings considerably. However, as it was not the intention of this study to demonstrate a causal link at an empirical level but to create a logical interpretation of the observed associations, the significance of this limitation was minimal.

A further limitation that the present study faced was that the data was gathered in a single point in time. While this factor proved to be convenient for the present study’s aims, this factor precluded insight into the developmental sequences or processes that were involved during the socialisation process, as well as the sequences that lead to the delinquent behaviour. While an extensive longitudinal study would address this limitation, it was believed to be unnecessary in view of the scope and aims of the present study.

7.5 General Recommendations

The study met with some success in demonstrating that differential socialisation is a potentially alternative route by which a youth can develop socially de-valued values and thus become more susceptible to the temptations to participate in delinquent behaviour. It provides a logical interpretation for the observed association between media values and delinquent behaviour. However, any study is futile if it does not carry with it practical applications. While the concern about media influence is unlikely to abate, practical steps can be taken to address the possible negative influence media values have on children. The first step would begin within the home, strengthening the family unit. This is not a new or original view for delinquency prevention, but one that is of significance. Parents have the greatest potential to influence children – however, they often sacrifice to the media their opportunity to establish values in their children.

Although parents might be incapable of controlling the content of programming or the way in which the child frames the program, parents should become more conscientious in assisting by influencing the child’s viewing patterns, interpretation and acceptance of media content. One of the biggest problems is that few parents are involved in, or actively exercise control over, their child’s consumption, interpretation and use of media information. The solution would lie in parents monitoring their children’s media consumption more closely, as parental attitude is a crucial factor. Research has shown that if the parent makes it clear that they
disapprove of what is being portrayed, the negative effects on the child can be avoided (Zigler, Lamb & Child 1982:84). By taking a more active role in the monitoring of their children's media consumption and value inculcation process, parents would be benefitting the moral development of their young by creating clearly prescribed values and beliefs. This would take the burden off the child to formulate and select his or her own values from a wide selection of contradictory information, a lot of which is promulgated by the media.

Should the family unit fail in its role as socialising agent, another practical step that could be undertaken to minimise the possible negative influence of media values would involve the re-socialising of the delinquent adolescent, a practice which is relatively recent but effective. This would primarily involve the participation of the school, community, and institutional workers in the teaching of clearly prescribed pro-social values and behaviour. The media itself could prove to be a very effective instrument in the re-socialising process. If role modelling can work for good purposes such as disease prevention, why not harness the media to serve the purpose of instilling good values into our children? The media is, after all, ideally suited for this.

The knowledge, norms and skills conveyed by the mass media cover a whole spectrum, placing it therefore in a position to take over large parts of the socialisation process in both the formal and informal groups (Erasmus 1991:90). The media's availability, accessibility, simplicity and persuasive ability make it an ideal way to enhance pro-social values. Media crime prevention campaigns such as the Scared Straight documentary (Heeren & Shichor 1984:375), and the McGruff campaign (Lab 1988:72) proved, to a large degree, successful in the prevention of juvenile delinquency. Thus, with some changes in themes, the media could certainly be used to promulgate pro-social values. This would require the lobbying of media networks and more research on the exposure of the public to media information as a means of bringing about re-socialisation, as the media is still a relatively new technique in the field of crime prevention.

7.6 Suggestions for Further Research

In view of the lack of literature available on the subject, the limitations of this particular study and the aforementioned recommendations, it is clearly evident that mass media socialisation and its association with youth crime is deserving of more research. This highly neglected area of research holds many possibilities when
taking into account the other possible variables acting in the totality of the situation. However, it is the subjective elements of the association, and not the structural elements, that are important areas to investigate. Although this study found variability among the different value stances, the design has not addressed all possible relevant factors. Additional predictive power may come from broadening the study to include the mediating factors highlighted in chapter two.

Regardless of age, individuals respond to media content, and its interactive nature and arousing content is influencing our values. Research has focused on the effects of specific media content on specific behaviour, but there is a growing need to look at how the media affects the socialisation process. Some researchers believe that commitment to deviant values is not a necessary or sufficient condition for delinquency to develop. More research in this area is required. While this study does not consider media socialisation as the primary cause of individual delinquency, it is viewed as a variable in a causal chain of events. Some of the fundamental questions that need to be addressed are: What role do other socialising agents play during mass media socialisation?; Do they complement, supplement or weaken the media’s influence?; What research methods can be developed to empirically demonstrate that specific value congruence is reflective of media-youth socialisation?; What role does media socialisation play in the developmental sequences or processes of socialisation and the leading up to the delinquent behaviour?

These questions could be addressed firstly by future longitudinal studies where the developmental processes and sequences are examined. Secondly, by studies that examine one or more of the mediating factors, in conjunction with the media-youth socialisation process. This would empirically establish the exact nature of the mass media’s socialisation and eliminate skepticism that other factors are at work rather than the media’s values. Thirdly, research into the benefits of re-socialisation and the use of the mass media in the promulgation of pro-social values would establish whether such measures pose any benefits and are of any preventative interest. Future research could consider broadening the view of possible effects to include not only behavioural patterns, but also social expectations, knowledge and evaluative responses as possible outcomes of media exposure. The mass media is, after all, a source of general information.
All individuals are a product of their social relations and socialisation, and behave according to the ideals and values learned and internalised. Behaviour in any given situation depends upon the socialisation received and the values taught. It is therefore, socialisation that guides people into socially acceptable behaviour patterns. The learning of the distinctive patterns of the society occurs through the various agencies of socialisation, and, as the child grows, the socialisation process continues and becomes more complex as it incorporates expanding influences, building upon what has gone before. Socialisation in any one stage affects the resolution of issues at later stages and, as such, it runs deep and carries with it lifelong influences. While development may be over by adolescence, learning continues, and as a result socialisation is never complete and society has a chance to start over again where it has failed. However, one needs to keep in mind that the child does not come out of a void, but is rather a product of different socialisation experiences and a past history, in the course of which different forms of behaviour would have been exposed to environmental conditioning. The child therefore grows up with edited views of the larger society and develops potentially unique commitments on the basis of those views.

Previously, our social existence was tied to a small town/suburb/community and values were clearly prescribed. But with technological changes and the weakening of social institutions, we have become consumed by a social world of unbound proportions, exposed to more opinions, values, personalities and ways of life than any previous generation, leading to the disorganisation of traditional norms and values. Research has shown that when the institutions of community, family and culture break down and there is a lack of available adults to serve as effective socialising agents, individuals are left with a void, a shortage of firm bases for distinguishing right from wrong. This value gap is then often filled in an arbitrary manner, resulting in the child seeking models outside the home. This leads him or her to develop a self-image based on the standards of those around him or her, thereby increasing the risk of the adolescent becoming involved in problem behaviour. Adolescents who have not internalised values for conventional behaviour are at greater risk, as the probability of criminal or conforming behaviour occurring is a function of the variables operating in the underlying social learning process. Studies have shown that stronger commitment to values reduces the risk of delinquent behaviour, as traditional values protect against problem behaviours,
with the greatest risk factor being the lack of commitment to any meaningful values.

The more complex the society becomes, the more numerous the subdivisions that occur, resulting in the development of subcultural differences in values. These subcultural differences account for groups responding differently to the expectations of the society, as well as the socialising agent’s values and what they transmit (Thompson 1978:32). The mass media has become not only a major source of information but also a prominent factor in the lives of children through its entertainment and stimulation. Schickendanz, Schickendanz & Forsyth (1998) consider the media as one of the biggest influences on intellectual and moral development, simply due to the amount of time spent on it. Hamill (1999) regards the media as an asocial, conscious-altering instrument that takes one out of the real world. While a child may be a product of his or her past and socialisation experiences, the child’s use and response to the media may be one of the most important ways in which a child learns to extract the kind of information, values and behavioural prescriptions most appropriate for himself or herself (Messaris 1984:177). In earlier times, the media came late as books and magazines required reading skills that were learned at school, therefore the media had only a modest role to play in childhood socialisation. Today however, the media is omnipresent from the cradle and has displaced much of the socialisation influence that came from parents (Vivian 1991:298).

The media has come to occupy a larger portion of our lives than other sources of socialisation, and children as young as two or three years of age are becoming regular consumers of the media, increasing, then slightly decreasing this consumption, during adolescence. Regardless of age, individuals respond to media content, learning from what they see, hear or read with 98% recall accuracy of information that they have learned via visual modes (Kane, Taub & Hayes 2000:63). The media’s interactive nature and arousing content is undoubtedly influencing our values, making the media more and more deeply established as a social system. The media increasingly fulfills the functions previously performed by the family, school and religion. The media is an environmental influence that surrounds, dominates and engulfs children for many hours of the day. As such, it has become a significant socialising agent whose influence begins well before the child enters school. The media, as a differentiated subsystem of society, from which
a lot of dissimilarity from society’s ideals can occur and be transmitted, is believed to be eroding a sense of values among its audience (Selnow 1990:64).

Of all the media issues, violence is the one that has received the most concentrated attention. Research has focused on the effects of specific media content on the specific behaviour of children, but little has been done on the study of the possible role that media socialisation plays in delinquency. Value acquisition has been one of the most needed and neglected areas of research, despite acknowledgement by researchers that values are the key antecedents, consequences, and correlates of human action and experience. There existed a need to explore the role of the media in the instilling of values. Thus it became the aim of this study to move away from the issue of violence and focus on the role of media values, media socialisation and delinquent behaviour.

7.8 Conclusion

This study attempted to develop a theoretical approach to the explanation of juvenile delinquency, while conducting empirical testing of that approach. Delinquent behaviour was analysed from the perspective of the social learning and control theories, in an attempt to develop a clearer delineation of how media socialisation may contribute to individual delinquent behaviour. The media was chosen as the agent of choice because of its growing influence and the fact that it is completely within society’s control. Studies have shown that the stability of our society may in fact be assured through the transmission of pro-social values, highlighting the need to work at harnessing the media’s potential as a means of socialising our children. Making it a more effective agent of socialization, that teaches attitudes, values and behaviours that reflect the moral values of a pro-social society.

Though evidence that media representation directly affects social behaviour may not be conclusive, it merits further research and thought. The media’s ability to reach millions with a single message at any time means that we can no longer underestimate the effect of the mass media or discount the media as a major criminogenic factor, particularly during the socialisation process. Though this study has examined in detail a small aspect of mass media socialisation and been able to explain it moderately well, the role of the media in instilling values has not been fully explored. Various aspects have barely been looked at and it therefore remains
for future researchers to explore further implications of this area and expand the effort into new areas.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire

A survey conducted by
Carla Fernandes
for
Masters Dissertation

This questionnaire is about your experience with the mass media. This questionnaire is completely confidential and will not be seen by anyone but the interviewer. No names must appear on this questionnaire.

PLEASE ANSWER HONESTLY.
It is important to have a true picture of the way adolescents feel.
If you want anything explained please ask the interviewer.

Answer each question by either:
☑ putting a tick in the appropriate box,
___ filling in the blank spaces, or
⊙ circling the appropriate answer
1. **Gender:**  
   - Female □  
   - Male □

2. **Age:**  
   - 13 □  
   - 14 □  
   - 15 □  
   - 16 □  
   - 17 □  
   - 18 □

3. **Level of Education:**  
   - Grade 8 □  
   - Grade 9 □  
   - Grade 10 □  
   - Grade 11 □  
   - Grade 12 □

4. **What is your parent/guardian’s occupations:**

5. **Approximately how many hours per week do you spend on the following:**  
   - Reading Magazines/Newspapers _______  
   - Reading Books _______  
   - Playing Computer/Video games _______  
   - Watching TV/Videos _______  
   - Listening to Radio/Music ___________  
   - Going to the Cinema _______  
   - Surfing the Internet ______________

6. **How many hours per week do you spend with the following:**  
   - Friends _______  
   - Parents/Guardians _______  
   - Teachers _______

7. **How many hours per week do you devote to religious activities?**

8. **How often does your parent/guardian supervise what you see/hear/read in the media?**  
   - Never □  
   - Seldom □  
   - Often □  
   - All the time □

9. **How important do you feel the media makes the following out to be:**  
   - **Being bold/daring?**  
     - Not at all □  
     - Not really □  
     - Somewhat □  
     - Very □
   - **Pursuing pleasure?**  
     - Not at all □  
     - Not really □  
     - Somewhat □  
     - Very □
   - **Being honest?**  
     - Not at all □  
     - Not really □  
     - Somewhat □  
     - Very □
   - **Being obedient?**  
     - Not at all □  
     - Not really □  
     - Somewhat □  
     - Very □
   - **Pursuing wealth?**  
     - Not at all □  
     - Not really □  
     - Somewhat □  
     - Very □
   - **Being powerful?**  
     - Not at all □  
     - Not really □  
     - Somewhat □  
     - Very □
   - **Respecting tradition?**  
     - Not at all □  
     - Not really □  
     - Somewhat □  
     - Very □
Being responsible?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Very □

10. If a something is shown often in the media, do you feel that it indicates that society approves of it?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Definitely □

11. Does the media influence your views on what is socially acceptable?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Definitely □

12. Do you feel that the media accurately reflects reality?
Not at all □ Not really □ To some degree □ Totally □

13. How tolerant are you of the things portrayed in the media?
Not at all □ Not really □ To some degree □ Totally □

14. How important do you feel the following are to achieving your personal goals?:
Being bold/daring?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Very □
Pursuing pleasure?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Very □
Being honest?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Very □
Being obedient?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Very □
Pursuing wealth?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Very □
Being powerful?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Very □
Respecting tradition?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Very □
Being responsible?
Not at all □ Not really □ Somewhat □ Very □

15. How often have you identified with someone in the media?
Never □ Once or twice □ Several times □ Often □

16. How often have you imitated someone in the media?
Never □ Once or twice □ Several times □ Often □

17. Do you feel that your beliefs influence the way you act?
Not at all □ Not really □ To some degree □ Totally □

18. When making a decision, which of the following is important to you?:

i. that society regards it as acceptable? □
ii. that you believe it is acceptable? □

iii. that it won't result in you being punished? □

19. In the last 12 months, have you and if so how often have you:

1. Started / been involved in a fist fight with another person?
   Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

2. Gone onto someone else's property without their permission
   Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

3. Driven without a legal certified licence
   Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

4. Run away from home
   Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

5. Taken part in/ been part of gang activities
   Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

6. Broken/damaged/defaced/set alight to someone else’s property
   Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

7. Taken something of value from a shop without paying for it
   Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

8. Taken and driven someone’s car without their knowledge and/or permission?
   Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

9. Purchased/been in possession of/sold stolen property
   Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

10. Sold illegal drugs to others?
    Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

11. Used force/ the threat of force to steal something from someone?
    Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

12. Broken into someone’s home/ place of business with the intent to steal?
    Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

In the last week, have you and if so how often have you:

13. Drunk alcohol?
    Not at all □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

14. Used illegal drugs to get high?
    Never □ Once/twice □ Several times □ Often □

20. How would you rate the role that the media plays in your life?
    (1= not important  5= very important)
    1  2  3  4  5