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Abstract

In this study, various teenage male students, who identified themselves as being of Puerto Rican descent, were surveyed. The subjects were administered a self-report survey, which included a series of questions related to their academic performance and delinquency. The survey questions related to delinquency included general delinquency, drug and alcohol use, fighting, and more serious crimes. It is hypothesized that those students who have greater academic performance will be less likely to commit delinquent acts.

**Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there was a relationship between academic performance and delinquency among teenagers of Puerto Rican descent. This study examined the students’ academic grade point averages in comparison to their levels of delinquency. Specifically, the study examined drug and alcohol use, physical violence, general delinquency, and more serious criminal offenses. According to Travis Hirschi, those individuals who have strong attachments and beliefs, such as that of academic performance, are less likely to commit in delinquent actions. The hypothesis for this study is that those students who have greater academic performance, i.e. higher grade point averages, will be less likely to commit acts of delinquency. This hypothesis will be tested using the information provided, which examines the relationship between academic performance and delinquency.

**Literature Review**

Created in 1969, Travis Hirschi’s Social Bond theory has since been widely used by sociologists and criminologists to explain individuals’ delinquency and other social issues. Hirschi stated in his theory that there are four basic elements to the social bond theory, which are attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief (Van Gundy-Yoder, 2007). Attachment can be described as the level of values and/or norms that an individual holds in their society. Commitment is the level of commitment an individual has to abide by legal behavior. The norms and values that are taught to individuals in their adolescent years help shape how these individuals will behave in adulthood. The third bond, involvement, is the person’s choice to get involved in conventional versus deviant behavior, i.e. activities. The last bond is described as an individual’s belief that things are important (Van Gundy-Yoder, 2007).

Hirschi argues that the more weakened the groups to which the individual belongs and the less they depend on them, the more they will recognize no other rules of conduct of than their own. This will lead to the individual committing delinquent acts if they believe it will benefit them in some way. Many researchers have used this theory to test why some adolescents commit deviant acts and partake in delinquent behaviors. Most associate lack of social bonds as the reason to why adolescents are committing acts of deviance. Some researchers have argued that commitment plays a substantial role in determining an individual’s level of deviance. In a study of the subculture of violence and delinquency, it was suggested that the adolescent individuals would create their own subculture revolving around violence, and would then choose to be committed to those values rather than the values of society (Felson, Liska, South, & McNulty, 1994). The researchers used their findings to explain violence in school systems. They stated that, in schools where academics are not highly valued, students are more likely to create their own rules and subcultures in order to fulfill their commitment needs (Felson, Liska, South, & McNulty, 1994).

Lack of involvement in a student’s life could be seen as a reason why they are committing delinquent acts. Researchers have suggested that individuals who are involved in after-school activities, such as clubs or athletic teams, are less likely to have the time to behave in a delinquent manner (Agnew, 1985). However, a study completed by Patricia Jenkins suggests that involvement is the weakest of the four social bonds in predicting delinquency. The data suggest that school involvement has no significant independent effect of school delinquency (Jenkins, 1997). There are also researchers who state that lack of belief causes individuals to commit criminal acts. If an individual does not believe that the laws of society are appropriate, they are less likely to obey them than those individuals who hold a higher belief in the law. As with the law, if students do not believe in the school system or the importance of academics, they are not likely to behave in a manner that would benefits them academically, they are more likely to engage in delinquent behaviors, such as drinking, drug use, fighting, etc.

According to Hirschi’s theory, the loosening of social ties to the school is a causal factor in the development of delinquency among adolescents (Fanworth, Schweinhart, & Berrueta-Clement, 2014). What some researchers have found, however, is that the majority of delinquent students come from schools that are in low-income areas. There is now the question of whether the delinquency is caused by beliefs within the adolescent, or if the low value of schooling is a variable in this delinquency. In a recent study, Marguin and Loeber found that children with lower academic performance tended to offend more frequently, would commit more serious and violent offenses, and persisted in their offending. They stated that the association was stronger for the male students than the female students, and for whites than African Americans. The research also concluded that academic performance was predicative of delinquency independent of the individual’s socioeconomic status (Maguin & Loeber, 2014).

One major question that arises from this research, however, is does poor academic performance precede delinquency, does delinquency precede low academic performance, or are both academic performance and delinquency related? Maguin and Loeber’s research shows that the odds of delinquency for children with low academic performance is 2.07-2.11 times higher than for children with high academic performance (Maguin & loeber, 2014). As a way to combat this problem, researchers have devised new academic- and community-based practices. The School of Social Work at the University of Southern Mississippi created the “Neighborhood University,” a delinquency-prevention program. The aim of this program was to improve the academic performance of the children in the community, with the hopes that this improvement would decrease the rates of delinquency (Fornster & Rehner, 2014). What the researchers discovered was the improvement of the students’ academic abilities and interest decreased the rates of delinquency in the area. Using this information, we can assume there is a relationship between academic performance and delinquency.

**Survey Site:**

The sample was taken in the Bronx, New York. The families of this area are primarily below the poverty line, with 73.7% of the households having earned a total income of less than $10,000. Most of the families live in urban, public housing, and the home ownership rates of the families in the area are relatively low. Of the households sampled, 70.8% received public assistance in the previous year.

| N | Valid | 1071 |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Missing | 6 |

| **marital status** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | married | 342 | 31.8 | 31.9 | 31.9 |
| separated | 248 | 23.0 | 23.2 | 55.1 |
| divorced | 162 | 15.0 | 15.1 | 70.2 |
| widowed | 71 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 76.8 |
| never married | 248 | 23.0 | 23.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1071 | 99.4 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | -1 | 6 | .6 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

The vast majority of the parental respondents of this survey are the mother, so it is worth noting that only 17.7% were employed, where 72% classified themselves as a homemaker. Of those who had a spouse, only 30.8% were employed.

|  | | R employment status | spouse employment status |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N | Valid | 1072 | 1013 |
| Missing | 5 | 64 |

**Frequency Table**

| **R employment status** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | employed | 190 | 17.6 | 17.7 | 17.7 |
| unemployed | 50 | 4.6 | 4.7 | 22.4 |
| retired/disabled | 26 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 24.8 |
| student | 34 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 28.0 |
| homemaker | 772 | 71.7 | 72.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1072 | 99.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | -1 | 5 | .5 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

| **spouse employment status** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 0 | 512 | 47.5 | 50.5 | 50.5 |
| employed | 312 | 29.0 | 30.8 | 81.3 |
| unemployed | 91 | 8.4 | 9.0 | 90.3 |
| retired/disabled | 49 | 4.5 | 4.8 | 95.2 |
| student | 7 | .6 | .7 | 95.9 |
| homemaker | 30 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 98.8 |
| something else | 9 | .8 | .9 | 99.7 |
| 8 | 3 | .3 | .3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1013 | 94.1 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | -1 | 64 | 5.9 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

For the child respondents, it is worth noting which of the 1077 were attending school in the previous year. Listed below is the chart of this data. Approximately 90.5% of the respondents were attending school in the previous year, which equates to be 975 out of the 1077.

| **Statistics** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| school last year | | |
| N | Valid | 1077 |
| Missing | 0 |

| **school last year** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | Yes | 975 | 90.5 | 90.5 | 90.5 |
| No | 102 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1077 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

**Method:**

This secondary data analysis will utilize the data gathered by the Hispanic Research Center at Fodham University in 1986 in the Bronx, New York. The funding for this research was provided by the National Institute for Mental Health and the principle investigator was Dr. Orlando Rodriquez. The sample was made up of Puerto Rican males ranging from 12 to 19 years old. The sample was randomly selected and comprised of 1077 participants.

This research will attempt to determine whether or not there is significance between academic performance and rates of delinquency. The dependent variables for this analysis will be in the form of the respondent’s rate of delinquency, specifically drug and alcohol use, violent behavior, general delinquency, and major criminal acts. The independent variables will be the respondent’s academic performance, specifically their study habits, grade point averages, and if they were currently enrolled in school at the time of the survey.

**Findings:**

Throughout the findings, the independent variable academic performance will be used and compared to acts of self-reported delinquency by the respondents. The independent variable academic performance was defined by studying (afternoon, after dinner, weekends), GPA, and types of courses taken in school.

| **Gpa** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 55 and less | 18 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| 56-69 | 57 | 5.3 | 8.4 | 11.0 |
| 70-79 | 253 | 23.5 | 37.3 | 48.3 |
| 80-89 | 294 | 27.3 | 43.3 | 91.6 |
| 90-100 | 57 | 5.3 | 8.4 | 100.0 |
| Total | 679 | 63.0 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | -1 | 396 | 36.8 |  |  |
| 9 | 2 | .2 |  |  |
| Total | 398 | 37.0 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

| **study in the afternoon** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | none | 154 | 14.3 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| one | 107 | 9.9 | 13.9 | 33.9 |
| two | 153 | 14.2 | 19.9 | 53.8 |
| three | 148 | 13.7 | 19.2 | 73.0 |
| four | 83 | 7.7 | 10.8 | 83.8 |
| five | 125 | 11.6 | 16.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 770 | 71.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | 9 | 307 | 28.5 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

| **study after dinner** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | none | 252 | 23.4 | 32.7 | 32.7 |
| one | 113 | 10.5 | 14.7 | 47.4 |
| two | 154 | 14.3 | 20.0 | 67.4 |
| three | 102 | 9.5 | 13.2 | 80.6 |
| four | 63 | 5.8 | 8.2 | 88.8 |
| five | 86 | 8.0 | 11.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 770 | 71.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | 9 | 307 | 28.5 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

| **study on weekends** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | none | 226 | 21.0 | 29.4 | 29.4 |
| very little | 126 | 11.7 | 16.4 | 45.7 |
| not too much | 158 | 14.7 | 20.5 | 66.2 |
| 4 | 1 | .1 | .1 | 66.4 |
| some | 147 | 13.6 | 19.1 | 85.5 |
| quite a bit | 80 | 7.4 | 10.4 | 95.8 |
| a great deal | 32 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 770 | 71.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | 9 | 307 | 28.5 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

| **type of classes taken** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | college prep | 65 | 6.0 | 15.6 | 15.6 |
| vocational courses | 129 | 12.0 | 30.9 | 46.4 |
| general | 220 | 20.4 | 52.6 | 99.0 |
| 7 | 4 | .4 | 1.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 418 | 38.8 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | -1 | 652 | 60.5 |  |  |
| 9 | 7 | .6 |  |  |
| Total | 659 | 61.2 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

The dependent variable for this study is defined as number of times the respondent cheated in school, the total number of times they used drugs, number of general delinquency offenses, and number of minor assault offenses. Drug use (DrugUse2), general delinquency offenses (generaldelin2), and minor assault offenses (minorassault2) were recoded.

| **Attitude Deviance A cheat school** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | not wrong | 14 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| a little wrong | 141 | 13.1 | 13.2 | 14.5 |
| wrong | 393 | 36.5 | 36.7 | 51.1 |
| 3 | 1 | .1 | .1 | 51.2 |
| 4 | 1 | .1 | .1 | 51.3 |
| very wrong | 522 | 48.5 | 48.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1072 | 99.5 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | 9 | 5 | .5 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

| **minorassault2** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | none | 679 | 63.0 | 63.1 | 63.1 |
| 1-5 | 299 | 27.8 | 27.8 | 90.9 |
| 6-10 | 48 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 95.4 |
| 11-20 | 23 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 97.5 |
| 21-30 | 13 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 98.7 |
| 31 and more | 14 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1076 | 99.9 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 1 | .1 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

| **DrugUse2** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | none | 998 | 92.7 | 92.8 | 92.8 |
| once | 15 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 94.2 |
| twice | 14 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 95.5 |
| three times | 8 | .7 | .7 | 96.3 |
| four times | 3 | .3 | .3 | 96.6 |
| five times | 2 | .2 | .2 | 96.7 |
| six and more times | 35 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1075 | 99.8 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 2 | .2 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

| **generaldelin2** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | none | 406 | 37.7 | 37.7 | 37.7 |
| 1-5 | 261 | 24.2 | 24.3 | 62.0 |
| 6-10 | 86 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 70.0 |
| 11-20 | 81 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 77.5 |
| 21-30 | 43 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 81.5 |
| 32-50 | 37 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 84.9 |
| 51-100 | 65 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 91.0 |
| 101 and more | 97 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 1076 | 99.9 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 1 | .1 |  |  |
| Total | | 1077 | 100.0 |  |  |

Minor assaults, drug use, and general delinquency were recoded in order to create more manageable groupings and to effectively deal with any outliers.

**Examination #1**

This first examination compares academic performance and attitudes about cheating in school. The independent variables of GPA, studying, and types of classes will be examined in relation to the dependent variable of attitudes about cheating in school. The research hypothesis will show a relationship between the IV and the DV, while the null hypothesis will show no relationship.

| Attitude Deviance A cheat school | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| N | Valid | 1072 |
| Missing | 5 |
| Mean | | 3.33 |
| Median | | 3.00 |
| Mode | | 4 |
| Std. Deviation | | .750 |

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attitude Deviance A cheat school | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 4.692 | 4 | 1.173 | 2.282 | .059 |
| Within Groups | 449.218 | 874 | .514 |  |  |
| Total | 453.910 | 878 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA of GPA and attitudes on cheating in school were not significant, meaning GPA does not have an effect on attitudes about cheating in school. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attitude Deviance A cheat school | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 12.527 | 5 | 2.505 | 4.712 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 511.491 | 962 | .532 |  |  |
| Total | 524.018 | 967 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA of studying in the afternoon and attitudes on cheating in school were significant, meaning studying in the afternoon has an effect on attitudes about cheating in school. Therefore, the research hypothesis was accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attitude Deviance A cheat school | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 4.957 | 5 | .991 | 1.838 | .103 |
| Within Groups | 519.921 | 964 | .539 |  |  |
| Total | 524.878 | 969 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA of studying after dinner and attitudes on cheating in school were not significant, meaning studying after dinner has no effect on attitudes about cheating in school. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attitude Deviance A cheat school | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 7.481 | 5 | 1.496 | 2.787 | .017 |
| Within Groups | 516.967 | 963 | .537 |  |  |
| Total | 524.448 | 968 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA of studying on the weekends and attitudes on cheating in school were significant, meaning studying on the weekends has an effect on attitudes about cheating in school. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Attitude Deviance A cheat school | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 4.220 | 3 | 1.407 | 1.857 | .140 |
| Within Groups | 99.215 | 131 | .757 |  |  |
| Total | 103.435 | 134 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA of types of classes taken and attitudes on cheating in school were no significant, meaning types of classes taken has no effect on attitudes about cheating in school. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Examination #2**

The second examination compares academic performance and minor assaults. The independent variables are GPA, studying, and types of classes will be examined in relation to the dependent variable of total number of minor assaults committed by the respondent. The research hypothesis will show a relationship between the IV and DV, while the null hypothesis will show no relationship.

| **Statistics** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # of minor assault offenses | | | | |
| N | Valid | | 1076 | |
| Missing | | 1 | |
| Mean | | | 2.4628 | |
| Median | | | .0000 | |
| Mode | | | .00 | |
| Std. Deviation | | | 8.81233 | |
| **ANOVA** | | | | | | | | |
| minorassault2 | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Sum of Squares | | df | | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | | 19.597 | | 4 | | 4.899 | 5.903 | .000 |
| Within Groups | | 728.677 | | 878 | | .830 |  |  |
| Total | | 748.274 | | 882 | |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA of GPA and total number of minor assaults were significant, meaning GPA has an effect on total number of minor assaults. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| minorassault2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 33.487 | 5 | 6.697 | 8.250 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 784.179 | 966 | .812 |  |  |
| Total | 817.667 | 971 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA of studying in the afternoon and total number of minor assaults were significant, meaning studying in the afternoon has an effect on total number of minor assaults. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepte

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| minorassault2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 15.487 | 5 | 3.097 | 3.708 | .002 |
| Within Groups | 808.530 | 968 | .835 |  |  |
| Total | 824.017 | 973 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA of studying after dinner and total number of minor assaults were significant, meaning studying after dinner has an effect on total number of minor assaults. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| minorassault2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 30.289 | 5 | 6.058 | 7.493 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 781.738 | 967 | .808 |  |  |
| Total | 812.027 | 972 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on studying on the weekends and total number of minor assaults were significant, meaning studying on the weekends has an effect on total number of minor assaults. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| minorassault2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 1.634 | 3 | .545 | .794 | .499 |
| Within Groups | 89.120 | 130 | .686 |  |  |
| Total | 90.754 | 133 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on types of classes taken and total number of minor assaults were not significant, meaning types of classes taken has no effect on total number of minor assaults. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Examination 3#**

The third examination compares academic performance and drug use. The independent variables are GPA, studying, and types of classes will be examined in relation to the dependent variable of drug use by the respondent. The research hypothesis will show a relationship between the IV and DV, while the null hypothesis will show no relationship.

| **Statistics** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of times used drugs | | |
| N | Valid | 1075 |
| Missing | 2 |
| Mean | | 2.4419 |
| Median | | .0000 |
| Mode | | .00 |
| Std. Deviation | | 34.17461 |

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DrugUse2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 2.463 | 4 | .616 | 1.009 | .402 |
| Within Groups | 535.017 | 877 | .610 |  |  |
| Total | 537.480 | 881 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on GPA and drug use were not significant, meaning GPA has no effect on drug use. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DrugUse2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 9.670 | 5 | 1.934 | 2.087 | .065 |
| Within Groups | 894.365 | 965 | .927 |  |  |
| Total | 904.035 | 970 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on studying in the afternoon and drug use were not significant, meaning studying on the weekends has no effect on drug use. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DrugUse2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 3.631 | 5 | .726 | .780 | .564 |
| Within Groups | 900.482 | 967 | .931 |  |  |
| Total | 904.113 | 972 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on studying after dinner and drug use were not significant, meaning studying after dinner has no effect on drug use. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DrugUse2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 17.272 | 5 | 3.454 | 3.763 | .002 |
| Within Groups | 886.802 | 966 | .918 |  |  |
| Total | 904.074 | 971 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on studying on the weekends and drug use were significant, meaning studying on the weekends has an effect on drug use. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DrugUse2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 1.184 | 3 | .395 | .325 | .807 |
| Within Groups | 515.576 | 425 | 1.213 |  |  |
| Total | 516.760 | 428 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on types of classes taken and drug use were not significant, meaning types of classes taken has no effect on drug use. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted.

**Examination #4**

The third examination compares academic performance and general delinquency. The independent variables are GPA, studying, and types of classes will be examined in relation to the dependent variable of total amount of general delinquency by the respondent. The research hypothesis will show a relationship between the IV and DV, while the null hypothesis will show no relationship.

| **Statistics** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total number of general delinquency offenses** | | | | | | | | |
| N | Valid | | 1076 | |
| Missing | | 1 | |
| Mean | | | 24.2695 | |
| Median | | | 2.0000 | |
| Mode | | | .00 | |
| Std. Deviation | | | 54.84128 | |
| **ANOVA** | | | | | | | | |
| generaldelin2 | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Sum of Squares | | df | | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | | 229.002 | | 4 | | 57.251 | 12.023 | .000 |
| Within Groups | | 4180.669 | | 878 | | 4.762 |  |  |
| Total | | 4409.672 | | 882 | |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on GPA and total amount of general delinquency were significant, meaning GPA has an effect on total amount of general delinquency. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| generaldelin2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 246.813 | 5 | 49.363 | 9.926 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 4803.955 | 966 | 4.973 |  |  |
| Total | 5050.769 | 971 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on studying in the afternoon and total amount of general delinquency were significant, meaning studying in the afternoon has an effect on total amount of general delinquency. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| generaldelin2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 131.937 | 5 | 26.387 | 5.161 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 4948.774 | 968 | 5.112 |  |  |
| Total | 5080.710 | 973 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on studying after dinner and total amount of general delinquency were significant, meaning studying after dinner has an effect on total amount of general delinquency. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| generaldelin2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 298.748 | 5 | 59.750 | 12.126 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 4764.740 | 967 | 4.927 |  |  |
| Total | 5063.488 | 972 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on studying on the weekends and total amount of general delinquency were significant, meaning studying on the weekends has an effect on general delinquency. Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted.

| **ANOVA** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| generaldelin2 | | | | | |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 3.684 | 3 | 1.228 | .212 | .888 |
| Within Groups | 2468.028 | 426 | 5.793 |  |  |
| Total | 2471.712 | 429 |  |  |  |

The results of the One-Way ANOVA on types of classes taken and total amount of general delinquency were not significant, meaning types of classes taken has no effect on total amount of general delinquency.

**Results and Discussion:**

Examination #1

This examination looked at the respondents’ academic performance compared to attitudes about cheating in school. Each independent variable was analyzed in comparison with the dependent variable, and the results somewhat supported the hypothesis.

When comparing grade point average to attitudes about cheating in school, there was a lack of statistical significance between the two variables leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. One possible reason for the lack of relationship between GPA and attitudes about cheating might be that those students who believe cheating is not morally wrong are those who are willing to cheat to earn a better grade, putting them in the group of students with higher GPAs. After analyzing the charts for comparing types of classes taken and attitudes about cheating in school, the data revealed there was no relationship; therefore the null hypothesis was accepted.

After examining the charts, the data did support the research hypothesis between the two variables of studying in the afternoon and attitudes on cheating in school. The data also supports the research hypothesis when the variables of studying on the weekends and attitudes on cheating in school were examined. However, there was no relationship between studying after dinner and attitudes on cheating in school.

Examination #2

The second examination compared academic performance to total number of minor assaults committed by the respondents. The data resulting from this research suggests that, for the most part, there is a relationship between academic performance and total number of minor assaults committed.

After examining the charts, the data suggests that there is a relationship between grade point average and total number of minor assaults. Similarly, there is a relationship between total number of assaults and all three times for studying (afternoon, after dinner, and on the weekends). However, there appeared to be no relationship between the types of classes being taken and total number of minor assaults committed by the respondents.

While the One-Way ANOVA does not state what type of relationship there is between the variables, it is possible to assume that those respondents who take their academic performance more seriously are less likely to engage in the act of minor assault. One reason for this could be that those individuals who study in the afternoons, after dinner, and on the weekends are more likely to have a higher grade point average, and consequently less likely to have the time to commit delinquent acts. These individuals are also possibly less likely to associate with those individuals who engage in delinquent acts, such as committing minor assault.

Examination #3

The third examination compared the respondents’ academic performance to total amount of drug use. The dependent variable of drug use was arranged into a broad category, with no data relating to specific types of drugs. The majority of the data suggested there was no relationship between academic performance and drug use. For four of the five statistical tests run, the null hypothesis was supported.

The data charts suggest that grade point average has no statistical effect on total drug use. The data also suggests that whether the participant studied in the afternoon or after dinner has no effect on whether they are likely to participate in drug use. However, the research does suggest a relationship between studying on the weekends and total amount of drug use. As with the first three examinations, types of classes taken have no effect on total amount of drug use.

It was interesting to see that all variables, with the exception of studying on the weekends, have no effect on total amount of drug use. I had hypothesized that academic performance would have had an impact on drug use, specifically that those who had higher academic performance would be less inclined to use drugs. However, this was not the case, and the data suggests that there is no relationship between the two variables.

Examination #4

The fourth examination for this research compared academic performance to general delinquency. General delinquency was chosen as the dependent variable as a way to encompass multiple types of delinquency that were not mentioned specifically in the data given. After examining the data, one can conclude that there is a relationship between academic performance and total amount of general delinquency.

The data charts suggest that there is a relationship between grade point average and general delinquency. Similarly, the data suggests that there is a relationship between all times of studying (afternoon, after dinner, and on the weekends) and total amount of general delinquency. However, as with all previous tests before this, there seemed to be no relationship between types of classes taken by the respondents and total amount of general delinquency.

**Conclusion:**

After examining and analyzing the data, it can be concluded that the research hypothesis was only partially supported. Academic performance seemed to only have an effect on total number of minor assaults and total number of general delinquent acts. Academic performance had no effect on total number of drug use, with the exception of the variable “studying on the weekend.” Academic performance had a mixed effect on the respondents’ attitudes on cheating in school, where both the null and research hypothesis were supported.

It was interesting to examine the data that was collected from this study. I did not expect to find that types of classes being taken by the respondent would have no influence on delinquency in any of the examinations. I had believed that those students who were in college prep or vocational classes would have been less likely to engage in delinquent acts, whereas the data does not support this belief. I also found the results from the first examination interesting, where they were completely mixed and did not have a pattern like the three other examinations. I had hypothesized that students who had higher academic performance would have believed that cheating in school was morally wrong.

For future research, I believe it would be interesting and productive to further analyze academic performance on drug use, since in this study I simply looked at total amount of drug use and not specific types of drugs. I would also compare academic performance to more types of delinquency, such as burglary, truancy, and more serious types of offenses, such as rape and other part one offenses.

For this research, I used One-Way ANOVAs to determine if there was a relationship between the variables or not. While this test shows if there is or is not a relationship, it does not give directionality. I would like to recode the variables for future research to be able to use different tests to determine if there is directionality of the relationships that were discovered. I would also have liked to have been able to conduct this research using female participants, instead of all males. I believe it would be interesting to determine if the relationships are the same or if they differ between the two sexes.

Overall, I believe that the data supported the research hypothesis that there is a relationship between academic performance and delinquency, but only partially. I cannot say that there was strong support for the hypothesis, but I also cannot say that the data did not support the hypothesis either. Perhaps with further testing, I can narrow down some variables and add a few others to determine if there is a relationship or not, and what the directionality of that research is.
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