DESTINY AND DRIFT: SUBCULTURAL PREFERENCES, STATUS ATTAINMENTS, AND THE RISKS AND REWARDS OF YOUTH*

JOHN HAGAN
University of Toronto

I combine the concept of drift, drawn from social control theory, and a life course conceptualization to elaborate a paradigmatic model to study cultural stratification. I apply this model in a thirteen-year panel study to examine the effects of adolescent subcultural preferences on later adult status attainments. Adolescents adrift from parental and educational control are more likely than those with more controls to develop mild or more seriously deviant subcultural preferences. I identify two distinct adolescent subcultural preferences: a subculture of delinquency and a party subculture. Among males with working-class origins, identification with the subculture of delinquency has a negative effect on trajectories of early adult status attainment. However, among males from non-working-class backgrounds, identification with a party subculture has a net positive effect when the negative effects of partying on educational performance are removed.

Sociological research on deviance and stratification is largely unintegrated.[1] This is understandable, since deviance research emphasizes descent into disrepute, while stratification research more often focuses on the attainment of prestige. The stages of the life course that each field emphasizes also differ: Crime peaks during adolescence, while occupational destinations crystallize in adulthood. Theoretical concerns also distinguish these fields: The dominant theory of deviance emphasizes breakdowns in social control; the dominant stratification theory focuses on the socialization of aspiration and achievement. In general, deviance research attends to the inauspicious circumstances that lead to disrepute, while stratification research explores the more hopeful determinants of durable, if not distinguished, occupational careers.

From a more general perspective, however, it is obvious that adolescent deviance and adult stratification outcomes should be linked in some way and that their respective subfields could benefit from some level of integration. Yet only a few studies to date have attended to this linkage. In this paper I use the concept of drift from the deviance literature (Matza 1964) and research on cultural stratification (DiMaggio 1982,1987) and the life course (Elder 1985) to further this effort.

The concept of drift evolved in direct response to Cohen's (1955) *Delinquent Boys* and in indirect response to Coleman's (1961) *The Adolescent Society*. Cohen initiated research on subcultural delinquency that is still central to sociological criminology and that spawned a British subcultural sociology (e.g., Hall and Jefferson 1976; Willis 1977; Hebdige 1984), while Coleman established a lasting appreciation of the adolescent cultural underpinnings of adult social stratification. However, despite a common concern with adolescent culture, these sociological classics exemplify disconnection in deviance and stratification research. For example, although Coleman's research is seminal in its attention to the roles of athletic and academic values in adolescent society (see also Otto and Alwin 1977), it neglects the disreputable kinds of values embodied in the subculture of delinquency (see Campbell 1969; Short and Strodtbeck 1965; Schwendinger and Schwendinger 1985). Meanwhile, the criminological and British traditions treat subcultural in-

* Direct correspondence to John Hagan, Faculty of Law, University of Toronto, Toronto Canada, M5S 2C5. This research was supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, a Killam Research Fellowship from the Canada Council, and by the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research.

[1] The terms "stratification" and "status attainment" are used somewhat interchangeably in this paper. Of course, status attainment is only one (albeit important) aspect of stratification. Another aspect, involving measures of class position, is introduced later in the paper. Nonetheless, I intend no claim to comprehensiveness.

volvements as a dependent variable, neglecting the role that such involvements can play in influencing later status attainments.

ADOLESCENT DEVIANCE AND ADULT OUTCOMES

A few studies have considered the consequences of adolescent deviance for adult stratification outcomes (e.g., Sampson and Laub 1990), and it is generally well recognized that adolescence is a critical transitional period from childhood to adulthood (Elder 1980; Modell, Furstenberg, and Hershberg 1976; Hagan and Palloni 1990). But this research is more complicated and open-ended in the possibilities it raises than often is realized (Hagan and Palloni 1988).

Robins's (1966) study of adult outcomes, *Deviant Children Grown Up*, followed two groups into adulthood: a clinic-based sample of predominantly low-status "severely antisocial children" and a "control group" who were without adolescent behavior problems and were matched with the clinic sample on race, age, sex, IQ, and SES. As adults the clinic sample experienced more unemployment for longer spells and with more frequent job changes, fewer promotions, depressed earnings, more credit problems and greater reliance on public assistance than did the control group.

The Gluecks (1950, 1968) applied a similar matched group design to study white males from Boston who, because of their persistent delinquency, were committed to one of two correctional schools in Massachusetts. Sampson and Laub (1990) reanalyzed these data and reported that not only adult criminal behavior, but "seven adult behaviors spanning economic, educational, employment, and family domains are also strongly related to adolescent delinquency" (p. 616). These outcomes included greater adult unemployment and welfare dependency among the delinquent sample.

As Jessor, Donovan, and Costa (forthcoming) noted, however, recent research on adult consequences of adolescent deviance suggests more complicated and socially contingent adult possibilities. For example, while Ghodsian and Power (1987) observed continuity in drinking among a national sample of British youth followed from ages 16 to 23, a subsequent analysis of these data by Power and Estaugh (1990, p. 493) argued that teenage drinking was "generally unrelated to early adult experience of either obtaining or remaining in employment."

Mixed findings also emerged from a study by Newcomb and Bentler (1988), whose sample of Los Angeles high school students demonstrated continuities in drug use and problems of job instability in early adulthood. However, the authors also noted that "early drug use did not generate a pattern of irresponsibility, laziness, and work avoidance" (p. 169). In addition, their composite measure of "social conformity" in adolescence had no net effect on income, job instability, job satisfaction, collected public assistance, or amount worked in early adulthood.

The most compelling study, however, is one of Colorado high school and college students by Jessor et al. (forthcoming). Although the authors found continuity in problem behaviors from adolescence into adulthood, these behaviors did not affect work and status attainment. They argue that the latter unexpected findings are made plausible by three factors:

> First, our research involved normal rather than clinical samples, and the extent of their adolescent/youth involvement in problem behavior—even at its greatest—has to be seen as moderate for the most part. Second, our samples were largely middle class in socioeconomic status, and the openness of the opportunity structure for them and their access to "second chances" have to be seen as far greater than might be the case for disadvantaged youth who had been involved in problem behavior. Third, . . . , even for samples such as ours, there can still be compromising outcomes [yet] to be manifested. (chap. 9, p. 19)

Jessor et al. combine these observations in an "interactionist perspective," asserting that the course of psychosocial development is not inexorable, that past actions do not necessarily foreclose future options, and that there can be resilience in growth and change: "at least in social contexts that are not entirely malignant, and at a time in history when the social setting itself is relatively open and undergoing change" (chap. 9, p. 20).

DRIFT, PREFERENCES AND ATTAINMENTS IN THE LIFE COURSE

The theoretical perspective for this analysis begins with the concept of drift, which David Matza (1964) introduced in order to soften an assumption of determinacy that characterizes much research in stratification (cf. Jencks et al. 1972) as well as in deviance. Matza wrote that "drift stands midway between freedom and control," and he defined drifters as "those who have been granted

the potentiality for freedom through the loosening of social controls but who lack the position, capacity, or inclination to become agents in their behalf" (pp. 28-29). He emphasized that such individuals tend to drift between criminal and conventional involvements, and that the process of "maturational reform" associated with the transition to adulthood means that the direction of drift between adolescence and adulthood is mostly from crime to convention — that is, from experimentation with delinquency and related interests to conventional, even mundane, adult occupations. Beyond this, little is known about the directions that the lives of adolescent drifters take.

Elder's (1985) conceptualization of the life course in terms of trajectories and transitions provides a useful framework for studying drifting adolescents as well as adolescents who are more directed. Trajectories — pathways through the life course, including occupational careers, marital histories, and parenthood — encompass patterned and age-graded sequences or transitions that consist of events, experiences, or processes, such as first and succeeding jobs, marriages, and births. Adolescent subcultural preferences reflect transitional cultural experiences that in association with other background and foreground contingencies may establish longer-term life course trajectories for directed as well as drifting adolescents.

Adolescent subcultural preferences are partly adaptations to the pressures of the passage to adulthood. They include behaviors and values that are distinct from, if not opposed to, adult norms (Campbell 1969). However, having fun is also important, particularly with the opposite sex (Bordua 1961), and elements of risk and excitement also characterize these preferences (Katz 1989). These possibilities lure Matza's drifters, freed from institutional controls, into subcultural involvements.

So while Cohen's (1955) classic conceptualization emphasized the oppositional content of the "delinquent subculture," Matza (1964; also Sykes and Matza 1957, 1961) argued that a "subculture of delinquency" represents a more loosely determined "subterranean convergence" between adult and adolescent values.[2] Subterranean values include a Veblenesque search for adventure, excitement, and thrills (Veblen 1934); and Matza (1964) therefore observes that "an apparently tenuous and precarious subculture delicately balanced between crime and convention . . . is itself a subterranean tradition in American life" (p. 63). This is a tradition, notes Matza, into which individuals are more likely to drift than be directed.

The view of adolescent subcultures as perched between crime and convention emerged early in Matza's work, and this view has been extended by recent British research. For example, Hebdige (1984) wrote that for typical members of a working-class youth culture in contemporary Great Britain "there is a substantial amount of shared ideological ground not only between them and the adult working-class culture . . . but also between them and the dominant culture" (p. 86). Hebdige analyzed a cult of David "Bowie-ites" that provoked questions about gender as well as class in order "to negotiate a meaningful intermediate space somewhere between the parent culture and the dominant ideology" (p. 88).

Another important idea suggested by Matza is that teenage culture may sometimes curb serious deviancy. Campbell (1969) cited Matza in suggesting that much teenage culture is actually a conventional version of delinquency, "conventional in that it strips away delinquency's most odious features" (p. 846). Campbell's point is that although teenage culture emphasizes fun and adventure, disdains scholastic effort, and flirts with the boundary areas between propriety and immorality (e.g., staying out late, drinking, sexual explorations, and "conning" parents), nonetheless this culture is more accurately seen as "playing at" deviance. Campbell added irony to Matza's notion of subterranean convergence when he concluded that the "great social virtue" of much teenage culture is that "it offers sufficient inherent satisfactions to attract and maintain . . . many adherents who otherwise would be vulnerable to the appeals of delinquency" (pp. 840-41).

Many teenage subcultures may exist, with varying meanings, both for adolescents and their status attainments in adulthood (see also Roe 1984). DiMaggio (1982) anticipated this possibility at the middle and higher ends of the adolescent cultural continuum when he distinguished between "middlebrow cultural activity" (e.g., drawing,

[2] Two classic usages of the term "subculture" were outlined by Yinger (1960). The first points to basic differences in norms and values between subordinate and dominant groups in society. The second usage adds to the first a social psychological sense of frustration that stimulates the development and maintenance of the conflicting norms and values. Matza's usage of "subculture" allows more convergence and correspondence between subordinate and dominant group norms and values and does not assume the presence of a driving sense of frustration. I have adopted Matza's usage.

photography, crafts, woodworking, and sewing) and "cultural capital" (e.g., theater attendance, visits to museums and galleries). DiMaggio (1982) found that the former cultural involvements have little impact on educational attainment, while cultural capital enhances educational attainment apart from measured ability. Thus, different adolescent cultural involvements may have varied implications for adult status trajectories. Matza's conceptualization adds to this continuum the possibility that while adolescents sometimes may be driven or directed by parents and schools to acquire cultural capital or other forms of middlebrow culture, without parental and educational direction they are more likely to drift into less reputable subcultural pursuits. These pursuits may take their own directions, which are as yet little understood.

DiMaggio (1982; 1987; DiMaggio and Mohr 1985) built his work on Coleman's, as well as on work by Weber [1968] (1972), Bourdieu (1977), Collins (1975, 1979), Roe (1984), and Hebdige (1984). He established a paradigmatic model of the impact of adolescent culture on educational and, ultimately (although this has not yet been explored empirically), occupational attainments. This paradigm locates adolescent culture as an intervening variable between status origins and the abilities and efforts of adolescent children on the one hand, and educational and occupational attainments on the other (see Katsillis and Rubinson 1990). DiMaggio and Mohr (1985) encouraged the extension of this paradigm to the lower end of the cultural spectrum, noting that while they have paid attention to positively valued cultural resources, "it is possible that negatively valued cultural styles (e.g., punk lifestyles) influence the stratification process in comparable but opposite ways" (p. 1256).

OPERATIONAL ISSUES AND HYPOTHESES

Some fundamental issues are unresolved in research on cultural preferences and status attainment. For example, DiMaggio's use of "interest in," "familiarity with," and "taste for" high culture in his theoretical statements made it uncertain whether operationalizations of cultural capital should be attitudinal or behavioral. DiMaggio's (1982) initial measures of cultural capital mixed the two kinds of content, and the item that loaded most heavily in his factor analyses was an attitudinal measure of interest in attending symphony concerts (p. 193, Table 2). DiMaggio's use of behavioral measures follows the early use of such measures by Bourdieu (1973); but more recently Bourdieu (1984) has used subjective indicators, especially "taste," which he defined as "an acquired disposition to 'differentiate' and 'appreciate'" (p. 466).

The challenge is to capture the range of these "tastes" or "styles." Roe (1984 pp. 137-38, see also Appendix 3) argued that by age 15 adolescents have developed "specific taste attitudes" that preference measures distinguish more finely. This view is consistent with the emphasis on symbolic communication and style in contemporary subcultural writings (e.g., Hebdige 1984). Cultural tastes, styles, and preferences can have a range and detail that behavioral reports overlook. Although I consider behavioral measures, my primary measurement strategy is built around the kinds of preference measures suggested by Roe.

Some tentative hypotheses build on DiMaggio's model by treating adolescent cultural preferences as reflective of transitional experiences in the life course, capable of creating cultural deficits as well as cultural capital and other kinds of cultural resources that may extend their influence into the occupational sphere. My focus is on the fun and thrill-seeking side of teenage culture, that I infer from Matza's work is multidimensional, and that leads me to expect that:

H_1: Activities that adolescents perceive to be fun form distinct and internally coherent sets of subcultural preferences, some of which are more seriously deviant than others.

This hypothesis grounds predictions (below) about differential effects of subcultural preferences.

The subcultural preferences considered here derive salience partly from their separateness from high culture (including education) and from adults (especially parents). Indeed, it is the freedom from the hold of these institutions that allows adolescents to drift into these cultural domains. So I further expect that:

H_2: These subcultural preferences are negatively related to measures of educational ability, effort, aspiration, and expectation, as well as to parental efforts to control their adolescent children.

This hypothesis is selective in drawing from the subcultural tradition. While Cohen (1955) assumed that working-class origins lead adolescents to participate in the delinquent subculture, Matza's (1964) assumption of subterranean convergence questioned this link and placed greater

emphasis on the relaxation of institutional controls. My second hypothesis follows Matza in predicting that subcultural preferences are directly linked to weaknesses in the school and family ties that can limit the drift into less reputable subcultural domains. However, as I discuss below, this does not imply that class origins are of no significance.

Before pursuing the influence of these transitional subcultural preferences in establishing life course trajectories, I further note that effects of subcultural preferences may be mediated by societal reactions to them. Labelling theorists argue that delinquent and other subcultural involvements are shaped by the reactions of others. For example, Lemert (1951) argued that reactions by police and others highlight "the symbolic appurtenances of the new role, in clothes, speech, posture, and mannerisms, which in some cases heighten social visibility" (p. 76). If this is the case, then:

H_3: The cultural deficit of more seriously deviant subcultural preferences is mediated by police contacts.

This hypothesis brings me to more precise predictions about the cultural deficits I expect to be associated with the subcultural preferences of drifting adolescents. Since Jessor et al. (1991) found little evidence of adverse adult socioeconomic outcomes from adolescent deviance in general (unmatched) samples, adverse effects may be limited to more serious subcultural involvements and to adolescents from the underclass. Although this proposition has not been tested within a specific data set, it explains apparently contradictory findings and is anticipated in the stratification literature.

For example, Cohen (1955) acknowledged this link to stratification research and narrowed the focus further to male adolescents when he wrote in *Delinquent Boys* that "Hollingshead, in his *Elmtown's Youth*, stresses throughout the importance of parental status in obtaining special consideration in school activities and on the job through 'connections' and other means of exerting pressure" (p. 111). Hollingshead (1949) was indeed emphatic, observing that "class control tends to result in the manipulation of institutional functions in the interests of individuals and families who have wealth, prestige, and power" (p. 452). The continuity of these premises was reflected in Goode's (1978) more recent argument that "the relative resources of the individuals or groups in prestige processes may have considerable effect on who gets how much public praise or dispraise," so that "juvenile delinquents of upper middle-class families often avoid much loss in respect" (p. 252). This avoidance of consequences is the "openness of the opportunity structure" and the "access to second chances" that Jessor et al. associated with the disreputable involvements of middle class youth.

Meanwhile, DiMaggio (1982; DiMaggio and Mohr 1985) included gender with parental educational origins in specifying attainment models. Robins (1966) also emphasized that childhood deviance can influence male and female adult outcomes differently, and therefore that it is important to analyze these experiences separately by gender. Following such leads, I specify models by gender and parental class background, to predict conditions under which more serious subcultural preferences establish diminished trajectories of status attainment. I expect that:

H_4: Only the more seriously deviant subcultural preferences crystallize as cultural deficits; this is more likely to occur among the adolescent sons of working-class fathers.

In other words, drift into subcultural delinquency may be most consequential in working class families. But there may also be measurable benefits of less serious subcultural inclinations. Recall Matza's suggestion that less serious subcultural involvements may have the ironic virtue of curbing more deviant inclinations. Subcultural work also emphasizes that these involvements can play a part in adolescent male sex-role socialization; they may also anticipate activities that can consolidate and enhance adult network ties. For example, partying, drinking, and related pursuits, apart from the educational distractions and difficulties caused during adolescence, may ultimately yield tangible payoffs through adult work-related network-building activities involving these and other mildly disreputable pleasures. But I suspect such benefits may be restricted to non-working-class males, so that:

H_5: Less seriously deviant subcultural preferences are more likely to crystallize as a cultural resource for males of non-working-class origins.

DATA, MEASURES AND METHODS

The Sample

Two waves of panel data were collected in 1976 and 1989 in a suburb of about a half million peo-

Table 1. Factor Loadings: Principal Factor Analysis with Oblique Rotation of Subcultural Preferences, Male and Female Adolescents

	Males		Females	
Factor	Delinquency Subculture	Party Subculture	Delinquency Subculture	Party Subculture
Subculture of Delinquency				
Stealing expensive things (e.g., worth over $50)	.755	.154	.896	.080
Stealing little things (e.g. shoplifting)	.758	.161	.840	.072
Breaking into schools, breaking up school property	.803	.272	.788	-.075
Breaking streetlights, windows, etc.	.822	.240	.794	.098
Running from police	.755	.321	.728	.122
Fighting (in gangs)	.738	.266	.699	.034
Fighting (between individuals)	.663	.220	.676	.045
Eigenvalue	4.777		4.431	
% of total variance	36.7		34.1	
Party Subculture				
Going to parties	.204	.759	-.018	.806
Going to rock concerts and dances	.162	.792	-.009	.787
Picking up girls, meeting boys	.219	.709	.152	.752
Dating	.125	.706	-.089	.724
Driving around in car	.299	.605	.089	.669
Drinking alcohol	.408	.580	.358	.489
Eigenvalue		2.264		3.024
% of total variance		17.4		23.3

Note: The correlation between factors is .303 for males and .083 for females.

ple adjacent to Toronto (Canada). This suburb has grown dramatically in population over the last 25 years, with population growth concentrated around the intersection of two major highways that access the city. The sampling frame for wave 1 of the study in 1976 was the enrollment lists of all students in grades eight through twelve from all four secondary schools (including a vocational school) that serve the central area of this community. The vocational school students are not included in this analysis because they did not receive grades comparable to other students; this made it impossible to introduce essential controls for ability and effort (Katsillis and Rubinson 1990).[3]

The original sample was disproportionately stratified by housing type to increase class variation; I used addresses to sample respondents in equal numbers from single- and multiple-family dwelling units. Students sampled were personally invited and paid five dollars each to participate after school in the survey. The response rate was 83.5 percent, providing 693 regular secondary school students for the wave 1 of the panel.

Thirteen years later, telephone interviews were completed with 490 of the wave 1 regular secondary school students. Nine of the original respondents had died; the response rate was 71.6 percent. Given the interval between waves, this response was high and similar to the most comparable study I could locate (Otto and Featherman 1975). However, nonrandom sample attrition remains a concern.[4]

Sample Selection and Status Attainment

By 1989, the respondents in the sample were in their late twenties and early thirties. At this stage, 93.3 percent of the men (N = 250) and 81.1 percent of the women (N = 180) were employed; their reported occupations were ranked using Treiman's (1977) Standard International Occu-

[3] Vocational school students are different from other students in the sample in some significant ways. For example, male vocational school students score higher on the subculture of delinquency scale (x = 19.9 compared to 13.3 for other students) and their fathers have lower socioeconomic status (x = 39.5 compared to 46.7). It is unlikely that including these students would increase the generalizability of our findings, since they are drawn from a much larger catchment area than those drawn from the other more representative schools in our sample; vocational school students would be overrepresented if they were simply combined with the other students. In any case, this issue appears to be moot because when these students are included in the equations the pattern of results is not substantially altered.

[4] A bivariate and then multivariate search for factors that distinguished the selected from the attrited respondents in the 13-year recontact survey revealed that the latter were more often female (48.3% vs. 45.3%), were lower in self-evaluated school performance (x = 3.19 vs. 3.35), moved more often as children (x = 1.98 vs. 1.83), more often lived in multiple-family dwellings (77% vs. 66%), less often lived with both parents from age five (35% vs. 23%), and came more often from outside central Canada (15% vs. 10%). These differences were not dramatic, but they are nonetheless taken into account in the correction for selection bias reported below.

pational Prestige Scale.

Therefore, there were two potential sources of sample selection bias: attrition between waves of the survey and nonparticipation in the labor force. Information from wave 1 is available to model retention in the panel and additional information from wave 2 is used to model labor force participation, allowing correction for sample selection (Heckman 1979; Berk 1983). Gender-specific probit models for these corrections are presented in Appendix 1, and lambda values representing respective correction factors are reported below in regression models of status attainment.

Subcultural Preference Measures

The wave 1 survey used unique measures of the fun and the rebellion involved in adolescent subcultural experiences: the teenage respondents were asked to rank activities on a scale from one to ten in terms of "how much fun you think they are." To assess the different dimensions embodied in adolescent subcultures and their roles in establishing trajectories of adult attainment, I followed the lead of DiMaggio and factor analyzed the items separately for males and females using varimax and oblique solutions. The results are similar across solutions and genders. The oblique solution is summarized in Table 1.

As suggested in hypothesis 1, two distinct and internally coherent factors yield eigenvalues above 2.0 and explain a majority of the variance in rankings. One factor conforms to expectations of the criminological literature; I call it the "subculture of delinquency." The second factor involves a less rebellious set of interests, I call it the "party subculture." As Matza suggests, the second factor is more conventional. While the first factor (involving theft, vandalism, fighting, and running from police) is similar to scales of self-reported delinquency (from Porterfield 1943 to Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis 1981), the second factor only edges into the illegal with alcohol consumption, and is more focused on the pursuit of fun and the opposite sex. Drinking is, perhaps predictably, the only item that loads substantially on both factors, and it loads more heavily on the party factor. Removing drinking from the factor analysis makes little difference; for example, its removal only reduces the correlation between factors among males to .28 from .3.

The party subculture may only be a subculture to the extent that it is a more distinct part of adolescent than of adult society. Nonetheless, this subculture reflects much of the subterranean convergence that Matza postulates between adolescent and adult society, and the focus on partying, rock concerts, and drinking gives this factor a contemporary and adolescent Veblenesque cast (Veblen 1934). The means and standard deviations reported in Table 2 indicate that on average boys rank the subculture of delinquency higher than do girls, and that boys and girls rank the party subculture about equally, both ranking it higher than delinquency. The mean scores for the subculture of delinquency scale are relatively low (especially among girls) and the standard deviations are substantial. This kind of skewness is common in delinquency measures. I standardized the distributions of these scores and increased comparability across scales and genders by converting the delinquency and party measures separately by gender to *z*-scores (DiMaggio 1982; DiMaggio and Mohr 1985). These conversions emphasize relative more than absolute variation from the norm in assessing effects of subcultural preferences. Relativity is, of course, a common concern in considerations of deviance.

One might wonder how the above measures of subcultural preference correspond to actual behaviors. I included no behavioral measures of partying in the initial survey, but did include a self-report behavior scale that closely parallels the preference measures of the subculture of delinquency (Hirschi 1969).[5] The correlation of the subculture of delinquency preference scale with the self-report behavior scale is greater than .6, and the two scales cannot be considered simultaneously without causing collinearity problems. But I can follow DiMaggio's early example and join attitudinal and behavioral measures to create a second-order factor that provides an alternative scale of the subculture of delinquency (see footnote 7). However, I do not expect behaviors per se to have the strongest long-term effects on adult status attainments, other than through the stigma of police contacts that I measure directly in my models. Rather, I see the cultural tastes and styles formed in adolescence as the strongest influence and expressed in more diverse and detailed preference measures.

[5] The self-report delinquent behavior scale contains items that ask how often in the last year the respondent has taken little things (worth less than $2), taken things of some value (between $2 and $50), taken things of large value (worth over $50), deliberately banged up something that belonged to someone else, deliberately banged up or damaged something that belonged to the school, beaten up on anyone or hurt anyone on purpose (not counting brothers or sisters).

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations by Gender for Adolescent and Early Adult Variables

Variable	Measure	Males (N = 250) Mean (s.d.)	Females (N = 180) Mean (s.d.)
Adult SES	Treiman scale	47.800 (10.487)	49.71 (10.659)
Subculture of delinquency	Summed factor scores (Before conversion to z-scores)	13.306 (10.758)	7.325 (7.994)
Party subculture	Summed factor scores (Before conversion to z-scores)	28.574 (7.592)	28.144 (6.969)
Ability	"Compared to other students in your school, how do you rate yourself in the school work you do?" *(From 1 = among the worst to 5 = among the best)*	3.316 (.750)	3.411 (.650)
Effort	"On the average, how much time do you spend doing homework outside school?" *(From 0 = no homework to 6 = 3+ hours)*	2.404 (1.371)	2.839 (1.325)
Father SES	Treiman Scale when respondent was 12	46.712 (11.575)	45.567 (11.304)
Mother SES	Treiman Scale when respondent was 12	41.836 (7.664)	41.378 (7.372)
Relational control	"Do you talk about your thoughts and feelings with your mother/father?" *(From 0 = never to 3 = always)* "Would you like to be the kind of person your mother/father is?" *(From 0 = not at all to 4 = in every way)* (Alpha = .606/.615)	5.568 (2.348)	5.378 (2.531)
Instrumental control	"Does your mother/father know where you are when you are away from home?" "Does your mother/father know who you are with when you are away from home?" *(From 0 = never to 3 = always)* (Alpha = .811/.782)	5.700 (2.243)	7.25 (2.377)
Police contact	"Have you ever been picked up by the police?" *(From 0 = never to 4 = four+)*	.904 (1.280)	.172 (.615)
Educational aspiraction	"How much schooling would you like to get eventually?" "How much schooling do you actually expect to get eventually?" *(From 1 = no more to 7 = college graduation)* (Alpha = .858/.906)	11.548 (3.204)	11.906 (3.072)
English grade	Percentage score in spring	59.828 (12.351)	66.256 (12.755)
Math grade	Percentage score in spring	65.412 (15.646)	68.828 (16.438)
Educational attainments	Highest level education completed *(From 1 = some high school to 6 = university graduate)*	3.716 (1.740)	3.563 (1.618)

Other Independent Variables

Remaining independent variables are described in Table 2. The inclusion of occupational prestige variables for fathers and mothers reflects an assumption in cultural theories that parental class origins influence sons' and daughters' status attainments. I used Treiman's Standard International Occupational Prestige Scale to measure respondents' early adult status attainments. Respondents' reports of their mothers' and fathers' occupations when respondents were 12 years old

were scaled using the same index.[6] Treiman (1977) demonstrated that this index is cross-culturally valid, representing a generic hierarchy of occupations across societies. A further specification of the analysis by father's class position using measures developed by Wright (1978) is introduced below.

Except where otherwise indicated, the remaining independent variables in Table 2 were measured in the wave 1 survey. The measures of ability and effort are central to the cultural stratification paradigm (Katsillis and Rubinson 1990) and have added relevance in operationalizing the weakness of school as an institutional constraint on drift. A self-rated comparison with other students on school performance measured ability, and a self-report of average time spent on homework measured effort. I also included measures of educational aspirations and expectations; this scale yielded substantial alpha scores for males (.858) and females (.906).

The introduction of social control premises into the cultural stratification paradigm also required that I consider parental constraints on adolescents. Again, the premise is that parental constraints decrease the likelihood of adolescent subcultural drift (see Nye 1958; Hirschi 1969). I included scales of parental relational and instrumental controls in this analysis. I operationalized relational controls through questions about interaction (talking about thoughts and feelings) and identification with (wanting to be like) parents, and measured instrumental controls with questions about supervision (knowing who with) and surveillance (knowing whereabouts) of adolescents. Mother and father scores were joined to avoid collinearity problems. Alpha scores reported in Table 2 and analyses presented elsewhere (Hagan, Gillis, and Simpson 1988; Hagan, Gillis, and Simpson 1990) indicate that these scales are reliable.

It is likely that the remaining variables in Table 2 exert their influence between adolescent subcultures and adult status attainments, although assuming this causal sequence is not necessary to the conclusions I reach. The first of these variables, police contact, is the number of times respondents have been picked up by the police. I assume police contacts result from activities associated with subcultural preferences. The next variables are English and math grades recorded from school files the spring after the wave 1 survey. Finally, a six-level index of educational attainment is included from the wave 2 survey. These attainments follow variables measured in the wave 1 survey.

I assumed a causal ordering of variables that is conservative in treating parental SES, self-rated ability, effort, and aspirations and expectations as predeterminants of identification with the delinquency or party subcultures. Police contacts, subsequent English and math grades, and educational attainments were added in sequence, as variables intervening between adolescent subcultural preferences and adult status attainments. This sequence is consistent with the cultural stratification paradigm (DiMaggio 1982; DiMaggio and Mohr 1985; Katsillis and Rubinson 1990). However, my conclusions do not depend on this assumed sequence.

ANALYSIS

I examined the determinants of adolescent subcultural preferences in Table 3 by regressing the subculture of delinquency and party subculture *z*-scores separately for males and females on fathers' and mothers' occupational prestige, adolescents' self-rated ability and effort, their aspirations and expectations, and parental relational and instrumental control. Since all hypothesized relationships specify direction, one-tailed tests of significance are reported.

Notable findings in Table 3 include negative effects of parental instrumental and relational control on subcultural preferences. The strongest of these effects are of parental instrumental control on the subculture of delinquency. Parental relational control also has a significant negative effect on identification with the party subculture among females. So sons and daughters who perceive themselves as less controlled by their parents are, as expected, more likely to drift into the preferences of the subculture of delinquency and the party subculture, even with parental status origins and educational measures of ability, effort, and aspiration/expectation held constant.

Ability, effort, and aspiration/expectation tend

[6] I have retained separate mother and father socioeconomic status measures in order to explore whether these measures differentially affect daughter and son outcomes. There is some evidence they do. The correlation between these parental status measures is below .2 for daughters and sons. Meanwhile, there is no consensus on how to treat single-parent households in this kind of analysis. Absent parents may or may not exert influence. When single-parent households are removed from the estimation of the equations in Table 4, the effect of the subculture of delinquency scale is increased modestly in the first equation, while the overall pattern of results remains the same.

Table 3. Unstandardized OLS Coefficients: Determinants of Subcultural Preferences Among Adolescent Males and Females

	Males (N = 250)		Females (N = 180)	
Variables	Subculture of Delinquency	Party Sub-culture	Subculture of Delinquency	Party Sub-culture
Father SES	-.011*	-.004	.011*	-.005
	(.005)	(.005)	(.006)	(.006)
Mother SES	.007	-.004	.006	-.001
	(.008)	(.008)	(.010)	(.010)
Ability	-.002	-.146*	-.311*	.041
	(.092)	(.091)	(.175)	(.171)
Effort	-.121**	-.027	.040	-.093*
	(.047)	(.047)	(.054)	(.053)
Educational aspirations	-.075**	-.039*	-.035	-.003
	(.021)	(.021)	(.024)	(.024)
Relational control	.010	-.013	-.041	-.078**
	(.029)	(.029)	(.030)	(.030)
Instrumental control	-.092**	-.043	-.119**	-.048
	(.032)	(.031)	(.032)	(.031)
Lambda A	-.694	.292	-1.619*	.265
	(.468)	(.472)	(1.006)	(1.016)
Lambda B	.537	-.004	-.256	.031
	(.487)	(.519)	(.275)	(.271)
Intercept	2.667	1.495	2.516	1.055
R^2	.191	.089	.150	.123

* $p < .05$ (one-tailed) ** $p < .01$ (one-tailed)

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses.

to be negatively related to subcultural preferences in the models for males and females, indicating that weak attachment to school goals also plays a significant role in forming these preferences. Six of these effects are significant, supporting the hypothesis that weak institutional controls make subcultural drift more likely.

Finally, effects of parental occupational prestige are inconsistent and isolated to the subculture of delinquency, with a negative effect for males and a positive effect for females. Overall, there is more consistent support for hypothesis 2 than there is for an assumed influence of parental prestige: Weak parental controls and lower academic ability, effort and aspirations/expectations are significant sources of subcultural drift. The less controlled by parents and involved or committed to school adolescents are, the more likely they are to drift into the subculture of delinquency and the party subculture.

I turn now to the determinants of adult occupational prestige to assess trajectories of subcultural drift and adult status attainment 13 years later. Table 4 presents the results of estimating four models separately by gender. Model 1 includes subcultural preferences and their predeterminants. This model reveals four significant effects among young adult males: positive effects of fathers' occupational prestige, son's self-rated academic ability, his aspirations/expectations, and a negative effect of the subculture of delinquency. Among females, ability has a notable effect as does aspirations/expectations, while identification with the subculture of delinquency has no significant effect. The party subculture has no significant effect in the first model among either males or females.

These findings confirm that drifting into the more seriously deviant subculture of delinquency, but not into the less deviant party subculture, creates a lasting cultural deficit among males.[7] Model 2 introduces police contacts to see if this variable mediates the effect of the subculture of delinquency on adult occupational prestige, as predicted in hypothesis 3. The effect of police contacts is significant and it does account for the effect of the subculture of delinquency among males.

Models 3 and 4 introduce grades and educational attainment. The effect of math grades is significant for males but not for females, while the effect of educational attainment is strong for both sexes. The most interesting result in model 4, however, is the emergence of a significant positive effect of the party subculture. Net of the measure of educational attainment introduced in model 4, identification with the party subculture improves the status attainments of young adult men with no similar effect apparent for women. Thus the tendency of the party subculture to re-

[7] A modified version of Table 4 is available on request. The modification introduced in this table replaces the preference measure of the subculture of delinquency with a second-order factor on which preference and self-report behavior scales are loaded equally. The second-order subculture of delinquency factor scores were converted into *z*-scores to facilitate comparisons between Table 4 and the modified table. The modified table does not reveal substantially altered findings: The unstandardized coefficients for the subculture of delinquency scales are quite similar, whether the preference factor or the second order combined attitude and behavior factor is used in models 1 to 4. I retain the preference measure because it is consistent with the measurement strategy I derived from Roe and my own theoretical expectations, as well as from the more recent work of Bourdieu and DiMaggio.

Table 4. Unstandardized OLS Coefficients: Determinants of Occupational Prestige Among Young Adult Males and Females

	Males (N = 250)				Females (N = 180)			
Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Father SES	.086˜	.088˜	.074	.059	-.071	-.071	-.077	-.119
	(.053)	(.052)	(.052)	(.051)	(.071)	(.071)	(.072)	(.074)
Mother SES	.092	.094	.091	.063	.164	.165	.164	.150
	(.080)	(.079)	(.079)	(.077)	(.106)	(.107)	(.106)	(.104)
Ability	2.471**	2.389**	1.902˜	1.411	3.570*	3.563˜	2.854	3.138
	(.924)	(.918)	(.981)	(.960)	(1.947)	(1.951)	(2.020)	(2.010)
Effort	.490	.415	.394	.079	.166	.174	.182	.316
	(.481)	(.480)	(.475)	(.468)	(.601)	(.611)	(.609)	(.603)
Relational control	.273	.292	.275	.230	.446	.445	.441	.415
	(.284)	(.282)	(.279)	(.272)	(.339)	(.340)	(.339)	(.335)
Instrumental control	.463	.373	.307	.241	-.547	-.053	-.087	-.164
	(.322)	(.323)	(.323)	(.314)	(.364)	(.365)	(.365)	(.361)
Educational aspiration	.358˜	.292	.326	.159	.530*	.534*	.504˜	.336
	(.214)	(.216)	(.215)	(.214)	(.265)	(.268)	(.268)	(.266)
Subculture of delinquency	-1.123*	-.783	-.665	-.829	-.237	-.248	-.249	-.119
	(.643)	(.664)	(.659)	(.643)	(.856)	(.867)	(.866)	(.872)
Party subculture	.787	.877	.940	1.301˜	.593	.590	.612	1.003
	(.657)	(.654)	(.647)	(.635)	(.841)	(.841)	(.841)	(.843)
Police contacts	—	-1.021˜	-1.036˜	-.869˜	—	.107	.031	.451
		(.544)	(.545)	(.532)		(1.344)	(1.344)	(1.359)
English grade	—	—	-.050	-.070	—	—	.083	.072
			(.057)	(.056)			(.073)	(.072)
Math grade	—	—	.105**	.091˜	—	—	.013	-.005
			(.044)	(.043)			(.055)	(.054)
Educational attainment	—	—	—	1.597**	—	—	—	1.479**
				(.414)				(.591)
Lambda A	-6.249	-5.253	-5.085	-2.864	15.988	15.993	16.631	20.976
	(4.698)	(4.709)	(4.660)	(4.589)	(11.240)	(11.249)	(11.190)	(11.010)
Lambda B	-11.682**	-12.125**	-11.977**	-11.082**	-3.832	-3.842	-3.401	-2.565
	(2.870)	(2.556)	(2.552)	(2.821)	(3.104)	(3.108)	(3.133)	(3.141)
Intercept	28.446	28.426	26.942	29.207	18.349	18.261	14.769	12.402
R^2	.201	.212	.230	.274	.090	.091	.100	.131

* $p < .05$ (one-tailed) ** $p < .01$ (one-tailed)

Note: Standard errors are in parentheses.

sult in reduced educational attainment suppresses the subculture's effect, but the net effect of this form of subcultural drift is positive.

Hypotheses 4 and 5 specify parental-class-origin interactions that more precisely predict negative subculture of delinquency effects for sons of working-class fathers, and positive party subculture effects for sons of non-working-class fathers. In the wave 2 survey respondents were asked to provide the kind of information used by Wright (1978) to classify locations in the class structure. Using this information on self-employment, employees, and supervisory responsibilities of fathers (retrospectively reported for when the respondent was age 12), I divided the respondents into those from working- and non-working-class origins. Working-class fathers were not self-employed, had no employees and no supervisory responsibilities; non-working-class fathers had at least one of these characteristics.

Among males, I initially specified the interaction effects of class origin and subcultural preferences on status attainment by creating product terms and adding them (and class) separately to model 4 estimated in Table 4. Despite collinearity between the product terms and their subcul-

Table 5. Unstandardized OLS Coefficients: Total and Direct Effects of Adolescent Subcultural Preferences on Young Adult Occupational Prestige Among Sons and Daughters of Working- and Non-Working-Class Fathers

	Total Effect	Direct Effect
Sons of Working-Class Fathers (N = 116)		
Subculture of delinquency	-2.108**	-1.995*
	(.944)	(.987)
Party subculture	-.346	.244
	(.912)	(.896)
Sons of Non-Working-Class Fathers (N = 134)		
Subculture of delinquency	-.780	-.244
	(.937)	(.921)
Party subculture	2.318**	2.775**
	(.989)	(.957)
Daughters of Working-Class Fathers (N = 80)		
Subculture of delinquency	-.381	-.221
	(1.041)	(1.062)
Party subculture	.789	.884
	(1.111)	(1.085)
Daughters of Non-Working-Class Fathers (N = 100)		
Subculture of delinquency	-.541	-.647
	(1.390)	(1.465)
Party subculture	.402	.897
	(1.255)	(1.283)

* $p < .05$ (one-tailed) ** $p < .01$ (one-tailed)

Note: Results are from regressions of young adult occupational prestige on variables included in models 1 and 4 of Table 4. Only subcultural effects are reported to conserve space.

tural components (the r's are about .7), the t-values for subculture of delinquency and party interactions with class on occupational prestige are respectively -1.38 ($p = .08$) and 1.90 ($p = .03$). Given subsamples of about 100 cases each, these levels of significance may seem satisfactory, but the collinearity involving the product terms biases downward the estimated significance of these interactions.

A more accurate picture of the distinct causal structures that operate within the male class groupings is provided by a Chow test of the results of separately regressing adult occupational prestige within male class groupings on the subcultural preference scales and the remaining variables considered in model 4 of Table 4 (Chow 1960; Kennedy 1985, pp. 87-88,186). This test produces a significant F score (2.06, $p < .05$) for the prediction of a difference, given the same model, in the causal structure that operates within class groupings.[8] The contingent effects that reflect this distinctiveness are apparent in the subcultural coefficients from the within class regressions.

The coefficients presented in Table 5 reveal that the effects of subcultural drift in establishing adult status trajectories are contingent on class origins. The total effect of identification with the subculture of delinquency on early adult occupational prestige is only significant and substantial among sons of working- class fathers; the direct effect of identification with this subculture within this context (and only in this context) is also robust. Meanwhile, the effect of adolescent identification with the party subculture is only significant and substantial among sons of non-working-class fathers. This effect is suppressed by the same kinds of educational measures noted above, so that when they are held constant, the direct causal effect of identification with the party subculture is even more pronounced.

Panel A of Table 6 presents *t*-tests of significance of the direct effects of the subculture of delinquency on adult occupational prestige among sons of working-class fathers, compared to the direct effects of this subculture among sons and daughters in the other class contexts; Panel B of this table presents similar tests for the direct effects of the party subculture among sons of non-working-class fathers compared to among sons and daughters in the other class contexts. Five of the resulting six comparisons are significant at the .05 level or above, and the sixth is in the right direction and approaches significance. Both male comparisons are significant. Overall, there is considerable support for hypotheses 4 and 5, that the effects of subcultural drift are contingent on gender and class of origin.

[8] The equation for the Chow test is:

$$F(k, n-2k) = \frac{[SSEn - (SSE1 + SSE2)] / k}{(SSE1 + SSE2) / (n-2k)},$$

where SSEn is the residual sum of squares for the full sample (18,569), SSE1 is the residual sum of squares for the first subsample (6840.2), SSE2 is the residual sum of squares for the second subsample (9286.7), n is the full sample size (250), and k is the number of independent variables (16). In the current case, then, F is 2.06 and is statistically significant at the .05 level. This indicates that the causal structure of the models estimated is distinct within groupings. Pair-wise tests of significance are presented below for differences in specific coefficients.

Table 6. Gender-Specific and Class-Specific Direct Effects of Subcultural Preferences on Adult Status Attainment

		Sons of Working-Class Fathers Compared to:		
A. Subculture of Delinquency	Direct Effects	Sons of Non-Working-Class Fathers	Daughters of Working-Class Fathers	Daughters of Non-Working-Class Fathers
	Difference in b's	1.755	1.774	1.348
	t-value of difference	1.844*	2.002*	1.097
		Sons of Non-Working-Class Fathers Compared to:		
B. Party Subculture	Direct Effects	Sons of Working-Class Fathers	Daughters of Working-Class Fathers	Daughters of Non-Working-Class Fathers
	Difference in b's	2.531	1.891	1.878
	t-value of difference	2.724**	1.914*	1.700*

* $p < .05$ (one-tailed) ** $p < .01$ (one-tailed)

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

My findings encourage researchers of deviance and stratification to broaden their visions of their fields. For example, one of the established findings in sociological criminology is that crime peaks in adolescence (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1983). However, sociological criminologists too often regard this finding as the endpoint of their research. What becomes of the former delinquents? Almost all cease their criminal activity, but this does not mean that earlier delinquent experiences are of no significance. I have found that identification with the subculture of delinquency has negative effects on trajectories of early adult occupational attainment for males with working-class origins, while males with non-working-class origins who identify with the delinquent subculture are apparently shielded from its deleterious effects. This becomes apparent only when one extends the traditional focus of subcultural research to include both the causes of delinquency and a consideration of its consequences as well.

The benefits of integrating research on deviance and stratification are not one-sided. Stratification theory and research have been enriched in recent years by the incorporation of concepts as diverse as luck and cultural capital. Still, stratification research is usually characterized by the conception of well-socialized actors who tend to be directed, if not driven, to their status destinations. Control theory and Matza's concept of drift counter balance this conceptualization by broadening considerations of the family and school to include conditions of relative looseness as well as constraint, and by noting ways that adolescents are set free to drift into a range of subcultural preferences that are as central to teenage life as middlebrow and higher cultural interests. Broadened in this way, the cultural stratification paradigm acknowledges the probable effects of a range of cultural experiences in the transition to adulthood.

Finally, my findings point to the role of a party subculture that may socialize non-working-class males to participate in the kinds of pursuits that are later a part of male-bounded social networks. Old- as well as new-boy networks incorporate in their leisure pursuits much of what Matza had in mind (e.g., gambling, drinking and other mildly disreputable pleasures) when he spoke of a subterranean convergence between the avocations of adolescent and adult males. Although the party subculture lowers educational attainment among adolescents, when the effects of this are removed among males of non-working-class origins the resulting effect of the party subculture is positive.[9] Only a minority of youth with a party orientation avoid correlated problems of lower educational performance, as shown by this

[9] Gender stratification and stereotyping of this kind of "party" activity is an explanation cited for why female lawyers, for example, are less successful than male lawyers in recruiting male clients and for what is often called the "rainmaking" function in law firms. Thus a respondent in Epstein's (1981) study of *Women in Law* says succinctly of the "drinking routine" for network building, "There are a lot of mechanisms one can use to be informal that simply don't work in heterosexual situations, although in all-male settings they work very well" (p. 287).

statistical control. Nonetheless, this is a particularly intriguing minority group, and the specificity and strength of this suppression effect deserves further study.

My findings support the thesis that adolescents form distinct and internally coherent subcultural preferences that have class-specific effects on their trajectories toward adult occupational prestige. Further exploration of these effects promises to illuminate new paths of influence in our understanding of status attainment.

JOHN HAGAN is Professor of Sociology and Law and a Killam Research Fellow at the University of Toronto. He is also current President of the American Society of Criminology. His current research focuses on the causes and consequences of delinquency and crime in the life course, and on the professional and personal lives of lawyers. His book, Structural Criminology *(Polity and Rutgers University Press, 1989), received the Outstanding Scholarship Award from the Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, and the Distinguished Scholar Award from the Crime, Law and Deviance section of the American Sociological Association.*

Appendix 1. Gender-Specific Probit Models for Panel Retention and Labor Force Participation

I estimated separate probit models for males and females for retention in the second wave survey and labor force participation. I reasoned that retention would be influenced by the kinds of social competency and stability that are involved in maintaining an updated driver's licence registration and telephone listing. Respondents overall were more likely to be retained in the second wave survey if in the first survey they rated their school performance more highly, lived with both parents, were from central Canada, moved less, and lived in a single detached home. When these variables were included in gender-specific probit equations for retention, living with both parents significantly influenced male retention, while self-rated ability significantly influenced female retention ($p < .01$).

I reasoned that institutional commitments to schooling, family and work might influence labor force participation, considering marriage, childbearing, school attendance, and work commitment. As expected, the probit results indicated that female respondents were less likely to work if they had children, and that both men and women were less likely to work if they were in school ($p < .01$).

All subcultural preference and status attainment equations estimated in this paper are corrected for selection bias resulting from retention and labor force participation. The most significant results of these corrections involve labor force participation and occur in the estimation of the male status attainment equations. These corrections do not notably influence the estimated coefficients, but they do increase our confidence in them.

Appendix Table 1. Probit Equations for Male and Female Retention in Second Wave of Panel

Variable	Description	Males (N = 373) Coeff.	*t*-value	Females (N = 320) Coeff.	*t*-value
Intercept		-.561	-1.511	-.306	-.572
Self-evaluated ability	See ability in Table 2	.149	1.689*	.251	1.948**
Lived with both parents	1 = both parents	.375	2.336**	.073	.423
From central Canada	1 = central Canada	.369	1.828*	.021	.087
Residential mobility	1-5 = number of moves	-.004	-.061	-.066	-1.030
Parents' home	1 = single detached	.268	1.632*	.147	.832
Log-likelihood		-212.73		-193.14	
χ^2		17.936		7.997	
p		.003		.156	

* $p < .05$ (one-tailed) ** $p < .01$ (one-tailed)

Appendix Table 2. Probit Equations for Male and Female Participation in Labor Force in Second Wave of Panel

Variable	Description	Males (N = 268) Coeff.	*t*-value	Females (N = 222) Coeff.	*t*-value
Intercept		1.698	8.733**	1.670	4.457**
Married	1 = married	.456	1.434	-.340	-1.241
Children	1 = children	-.593	-1.837*	-1.242	-4.180**
In School	1 = school	-2.37	-4.492**	-1.969	-2.914**
Work commitment after children	1 = will work	—	—	.299	1.119
Log-likelihood		-53.935		-82.772	
χ^2		24.116		49.816	
p		.000		.000	

* $p < .05$ (one-tailed) ** $p < .01$ (one-tailed)

REFERENCES

Berk, Richard. 1983. "An Introduction to Sample Selection Bias in Sociological Data." *American Sociological Review* 48:386-97.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1973. "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction." Pp. 71-112 in *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change* edited by R. Brown. London: Tavistock.

_____. 1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

_____. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bordua, David. 1961. "Delinquent Subcultures: Sociological Interpretations of Gang Delinquency." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 338:119-36.

Campbell, Ernest. 1969. "Adolescent Socialization." Pp. 861-84 in *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*, edited by D. Goslin. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Chow, Gregory. 1960. "Tests of Equality Between Sets of Coefficients in two Linear Regressions." *Econometrica* 28:591-605.

Cohen, Albert. 1955. *Delinquent Boys*. New York: Free Press.

Coleman, James. 1961. *The Adolescent Society*. New York: Free Press.

Collins, Randall. 1975. *Conflict Sociology: Toward an Explanatory Science*. New York: Academic Press.

_____. 1979. *The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification*. New York: Academic Press.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1982. "Cultural Capital and School Success: The Impact of Status Culture Participation on the Grades of U.S. High School Students." *American Sociological Review* 47:189-201.

_____. 1987. "Classification in Art." *American Sociological Review* 52:440-55.

DiMaggio, Paul and John Mohr. 1985. "Cultural Capital, Educational Attainment and Marital Selection." *American Journal of Sociology* 90:1231-61.

Elder, Glen. 1980. "Adolescence in Historical Perspective." Pp. 3-46 in *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*, edited by J. Adelson. New York: Wiley.

_____. 1985. *Life Course Dynamics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Epstein, Cynthia. 1981. *Women in Law*. New York: Basic Books.

Ghodsian, M. and C. Power. 1987. "Alcohol Consumption Between the Ages of 16 and 23 in Britain: A Longitudinal Study." *British Journal of Addiction* 82:175-80.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. 1950. *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

_____. 1968. *Delinquents and Nondelinquents in Perspective*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goode, William. 1978. *The Celebration of Heroes: Prestige as a Social Control System*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hagan, John, A. R. Gillis and John Simpson. 1988. "Feminist Scholarship, Relational and Instrumental Control and a Power-Control Theory of Gender and Delinquency." *British Journal of Sociology* 39:301-36.

_____. 1990. "Clarifying and Extending Power-Control Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 95:1024-37.

Hagan, John and Alberto Palloni. 1988. "Crimes as Social Events in the Life Course: Reconceiving a Criminological Controversy." *Criminology* 26:87-100.

_____. 1990. "The Social Reproduction of a Criminal Class in Working Class London, Circa 1950-80." *American Journal of Sociology* 96:265-99.

Hall, Stuart and T. Jefferson. 1976. *Resistance Through Rituals*. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Hebdige, Dick. 1984. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. London: Methuen.

Heckman, James. 1979. "Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error." *Econometrica* 45:153-61.

Hindelang, Michael, Travis Hirschi, and Joseph Weis. 1981. *Measuring Delinquency*. Beverly Hills:Sage.

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hirschi, Travis and Michael Gottfredson. 1983. "Age and the Explanation of Crime." *American Journal of Sociology* 89:552-84.

Hollingshead, August. 1949. *Elmtown's Youth: The Impact of Social Classes on Adolescents*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Jencks, Christopher, Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary Jo Bane, David Cohen, Herbert Gintis, Barbara Heyns and Stephen Michelson. 1972. *Inequality*. New York: Basic.

Jessor, Richard, John Donovan and Frances Costa. Forthcoming. *Beyond Adolescence: Problem Behavior and Young Adult Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Katsillis, John and Richard Rubinson. 1990. "Cultural Capital, Student Achievement, and Educational Reproduction: The Case of Greece." *American Sociological Review* 55:270-79.

Katz, Jack. 1989. *Seductions of Crime*. New York: Basic Books.

Kennedy, Peter. 1985. *A Guide to Econometrics*. 2d ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Lemert, Edwin. 1951. *Social Pathology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Matza, David. 1964. *Delinquency and Drift*. New York: Wiley.

Modell, John, Frank Furstenberg, and Theodore Hershberg. 1976. "Social Change and the Transition to Adulthood in Historical Perspective." *Journal of Family History* 1:7-32.

Newcomb, M. D. and P. M. Bentler. 1988. *Conse-*

quences of Adolescent Drug Use: Impact on the Lives of Young Adults. Newbury Park: Sage.

Nye, F. Ivan. 1958. *Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior*. New York: Wiley.

Otto, Luther and Duane Alwin. 1977. "Athletics, Aspirations and Attainments." *Sociology of Education* 42:102-13.

Otto, Luther and David Featherman. 1975. "Social Structural and Psychological Antecedents of Self-Estrangement and Powerlessness." *American Sociological Review* 40:701-19.

Porterfield, Austin. 1943. "Delinquency and Its Outcome in Court and College." *American Journal of Sociology* 49:199-208.

Power, C. and V. Estaugh. 1990. "Employment and Drinking in Early Adulthood: A Longitudinal Perspective." *British Journal of Addiction* 85:487-94.

Robins, Lee. 1966. *Deviant Children Grown Up*. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins.

Roe, Keith. 1984. *Mass Media and Adolescent Schooling: Conflict or Co-existence?* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International.

Sampson, Robert and John Laub. 1990. "Stability and Change in Crime and Deviance over the Life Course: The Salience of Adult Social Bonds." *American Sociological Review* 55:609-27.

Schwendinger, Herman and Julia Siegel Schwendinger. 1985. *Adolescent Subcultures and Delinquency*. New York: Praeger.

Short, James and Fred Strodtbeck. 1965. *Group Process and Gang Delinquency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sykes, Gresham and David Matza. 1957. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." *American Sociological Review* 22:664-70.

_____. 1961. "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values." *American Sociological Review* 26:712-19.

Treiman, Donald. 1977. *Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Academic Press.

Veblen, Thorsten. 1934. *The Theory of the Leisure Class*. New York: Viking Press.

Weber, Max. [1968] 1972. *Economy and Society* edited by G. Roth and C. Wittich. New York: Bedminster.

Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning to Labour*. London: Saxon House.

Wright, Erik Olin. 1978. "Race, Class and Income Inequality." *American Journal of Sociology* 83:1368-97.

Yinger, J. M. 1960. "Contraculture and Subculture." *American Sociological Review* 25:625-35.