

DEFIANT OR DETERRED? SCHOOL DISCIPLINE PRACTICES, STUDENT
PERCEPTIONS, AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department Criminal Justice and Criminology
Sam Houston State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

by

Addison R. Kobie

December 2020

DEFIANT OR DETERRED? SCHOOL DISCIPLINE PRACTICES, STUDENT
PERCEPTIONS, AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

by

Addison R. Kobie

APPROVED:

Peter Lehmann, PhD
Committee Director

Elisa Toman, PhD
Committee Co-Director

Jurg Gerber, PhD
Committee Member

Phillip Lyons, PhD
Dean, College of Criminal Justice

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wonderful friends and family who always believed in the work that I was doing. I especially would like to thank my grandparents, Claudia Skwiot and Denny Walsh, and my parents Jamie and Harry Kobie which without their unwavering support this work could not have been completed. I would also like to thank my dear friends Stephanie Gibson and Ellen Thibodeau who were invaluable voices of reason during my thesis journey.

ABSTRACT

Kobie, Addison R., *Defiant or deterred? school discipline practices, student perceptions, and juvenile* Master of Arts (Criminal Justice and Criminology), December 2020, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

School disciplinary practices have been linked to increased juvenile delinquency, and these effects have been found to vary according to certain characteristics of youths. However, little is known about how students' perceptions related to school discipline might condition these relationships, despite related developments in the labeling and deterrence literatures more generally. Through the lens of defiance theory (Sherman, 1993), it is possible that some juveniles might respond to suspension/expulsion with "defiance," thus weakening the capacity of these sanctions to deter future delinquency. Using a nationally representative sample, this study examines the characteristics of juveniles and their reactions to school sanctions.

KEY WORDS: Juvenile delinquency, Defiance theory, School discipline, Exclusionary discipline, Student perceptions

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my appreciation and thanks to my committee members Dr. Elisa Toman and Dr. Jurg Gerber, as this thesis would not have been possible without their guidance. I would also like to extend my deepest gratitude to the chair of my committee Dr. Peter Lehmann, who without his valuable advice and patience my thesis would have been impossible to complete. I would also like to thank the invaluable advice and resources provided by the faculty and staff of Sam Houston University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Deterrence Theory	5
Labeling theory	10
Defiance Theory	18
School Discipline.....	25
Racial Inequalities in School Discipline.....	30
Defiance Theory and School Discipline	33
Hypotheses.....	35
CHAPTER III: METHODS	36
Data.....	36
Dependent Variable	36
Independent and Moderating Variables.....	37
Control Variables.....	40
Analytic Strategy	41
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS	42
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION	49

REFERENCES	55
APPENDIX A.....	69
APPENDIX B.....	70
VITA.....	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Descriptive Statistics.....	42
2 Descriptive Statistics by Use of Exclusionary Discipline.....	43
3 Pearson Correlation.....	44
4 OLS Model for Defiance theory with Main Conditions	46
5 OLS Model for Defiance theory with Exclusionary and Defiant Condition Interactions.....	47
6 OLS Model for Defiance theory with Exclusionary, Defiant Condition, and Race Interactions.....	48

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Does punishment reduce or increase offending? Under what circumstances might it do one or the other? According to one of the oldest schools of thought, the primary goal of punishment is deterrence, which theoretically anticipates that certain, swift, and severe punishments should increase the perceived costs associated with crime and, in turn, inhibit offending (Brooks, 2014; Paternoster, 2010). However, in spite of the expectation that punishment deters, this notion stands in stark contrast to the theoretical framework of labeling theory (Matsueda, 2014). Labeling theory's main theoretical tenet suggests that individuals conform to the label given by the punishment process (Becker, 1963).

Therefore, instead of the person being deterred, they assume the label of "deviant" or, in some cases, "criminal." In general, labeling theory states that the individual takes on the stigma of the act committed, meaning that one becomes defined in some way by his/her actions and is profoundly affected by the meanings about them assigned by others. Once a stigma is attached to the individual, it becomes harder for one to reintegrate into society, and thus he or she becomes more likely to continue engaging in deviant actions that gave rise to the stigma (Becker, 1963; Braithwaite, 1989). Thus, labeling theory proposes that punishment, especially when stigmatized, becomes an important factor in why an individual continues offending instead of desisting from crime.

However, labeling theory has had backlash (Hirschi, 1980; Goode, 1975; Klein, 1986; Tittle, 1980). One primary area of concern described in Paternoster and Iovanni's (1989) work was the limited rigorous testing of labeling theory. Overall, general labeling theory research was often not able to account for individual factors or social bonds and

how these factors may affect the adoption of a label (Scimecca, 1977). Furthermore, methodological inconsistencies in labeling theory were also called into question (Ward, 1971). Although more recent tests of labeling theory have addressed some of these issues, the need for further exploration of this perspective—and theoretical enhancements of it—is still necessary.

Sherman's (1993) defiance theory has, in some ways, sought to reconcile some of these critiques, as he integrated prior work to explain individual differences in reactions to labeling (See: Braithwaite 1989, Tyler 1990, Scheff & Retzinger 1991). Specifically, defiance theory aims to predict why individuals may be deterred, non-responsive to punishment, or defiant. In this way, the theory suggests that the differences between the effects of labels across individuals ultimately relates to their reaction to the shame of being labeled. For example, in some instances, an individual accepts the shame of punishment; in others, they will find the shame unfair and not accept it; in still others, they can be unaffected by the shame of punishment. Further, this shame of punishment is most relevant when an individual perceives that the punishment is fair, when one has strong social bonds, and when punishments are seen as discriminatory. In this way, defiance theory can help explain why individuals can react differently to a deviant or criminal label. Furthermore, the theory allows for individual characteristics such as race and ethnicity to be better understood in the labeling theory context.

An area where the defiance theory framework can be effectively applied is that of school discipline. Most notably, the landscape of American middle and high schools has changed demonstrably in the past forty years (Hirschfield, 2008). With the rise of fear of school violence since the 1990s, schools have, in many ways, become more formalized,

and as a result the use of punishments has become so as well (Grioux, 2003; Skiba & Peterson, 1999). Informal controls and interventions increasingly have been replaced by formal measures such as out of school suspensions, expulsions, and in-school correctional officers (Hirschfield, 2008; Giroux, 2003; Kupchik & Monahan, 2006). This switch in punishments suggests that schools have become more punitive, which closely mirrors the formalized nature of the justice system (Grioux, 2003; Skiba & Peterson, 1999). In this way, schools have taken on a similar goal as the correctional system at large; namely, to deter students from breaking school rules. However, it has been suggested that school disciplinary actions further the school-to-prison pipeline (Skiba et al. 2014a), meaning that schools can facilitate the process by which youths become delinquents and offenders. Therefore, studying school disciplinary practices informs not only an understanding of school systems but the criminal justice system as well. Overall, the framework of defiance theory can be helpful for understanding the labeling process in school disciplinary settings. Specifically, at the student level, school discipline can be considered just or unjust and stigmatizing or non-stigmatizing (Braithwaite, 1989), thus producing differences in the effects of suspension and expulsion on future delinquency.

School disciplinary practices, such as suspension and expulsion, have disproportionately affected minority students, especially those who are Black (Losen & Skiba, 2010; Skiba et al., 2014 b; Skiba, Peterson & Williams, 1997). The differences, however, are found to be not fully accounted for by differences in behaviors, although studies have been mixed (Wu et al., 1982; Rocque, 2010; Petras et al., 2011; Hinojosa, 2008; Horner et al., 2010; Huang & Cornell, 2017; See, however: Wright et al., 2014). Furthermore, studies have suggested that unfair treatment towards Black students may

result in defiant reactions to stigmatization, thus resulting in an amplification of these processes among Black youths (Gregory & Weinstein, 2008; Kupchik & Ellis 2008). Additionally, research focusing on the effects of Latino/a students' exposure to school disciplinary practices has been mixed, suggesting that this area should be further studied (Skiba et al., 2011; Gordon, Piana, & Keleher, 2000; Morgan & Wright, 2018).

This paper will address three main issues using nationally representative data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health (Add Health). First, the paper will examine the link between school discipline and delinquency, specifically focused on the effects of out-of-school suspension and expulsion. Then, the paper will investigate the role of defiance as it relates to the connection between school discipline and delinquency, and I will test whether these perceptions moderate this relationship. Finally, the paper will examine how race and ethnicity may further moderate the link between discipline, perceptions of school fairness, and delinquency.

CHAPTER II

Literature review

In the following chapter, a discussion of deterrence and labeling theory's general development, weaknesses, and strengths will be examined. Then, a discussion will be presented on defiance theory and how it relates to labeling theory. Next, previous studies on defiance theory will be reviewed, and areas in which they can be expanded upon will be highlighted. Then, I will provide an overview of contemporary school disciplinary practices, specifically focusing on disparities that have been found concerning race and ethnicity. Finally, a connection between school discipline and the framework of defiance theory will be discussed.

Deterrence Theory

Deterrence theory, as it relates to crime prevention, has roots at the beginning of the classical school of criminology in the works of Cesare Beccaria and Jeremy Bentham (Bruinsma, 2018). Specifically, Beccaria's work, *On Crimes and Punishments* (2009/1764), highlights principles that are the foundation of future deterrence-centered theories. One aspect of deterrence came from social contract theory purposed by Enlightenment authors Locke, Montesquieu, and Rousseau, who suggested that individuals give up a portion of their freedom to get access to society for greater amounts of happiness (Bruinsma, 2018). Therefore, this contract proposes that crime is breaking from this social contract. Given the Enlightenment framework presented, Beccaria supposes that laws should be equally applied, as every individual is a part of the social contract and therefore contributes an equal amount (Beccaria, 2009/ 1764; Bruinsma, 2018). Thus,

Beccaria highlights conditions that will deter individuals from further breaks in social contracts and prevent others who may otherwise commit crimes.

The first of Beccaria's necessary conditions is that punishment happens swiftly after the crime has been committed (Beccaria 2009/1764; Bruinsma, 2018). For example, there should not be a significant delay between the criminal act and the punishment for said act. The next is that the punishment should also be "certain," meaning that it is inevitable and known by the citizens. Next, it is crucial that individuals always receive punishment for the indiscretion and that it is not different between individuals. Thus, the state-sanctioned punishment is expected and fair, allowing for individuals to accept the punishment. The punishment should also be proportional to the harm committed and not necessarily retribution and should not be unnecessarily cruel or harsh but matching in "severity." For example, in Beccaria's time, theft may have been punished by death; however, that severity was way disproportioned from the crime and could cause dissonance between government and individuals. Beccaria, therefore, suggests that individuals are deterred from unwanted deviant actions when punishments are certain, swift, and severe, which creates the foundation of future deterrence work.

These ideas are expanded upon by Jeremy Bentham's work, *The Principles of Morals and Legislation* (2012/1789), which introduces "hedonistic calculus." This concept suggests that individuals seek to maximize pleasure and minimize pain and, in doing so, create a type of equation of what actions had an acceptable level of risk or pain. Thus, a person may not commit a crime if the punishment outweighed the reward they were to receive, which Bentham states are the purpose of deterrence (Bentham 2012/1789). Furthermore, he notes that other variables such as public approval "popularity"

and simplicity are also necessary for deterrent effect (Bentham 2012/1789, Bruinsma, 2018). For example, the public should not find the punishment shocking, nor should the punishment be too complicated. Bentham also suggests that individual characteristics may impact the punishment's equality and should also be accounted for. For example, a fine may need to be matched to a person's wealth to have an equal deterrent effect. This effect can differ because although a fine may be overwhelming for an indigent individual, someone who has enough funds to pay the fine might see it as the price of doing business. Bentham's work brings the assumption to deterrence theory that individuals are rational and pragmatic, which leads to them to make the best possible decision for them. Therefore, deterrence should be used to make actions deemed criminally deviant less valuable than more pro-social actions.

Scholarship has also expanded the complexity of deterrence through the inclusion of the concepts of general and specific deterrence (Paternoster, 2010). General deterrence suggests that seeing individuals being punished for crimes with the deterrent conditions met will prevent others from committing the same act. An example of this type of deterrence may famously see in the nuclear arms race, where escalating actions were deemed to be generally deterred by mutually assured destruction (Long & RAND Corporation, 2008). However, specific deterrence focuses not deterring on the societal level but instead on an individual level (Paternoster, 2010). An example of specific deterrence may be more visually seen in "three-strike" laws, which hopes by increasing minimum prison time for the third offense will deter the individual from committing those offenses as he or she is aware of the increased prison time (Tomlinson, 2016). Such laws inherently have a societal impact, but the goal is to deter the individual from

committing a future crime and not necessarily prevent others from committing a crime in the present.

However, until the 1960s, much of deterrence theory was left scientifically unexamined, meaning that most of these outlined ideas from Beccaria and Bentham had very little empirical study (Nagin, 1998). Thus, much like other criminological theories proposed in the last century, there is a lot left to be explored regarding the validity of deterrence theory. Nevertheless, in the last six decades, there have been strides in empirically examining deterrence theory, which has led to particularly mixed results (Nagin, 1998; Paternoster, 2010).

Empirical Support for Deterrence theory.

Deterrence theory has traditionally been broken up into five main areas: certainty, severity, swiftness, and whether the deterrence was general or specific (Tomlinson, 2016). The focusing of deterrence into different aspects has led to mixed results and overall has caused methodological problems to occur (Tomlinson, 2016; Kovandzic, 2001; Paternoster & Innovani, 1986; Grasmick & Bryjak, 1980; Nagin & Paternoster, 1991). For example, in his recent review of the deterrence literature, Nagin (2013) states that different aspects of deterrence, such as certainty of apprehension, have more evidence than the severity of punishment. Furthermore, he states that there is a range of empirical proof ranging from none to substantial in different deterrence (Nagin, 2013). These problems have led to many conclusions that deterrence theory has little to no empirical proof (Kovandzic, 2001; Matthews & Agnew 2008; Nagin & Paternoster 1991; Pratt, Cullen, Blevins, Daigle, & Madensen, 2017). For example, Mathew and Agnew's (2008) study found that the concept of certainty only deterred youths with no or few

delinquent peers. Furthermore, in some studies, the opposite conclusion of deterrence was found: the more individuals were punished, the less likely they were to desist from deviancy (Schneider & Ervin, 1990; Becker, 1963; Barrick 2013; Petrosino, Petrosino, & Guckenburg, 2010).

However, strides have been made to recontextualize some of the methodological issues found in deterrence theory. For example, Stafford and Warr (1993) suggest that it is unlikely for people to only be affected by specific or general deterrence and that instead, both could have both factors. For example, an individual could have been punished and also seen punishment to individuals close to them, therefore, suggesting that deterrence is a more complex definition than previously assumed and maybe more generalized as well (Stafford & Warr, 1993). Furthermore, Nagin and Pogarsky (2001) found that, when integrating the different concepts of deterrence, severity and certainty did provide deterrent effects when looking at drunk college-aged drivers, although they did not find any effects for swiftness. This finding suggests that a more generalized picture of deterrence may be more effective than focusing on specific concepts.

This generalization can be extended into formalized and informal control, as traditionally deterrence only looked at formalized control with mixed results (Tomlinson, 2016). However, there has been some indication that informal controls can also have a deterrent effect. For example, Bates and colleagues' (2017) article found that traffic law measures used for deterrence purposes were ineffective when looking at newly licensed young individuals. However, they did find that those who were still in a probationary period of driving were more likely to be deterred by informal sanctions such as parental involvement, although this lessens with the second probationary period license (Bates,

Darvell, & Watson, 2017). This deterrent effect with informal control is further explored in Patchin and Hinduja's study (2018), which found that students were more likely to be deterred from threats of informal punishments (in this case, cited as their parents and school sanctions) than by punishment via formal sanctions such as by the police.

Therefore, despite the evidence being mixed with deterrence theory, there have been calls for integrating parts of deterrence into other theories that allow for other individual factors and an overall broader scope (Tomlinson, 2016; Lee, 2017; Pratt et al., 2017; Nagin, 2013). For example, Paternoster (2010) suggests that despite the mixed often marginal magnitude of deterrent effects, there are still indications that individuals do behave rationally and can be deterred by perceptions of risk. Furthermore, this idea is seen in Braithwaite's (1989) reintegrative shaming theory, and Sherman's (1993) defiance theory suggests that one outcome of punishment is individuals being deterred from future criminal actions through a multitude of different factors both formal and informal. Therefore, although deterrence does not necessarily capture all possible outcomes, it may nevertheless still constitute some desistance of crime.

Labeling theory

Much like other seminal theories, labeling theory is a framework with an extensive history. Throughout the theory's development, many scholars, including Herbert Blumer, George Herbert Mead, Emile Durkheim, Kai Erikson, and Frank Tannenbaum, have contributed to the growth of the labeling perspective (Matsueda, 2014). However, the best-known contribution to the modern understanding of labeling theory is Howard Becker's (1963) work *Outsiders*, in which he lays out both the definitional aspects of labeling used in most modern applications of the perspective as

well as some criticisms of the theory, and this book can be used as a framework for describing labeling theory in general.

Understanding the development and limitations of labeling theory generally can help inform an understanding of the components of defiance theory. Furthermore, by understanding how labeling theory has developed, the assumptions that underlie defiance theory can also be explored, as the two perspectives have similar conceptual frameworks.

Development of Labeling theory.

In many ways, labeling theory originates from symbolic interactionism perspective, which is sometimes considered the foundation of labeling theory. Based on the work of George Herbert Mead, the perspective is rooted in the notion that individuals change and adapt to fit their environment often with the goal of being accepted by their society (Quist-Adade, 2018). For individuals to achieve these goals, Mead suggests that they use symbols which inform them of what a society expects. This is later summarized by Blumer (1969), which suggested that symbols—often (but not always) in the form of speech—are specifically interpreted by individuals to understand their status in their society. Furthermore, Charles Horton Cooley’s (1902) work on “the looking glass self” further extends symbolic interactionism, suggesting that external interactions and symbols are further shown inwardly as individuals learn to examine themselves through the lens of their social interactions. This idea, therefore, purports that people’s statuses are not static and that they can be changed by society, and these statuses can affect both people externally and internally (Matsueda, 2014). In this way, using symbolic language such as labels can affect an individual’s relationships with himself/herself and others. For example, when a youth is called a “troublemaker” by others, this label may be

internalized, and the youth can become a troublemaker (Matsueda, 2014; Quist-Adade, 2018; Becker, 1963). In this way, a person's interaction with others can result in a "self-fulfilling prophecy" in which the individual lives up to the label (Quist-Adade, 2018). This perspective is most notable in Tannenbaum's (1938) concept of the "dramatization of evil," which suggests that, instead of acts being evil, the person becomes the label assigned to them.

Lemert (1951) makes a distinction between primary and secondary deviance, with secondary deviance affected by the stigma that an offender receives. This stigma is often alienating such that the punishment affects the identity of the offender, making him/her more likely to continue to commit crimes as their social roles have changed. These role changes can be both formal and informal and fundamentally alter how an individual interacts with others, possibly leading to separation from the conventional world (Matsueda, 2014).

Becker (1963) further expands on the notion of labeling theory through how labels interact. First, Becker describes the act of delinquency as a violation of societal norms and, consequently, as a way for society to maintain social control. Therefore, a delinquent is someone who has violated these rules and has created a threat against the social order. This process takes place because what acts constitute deviance is decided by society rather than reflecting an inherent state of being. Specifically, no one is "naturally" deviant, but society marks some actions as deviant, and when caught engaging in those actions the individual is then labeled as such. These rules are typically implemented by moral crusaders and enforced by rule enforcers. Rule enforcers are typically criminal justice formal actors such as police officers who usually do not evenly enforce laws,

meaning that some criminal deviance is not caught or formally punished, thus leading to labels being unevenly applied (Becker, 1963).

Those who are already stigmatized or othered by society are more likely to be formally labeled—for example, minority groups. Therefore, when an individual is caught committing deviant actions, they are punished and stigmatized for their actions, thus leading to the label of deviant. However, Becker (1963) also describes individuals who are labeled as having committed a delinquent act but did not commit the act, meaning that a portion of individuals is stigmatized without cause. These categories suggest that some individuals conform, some are falsely labeled, and some are correctly labeled deviant.

In light of these arguments, Becker (1963) suggests that only those who are caught and labeled as deviant, regardless of whether they committed a rule-breaking act, face stigmatization. This deviant label carries negative stereotypes and inhibits the individual from participating in conventional society. This stigmatization can lead individuals to reject society and continue acting in a deviant manner, primarily when that deviant label is being “criminal.” Although all criminals are labeled as deviant, not all deviance is criminal. However, these negative labels can be self-perpetuating, leading to a cycle of deviance and ultimately can produce serious criminal behavior over the life course. However, Becker notes that, “Obviously, everyone caught in one deviant act and labeled a deviant does not move inevitably towards greater deviance” (p. 36). Therefore, labels are changeable to some degree if they do not reflect the self. However, as Becker warns, even when people try to disengage these labels, society often disregards such attempts; for example, he notes the phrase “once a junkie, always a junkie” (p. 37). Therefore, when these labels are formal, such as being convicted of a crime, they are

often hard to shed, even if the individual no longer acts like a deviant. In labeling theory, this process results in an increased likelihood of re-offending.

Although labeling theory has contributed much to criminology in recent years, overall the perspective has had a history of controversy (Hirschi, 1980; Goode, 1975; Klein, 1986; Tittle, 1980). A notable critique of early labeling research was that it failed to show empirical support and was overly simplistic (Bernburg, 2009). For example, Ward (1971) points out in his critical analysis that there was a lack of empirical work on labeling theory, especially with a focus on juvenile delinquency. Additionally, there were important methodological inconsistencies that needed to be addressed; for example, how one defines the labeling process and what characteristics are associated with labeling theory was unclear (Ward, 1971). Scimecca (1977) also showed a need for labeling theory to be able to contend with label potency between people. For example, it was unclear why some individuals do not react to labeling or what might be the sociological, biological, and psychological factors that may contribute to the adoption of a label.

The need to further improve tests of labeling theory research was perhaps most famously addressed by Paternoster & Iovanni (1989), who suggested that labeling theory studies had a too-simplistic hypothesis. Although the authors highlighted some works that had addressed the full hypothesis, the call for action provided by these authors was primarily directed toward understanding and testing labeling theory in a falsifiable way. As a result, many subsequent empirical studies have focused on evaluating the theory while overcoming these methodological shortcomings with the goal of better understanding the complexities of labeling processes and how they interact with individuals' characteristics.

Empirical Support for Labeling Theory.

Given the nature of the theory and the nature of labeling, longitudinal studies are particularly valuable in testing labeling theory (Kavish, Mullins, & Soto, 2016). In this area, labeling theory tends to find more support when compared to cross-sectional studies, suggesting that these types of studies are more appropriate.

Johnson, Simons, and Conger (2004) found in their analysis of Iowa Youth and Families Project that youths were not deterred by interaction with formal sections but instead increased their delinquent behavior. This pattern of findings suggests that labeling theory rather than deterrence theory or rational choice theory had more support (Johnson, Simons & Conger, 2004). In Bernburg and colleagues' (2006) study, the authors used four waves of the Rochester Youth Development Study to look at 870 students going through school. In this study, they found that formal deviant labeling leads to increased involvement in deviant groups, which increased the probability of serious delinquency, even after controlling for such factors as race and parental poverty (see also Bernberg & Krohn, 2003). Ray and Down's (1986) study found that, although secondary deviance with regard to being labeled a drug user was supported among males, this pattern was not observed among females.

More recently, Restivo and Lanier's (2015) study found that official intervention leads to increased self-identification as a delinquent, decreased pro-social expectation, and increased association with delinquent peers. Kavish and colleagues' (2016) also found that formal labeling, such as being arrested, was related to the youths' delinquency later in life. Also, they found that a youth's perception of care by teachers and family did

partially mediate some of the relationship between delinquency and formal labeling.

These latter findings suggest that formal labeling without the intervention of family and teachers can have a significant impact on future deviance.

Qualitative studies, however, do have the ability to explain how salient a label is for the individuals, as discussed by Heckert and Heckert (2010). Although they proposed combining both labeling theory and differential association theory, they argued that labeling and self-identifying processes can be shown through qualitative studies. For example, Adams and colleagues' (2003) study looked specifically at how juvenile delinquents self-identified with negative labels in a questionnaire given to 337 detained juveniles in two facilities. They found that the more negative adjectives, such as being "bad" or "rude," that a youth used to describe themselves was predictive of an increase of self-reported delinquency. They also found that teacher and peer labeling were associated with predicting general and serious delinquency, although they did not find that parental labeling was related to delinquency—a finding which was inconsistent with some prior research. Furthermore, labels were significant predictors of general and serious delinquency, although they did not find an effect for drug-related offenses. These findings suggest that those who label themselves or are labeled by teachers or peers in negative terms are more likely to commit general or serious delinquency than those who have no or fewer negative labels assigned to them.

In another qualitative examination of the labeling perspective, Hirschfield (2008) found in his interview of 20 minority youths that the deviant label had less of an impact among those who lived in highly disadvantaged areas. He suggests that, in high-poverty urban neighborhoods, the act of being arrested is normalized and therefore has a little

stigma. However, it should be noted that the youths were not asked to compare themselves to conventional social standards. Thus, Hirschi's study suggests that there are individual differences and cultural factors that may mitigate the harm felt by a deviant label. Furthermore, Abrah's (2019) study using 23 adult juvenile delinquents shows that both those who persisted in crime and those who desisted experienced some levels of negative societal reaction. However, he also found that those who desisted had moved out of their neighborhoods, suggesting that the label itself may not be as influential as the environment in which they lived. In sum, then, these findings suggest that qualitative studies show somewhat mixed support for labeling theory and that considering individual differences with stigma and labels is necessary.

Finally, there have been some reviews and meta-analyses done examining levels of support for labeling theory in the empirical literature, and these studies have reported mixed results. For example, Mahoney (1974) found in his review that there was not enough empirical evidence to conclude that the labeling perspective was supported or not. This finding was echoed four years later with Albrecht and Albrecht's (1978) critical assessment in which they reported that labeling theory was "neither confirmed nor disproven" (p. 126), and they argued that labeling theory was "not sufficiently developed" (p. 125) but did have some promise as an integrative theory. More recently, however, Petrosino, Petrosino, and Guckenburg's (2010) analysis of twenty-nine studies from 1973-2008 found in twenty-nine randomized controlled studies that juvenile system processing (i.e., formal labeling) increased delinquency instead of controlling or deterring it. Barrick's (2013) analysis also revealed that, although previous studies did not

uniformly suggest deviance amplification, support for labeling theory was greater than support for the deterrence perspective.

In conclusion, while early labeling research reported inconsistent findings, more recent studies of the labeling perspective seem to provide support for the theory's central tenets and suggest that criminal justice interventions, along with a variety of other formal and informal labeling mechanisms, tend to increase rather than decrease the likelihood of reoffending as anticipated by the theory. The findings also suggest that there are differences between individuals that may exacerbate or nullify the label, and these may include social bonds, attitudes, and demographic variables.

Defiance Theory

Defiance theory was first described in Sherman's (1993) work in which he explains some of the weaknesses of labeling theory in general and how those weaknesses might be resolved. Also, his study attempts to integrate several other theoretical perspectives, including Braithwaite's (1989) reintegrative shaming theory, Tyler's (1990) procedural justice theory, as well as Scheff and Retzinger's (1991) work on shame and rage. Braithwaite's reintegrative shaming theory (1989) suggests that, instead of the historical way that labeling theory is viewed, there should be explicit consideration of the variable "shame," which can be in two forms. The first type of shame is stigmatizing that reacts similarly to what traditional labeling theory suggests. Therefore, this form of shame creates a sense of rejection, which further alienates individuals from traditional society. Braithwaite also suggests another type of shame called reintegrative shame, which punishes the offender but does not reject the individual from society. Instead of alienation, the individual is kept within society and faces less risk of repeat offending.

Therefore, in Braithwaite's theory, the consequences of shaming depend on whether it is stigmatizing or reintegrative, deterring individuals or labeling them chronically criminal.

This emotional structure of shame, especially the shame of rejection and the reaction with a future crime, is also described in Scheff and Retzinger's (1991) work. Specifically, they propose that cooperation in a social situation is based on "attunement and pride" while conflict, especially violent conflict, is generated by "unacknowledged alienation and shame" (p. 38). Sherman primarily uses un-acknowledge alienation, suggesting that those who are defiant reject the shame placed on the individual itself (Sherman, 1993).

Finally, Sherman also uses Tyler's work *Why People Obey the Law* (1990), which suggests that procedural justice, and ultimately why individuals obey laws are perceived legitimacy. This legitimacy comes from the fairness and respect in the system, and not necessarily fear of punishment. In Sherman's work (1993), this is the idea forms why individuals reject rules, specifically in those instances that individuals find "unfair."

Through the integration of these theories, Sherman explains how informal and formal controls, perceived fairness, and a more comprehensive range of emotional reactions are crucial for understanding the labeling or deterrent effects of formal and informal sanctions. Specifically, Sherman (1993) addresses the existence of differences in the effects of sanctions, and he focuses primarily on the conditions under which people may be more or less likely to desist. Accordingly, he describes three potential responses to a sanction: the sanction is irrelevant to the offender's behavior, the sanction deters the offender from the future offending, or the offender becomes defiant in response to the

sanctions. This latter reaction of defiance is key, as it explains why a sanction might deter some offenders but exert a criminogenic labeling effect on others.

Sherman (1993) explains that defiant reactions emerge under certain conditions; specifically, (1) when the offender is poorly bonded, (2) when the offender does not accept the shame of wrongdoing, (3) when the offender himself/herself is stigmatized by their society, and (4) when the offender feels that the shame that s/he has encountered is unfair. For the sanction to be considered unfair, Sherman describes two conditions that must be met: (1) the sanctioning agent behaves with disrespect and (2) the sanction “is arbitrary, discriminatory, excessive, undeserved, or otherwise objectively unjust” (Sherman, 1993, p. 461). However, as noted above, even when the sanction is perceived as unjust or discriminatory, these processes can be mitigated by strong and effective social bonds, while an offender who lacks such bonds that might be at increased risk of reacting with defiance. For example, an adolescent who otherwise would reject the stigma of an unfair punishment may accept it if he or she has strong affective ties to his or her parents. Thus, if these conditions are met, Sherman theorizes that the offender is likely to respond to the sanction defiantly, and, as a result, the sanction will not deter reoffending but instead will increase it.

Prior Research Testing Defiance Theory.

Though an abundance of previous research has provided tests of labeling theory more generally, defiance theory been used as the primary guiding perspective in very few prior studies (for exceptions, see Augustyn & Ward, 2015; Bouffard & Piquero, 2010; Jackson & Hay, 2013; Piquero & Bouffard, 2003; Slocum et al. 2016). Further, in such studies, most focus on the symbolic interactions between individuals and police and the potential stigmatizing consequences of these events (Bouffard & Piquero, 2010; Piquero

& Buffard, 2003; Slocum et al., 2006). Further, in these studies, the processes of stigmatization originate from police interaction rather than from other sources, such as courts or disciplinary actions in schools.

In one of the first studies to explicitly test Sherman's defiance perspective, Piquero and Bouffard (2003) examined cross-sectional police interaction data to investigate defiant reactions. In this study, the authors engaged data on 5,688 police-citizen encounters in which the interaction was recorded by a trained researcher not associated with the police. Through this approach, while they could not follow participants to collect information on future deviance, they were able to see immediate defiant reactions themselves, which ranged from refusing to cooperate to pulling a weapon on a police officer. The findings showed that police actions did influence the level of defiant responses; for example, citizens were more likely to act defiantly when police used threatening language or used physical force.

A similar pattern was observed in Bouffard and Piquero's (2010) longitudinal study, which found that those who were poorly bonded, were stigmatized, perceived that the punishment was unfair, and rejected the stigmatization had a longer time to desistance and higher offender rates than other groups. However, it should also be noted that these authors found mixed effects of social bonding, as those who were poorly bonded and found the sanction unfair but accepted the shame were found to be defiant instead of unreactive. Therefore, there was no significant difference between the unchanged and defiant categories in how they reacted. Thus, Bouffard and Piquero found mixed support for the theory, specifically for the existence of an "unchanged" category. Slocum and colleagues' (2016) further expanded this work by using the National Evaluation of the

Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T) program and exploring police contact and defiant reactions. They also found that those who were dissatisfied with police interactions had higher levels of delinquency. However, they also observed that those who were satisfied with their police interactions still engaged in higher levels of delinquency than those who were never in contact with the police, which suggests that offenders who did not respond to sanctions with defiance were not necessarily deterred from future offending. Overall, this indicates that police interactions do have a defiant effect; however, more work should be done to distinguish those who are “deterred” and “unreactive” from the defiant reaction group.

Augustyn and Ward’s (2015) study focused on other interactions with the justice system using data from the Pathways to Desistance study. Given that this survey follows adolescent offenders from their first arrest and interviews them after conviction and then every six months thereafter for three years, these data can track if the offenders desisted from crime or became defiant. In their study, Augustyn and Ward examined offenders’ attitudes toward police sanctions as well as those imposed by courts. As a result, this study was able to extend this line of inquiry from a focus solely on police-citizen interactions. The authors found that negative attitudes toward procedural justice resulted in an amplification of criminal behavior, meaning that those who viewed the process as unfair were more likely to have amplified criminal deviance. They also found that neutral or positive evaluations of the process nullified the “direct sanction-crime relationship” (Augustyn & Ward, 2015, p. 476). However, they did not find that positive views of criminal justice procedures resulted in a deterrent effect. Although these results provide mixed support for defiance theory, there is some indication that the “shame” element of

the perspective is empirically valid. Overall, these findings suggest that there are still issues that need to be resolved regarding distinguishing deterred offenders from others.

While not the primary focus, defiance theory sometimes has been used as a to understand and interpret results of some other studies. For example, Jackson and Hay's (2013) article examined familial bonds between the offender and parent, and these authors drew upon Sherman's work to understand the deterrent effects of those family bonds. This study found that offenders with supportive parents were less likely to reoffend. Jackson and Hay use this observation as a way to understand why criminogenic labels may or may not work, which, in light of Sherman's (1993) work, may suggest that being bonded to a family can lessen the stigma associated with a criminal sanction.

Way's (2011) study on school discipline and reactions from students is specifically informed by defiance theory as well. The study found that students who perceived school authority as legitimate were less defiant in their actions. Furthermore, although mediated by a positive teacher-student bond, fairness also predicted less interruptions of students. Although not specifically testing defiance theory, Gottfredson and colleagues' (2005) study found that, when students perceived school rules to be fair and clear, they were less likely to exhibit delinquent behavior and were less likely to be victimized. However, it should be noted that the authors did not find less teacher victimization in these contexts. In this way, Sherman's work can be understood as expanding upon labeling theory more generally by providing additional insights with regard to the situations and circumstances under which labeling effects may occur.

One notable finding from labeling theory more generally but which also might have relevance for defiance theory in particular is that demographic characteristics, and

especially race and ethnicity, can moderate the effects of a negative label (Paternoster & Iovanni, 1989). As demonstrated in Paternoster and Iovanni's (1989) review, race and ethnicity theoretically might influence not only the use of labels in a variety of contexts but also the effects of those labels on subsequent offending. While race was used as a control variable in many of the studies reviewed above, very few focused on the difference between racial/ethnic groups with regard to defiant reactions. One notable exception is Piquero and Bouffard's (2003) study, which focused the different interactions between same or different racial groups for offenders and police officers. In this study, the authors found that Non-White citizens were more likely to be defiant than White citizens, and they observed that least defiance-prone interactions in their analyses involved White citizens and Non-White officers. Furthermore, in general, school discipline research has been mixed regarding the role of race in defiant behavioral responses to sanctions for misbehavior (Gregory & Weinstein, 2008; Hinojosa, 2008; Petras et al., 2011; Wright et al., 2014; Horner et al., 2010; Huang & Cornell, 2017). These findings suggest that race/ethnicity should be examined in relation to defiance theory to account for differences in reactions.

Overall, defiance theory has very few direct empirical tests; however, several published works have shown empirical evidence of the importance of defiant reactions. Furthermore, other scholars have noted that efforts must be made to clearly distinguish between the members of the three groups identified by Sherman (1993): defiant, unreactive, and deterred. Additionally, this theory has not been used within a school disciplinary setting. However, the concurrent rise of punitive criminal justice policies and

school disciplinary sanctions might provide an ideal context in which to explore the salience of defiant reactions for offending.

School Discipline

In general, crime in school has been on the decline since the late 1990s (Musu-Gillette et al., 2018; Brooks, Schiraldi & Ziedenberg, 2000; Mayer & Leone, 2007). However, the climate of school discipline within the last few decades has substantially changed into a more punitive and formal type of social control, much like criminal justice system itself (Hirschfield, 2008). This transformation is often discussed in the context of “zero-tolerance policies” and other mandates that “criminalize” school discipline, which grew in the context of other “get tough” on crime policies of the 1980s and 1990s such as mandatory minimum sentences and “three strikes and you’re out” laws (Grioux, 2003; Skiba & Peterson, 1999). Much like their juvenile and criminal justice system counterparts, these policies use exclusionary methods of punishment to remove the youths from schools either temporarily or indefinitely to punish various misbehaviors (Skiba & Peterson, 2000). Although other penalties are available, such as detention, in-school suspension, and verbal warnings, zero-tolerance policies mandate out-of-school suspensions and expulsions (Hirschfield, 2008). Most of these zero-tolerance laws and policies focused initially on tackling drugs and weapons in schools; however, they quickly were expanded to address other types of misbehavior as well, such as dress code violations and disrespecting teachers (Skiba & Peterson, 1999; Morris, 2005). In fact, parents pushed for such policies to be put into place based on their perceptions that schools were not safe, especially with the rising coverage of school violence following the Columbine shooting (American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force, 2008; Kupchik, 2016; Skiba & Peterson, 1999).

Much like the controversy around the “war on crime,” zero-tolerance policies are plagued with unintended consequences. Many scholars have pointed out the ineffectiveness of these policies as well as exclusionary discipline more generally, despite these approaches to student misbehavior being a significant component of modern school discipline (Brooks, Schiraldi & Zeidenberg, 1999; Giroux, 2003; Kupchik & Monahan, 2006). Furthermore, scholars have pointed out that these policies tend to target minorities, those with mental and physical disabilities, and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Kupchik, 2009; Skiba, 2000). These concerns mirror many of the concerns raised surrounding the “war on crime” doctrines and similar zero-tolerance policies within the criminal justice system (Giroux, 2003).

Another concern that has been raised is that increased reliance on formal control in schools has created a context of “criminalization” in which students are easily pushed into contact with the criminal justice system (Hirschfield, 2008; Welch & Payne, 2010; Welch, 2018). Schools have increasingly employed police officers—school resource officers—who can arrest and formally charge students with crimes (Kupchik & Monahan, 2006). The presence of these officers facilitates the link from school discipline or sanctions to the prisons as they have the ability to make arrests. Students also often have limited rights in schools, especially when it comes to privacy concerns with search and seizure (Beger, 2002). Students are more heavily monitored now than ever; for example, in the 2015-2016 school year, 81% of schools had security cameras (Musu-Gillette et al., 2018). These practices, therefore, form a new paradigm not necessarily seen by the wider criminal justice community where students are treated as criminals before those crimes have been committed (Giroux, 2003). In these ways, students can become formally

labeled as deviant despite the fact that no criminal charges have been brought against them. As a result, it is necessary to understand the formal labeling taking place as well as the conditions under which those labels may produce criminogenic outcomes.

Two forms of exclusionary discipline that are commonly implemented are out-of-school suspensions and expulsion, both of which are frequently understood to be similar in their punitive nature as well as their consequences for students (Skiba, 2000). Out-of-school suspension is the more common exclusionary punishment, and the rate of this type of suspension has been rising since the 1970s (Losen & Skiba, 2010; Fabelo et al., 2011). Out-of-school suspensions are used for a multitude of defiant behaviors such as disobedience and not just for violent actions (Skiba, Peterson & Williams, 1997). For example, any type of behavior that would be seen as disrespectful or non-complying can be likely to receive a suspension instead of some other non-exclusionary sanction. This pattern was noted in Morgan and Wight's study (2018), which found that student behavior, such as lying, stealing, or cheating, was relevant in the disciplinary process, suggesting that the attitudes of students are as important as the actions themselves. Furthermore, the occurrence of suspensions is also not at all rare; for example, in Christle and colleagues' (2004) study examining 161 Kentucky middle schools found that 52% of the students that had been suspended more than once. This study also points out that those students who have been suspended once were likely to be suspended again.

Although relatively uncommon compared to out-of-school suspension, expulsion under zero-tolerance policies can be automatic and applied for behaviors ranging from drug use to "school disruption" to the intended use of weapons in schools (Skiba & Peterson, 1999; Skiba, 2000). This range of expulsion-worthy offenses has become

increasingly extensive as the definition of zero tolerance is not uniformly stated and often left up to schools to decide (Mayer & Leone, 2007). This means that punitive school punishments and the behaviors deemed to warrant them are not necessarily uniform within and between schools.

The costs of exclusionary discipline can be particularly high. Out-of-school suspensions and expulsions have notable effects on completing a high school degree and educational achievement overall (Hwang, 2018; Kupchik, 2016). This link can be because students miss instructional time, as this type of suspension sends a child home (Kupchik, 2006). Furthermore, many studies have shown that the loss of educational opportunities can lead to low academic achievement, thus further harming the child's future achievement (Hwang, 2018; Fabelo et al., 2011; Gregory, Skiba & Noguera, 2010). This pattern is shown in Fabelo and colleagues (2011) study of Texas schools, which found that, although students were not given more than a three-day suspension, there was no cap on the number of times a student could be suspended. For most students, suspension was not a one-time event, meaning that students were missing many days of learning, which likely compromised their academic achievement.

These experiences also can present a hardship for families and cause strain in their relationships. As shown in Kupchik's (2016) book *The Real School Safety Problem*, the families of children who are consistently suspended reported difficulties in getting their kids home from school. Some also reported having to change jobs or risk having their kids sent to juvenile detention centers as they were called in so frequently to pick up their child. Furthermore, some reported in keeping a child home from school just so they knew that they would not have to go pick them up later, further lowering the students'

amount of academic exposure. These strains could negatively affect the social bonds between parent and child by putting pressure on both the child and the adult. In contrast, Hwang (2018) found that, under certain circumstances, the suspension could lead to improved academic achievement as it increased parental involvement, though these effects were not universal. Since the bonds between parents and children have historically been an important measure of criminality, the strain placed on parent-child relationships by frequent suspensions may harm the development of these bonds.

Even when a student is not expelled, there is an increased chance of dropping out due to suspension alone (Kupchik, 2016). Students who receive suspensions are more at risk of dropout than other students since they are excluded the system of academic achievement by virtue of the sanction (Gordon, Piana & Keleher, 2000; Christle, Nelson & Jolivette, 2004). Dropping out itself has been linked to many undesirable outcomes for young individuals, including worse health, less overall wealth, and reduced happiness (Oreopoulos, 2007). Beyond the increased likelihood of dropping out, exclusionary school discipline has been linked to heightened involvement in delinquency and, subsequently, contact with the justice system. This effect of exclusionary school discipline has been termed by scholars the “school-to-prison pipeline.” As shown by Skiba and colleagues (2014a), the school-to-prison pipeline is a complex definitional issue that has had various interpretations. However, the most simplistic model is that school exclusion results in juvenile and criminal justice system involvement, though Skiba and colleagues (2014a) also note that factors such as school climate, school engagement, achievement, and dropping out also have effects on the pipeline.

The school-to-prison pipeline metaphor suggests that the criminalization of school discipline increases the odds of students being arrested in later life and being pushed into the prison system. Mowen and Brent's (2016) study supports this notion, as they found that those who were suspended had higher odds of being arrested in the future. This was also seen in Katsiyannis and colleagues' (2012) longitudinal study, which found that youths who were suspended were five times in secondary school more likely to be charged with a violent crime later in life.

Racial Inequalities in School Discipline

One of the primary issues surrounding harsh punishments in schools is that they consistently are applied more frequently to minorities more than White students. Specifically, minority students often receive suspension and expulsion as punishments more than their White counterparts (Losen & Skiba, 2010; Skiba et al., 2014b; Skiba, Peterson & Williams, 1997). Though most studies focus on the disciplinary experienced of Black youths compared to Whites, differences also emerge between Whites and other racial and ethnic groups as well, most notably including Latino/a, Asian, and Native American students. These racial/ethnic inequalities also have been shown not to arise from similar differences student misbehavior alone (Wu et al., 1982; Rocque, 2010). For instance, Wu and colleagues (1982) found that, when accounting for misbehavior and other such risk factors, non-Whites were still more likely to receive a suspension than Whites. However, as shown in Mowen and colleagues' study (2017), there is some indication that, under certain school-level circumstances (e.g., in schools situated in military contexts), racial differences in discipline can be less pronounced.

Much of the literature about minority status and school discipline has explored disparities between Black and White Students. Black students have been consistently

shown to be disproportionately punished, especially when compared to White students (Mendez & Knoff, 2003; Rocque, 2010; Skiba et al., 2002; Skiba et al., 1997; Shaw & Branden, 1990; Skiba et al., 2011). Furthermore, Skiba and colleagues' study (2011) found that Black students were overrepresented in significant consequences but underrepresented in minor consequences. Edwards (2016) study also found that, although attending a school with more Black students did increase the chances of being disciplined for all youths, that Black students were least likely to be disciplined in a racially mixed school. However, the finding that Black students are more harshly disciplined tends to hold across different demographic and individual factors as well. For instance, Ganao and colleagues (2013) found that, although other factors such as friend delinquency and physical abuse were significant predictors of suspension for White students, only delinquency was a significant predictor among Black students. Black female students have particularly high rates of suspension compared to other female groups (Blake et al., 2011; Mendez & Koff, 2003; Wallace et al., 2008). Furthermore, Blake and colleagues' (2011) found that black females were more likely to receive exclusionary disciplinary practices at a higher rate and for different infractions. For example, Black females were more likely to be cited for profanity, inappropriate dress, and physical aggression than their counterparts.

Although there have been fewer studies of school discipline focusing on Latino/a youths, the literature at present is mixed (Skiba et al., 2011). Gordon and colleagues (2000) found that, while Latino/a students' disproportional representation in suspension and expulsion was not universal, in certain cities Latino/a students were twice as likely to be suspended than White students (Gordon, Piana, & Keleher, 2000). Skiba and

colleagues (2011) also found inconsistencies related to Hispanic ethnicity, finding Latino/a student's more likely than Whites to be disciplined in middle school but not at the elementary school level. Peguero and Shekarkhar (2011), however, found that Latino/a students were being punished more frequently than White males, even after controlling for misbehavior, and this finding was seen most prominently among third-generation students. However, this pattern is contrasted by Morgan and Wright's (2018) study, in which they found that White and Latino/a students had equal likelihoods of experiencing punitive discipline after childhood delinquency was controlled for. These mixed findings suggest that their additional research is needed in this area, particularly with regard to whether the relationship between school discipline, defiant reactions, and future delinquency is stronger among Latino/a youths than White youths.

Although there has not been much study on the subject, there is some evidence that Native American students are disproportionately represented in exclusionary school discipline (Gordon, Piana, & Keleher, 2000). Furthermore, much like Black students, their cumulative odds of being suspended increase over time (Krezmien, Leone, & Achilles, 2006). Additionally, Asian Americans tend to engage in misbehavior at lower rates than members of other racial/ethnic groups, even if they do not have as strong of attachment to their schools as others (Peguero et al., 2011). This suggests that Asian students likely have other bonds that keep them from misbehaving, thus resulting in less frequent exposure to school discipline in the exclusionary discipline. Furthermore, even after accounting for differential misbehavior, Asian students have been found to be less likely to be suspended compared to their White counterparts (Krezmien, Leone, & Achilles, 2006; Wallace et. al., 2008).

Defiance Theory and School Discipline

The school atmosphere, with the use of exclusionary school discipline, may help facilitate defiant reactions. Way's (2011) article demonstrates that stricter school rules and punishments resulted in more disruptive and defiant behavior from students.

Furthermore, Way found that, those students who were in stricter school settings held that the act of disobeying rules and teachers was justified and consequently were more likely to be disruptive. Amemiya and colleagues (2020) also found that students who had minor misconduct infractions in the past were correlated with present rising defiant behavior from students. Furthermore, these results were higher with those who were attached to the school, suggesting that the infractions may have been perceived as unfair.

Furthermore, race and ethnicity may also factor into these reactions. Behavior, and especially aggressive behavior, has been explored to see if it mediated the effects of race on school discipline especially when seen between White and Black students (Hinojosa, 2008; Horner et al., 2010; Huang & Cornell, 2017; Petras et al., 2011; Wright et al., 2014), but this research has produced mixed results. For example, Petras and colleagues (2011) found that aggressive behavior did not explain away the effects of demographic variables such as race, though it should be noted that these researchers specifically looked at only Black and White students. Horner and colleagues (2010) similarly found that overt aggression did not fully account for Black students being disciplined at a higher rate. However, Wright and colleagues (2014) did find that, when accounting for past and present misconduct, the racial disparity between Blacks and Whites disappeared. Gregory and Weinstein's study (2008) on defiance referrals, however, suggests that Black students' defiant reactions depend on the characteristics of the teacher, such as a lack of caring and lower academic expectations.

These findings are similar to Sherman's (1993) notion that the legitimacy of the person who is sanctioning also matters. For example, if the student does not see the teacher as a legitimate authority figure, or if he or she does not show care toward the student, the student may be more apt to react defiantly to a sanction. This possibility is consistent with the findings from Kupchik and Ellis' (2008) study, which observed that Black students are more likely to believe that their school is unfair to them. Additionally, Amemiya and colleagues (2020) found that Black students tended to have more minor infractions, suggesting that the defiant reaction of Black students may be connected to the receipt of formal sanctions for minor rule breaking. These findings indicate that Black students' defiant reactions are in response to a deviant label applied to them in which they are particularly likely to perceive the stigma of the label as unjust. Overall, these findings suggest that defiance theory may be well suited for answering the variations between racial and ethnic as it relates to differences in the labeling effects of school discipline outcomes and defiant responses to them.

In many ways, the school classroom has now become tied to a more formalized punishment that mirrors the stigma felt by being labeled a criminal. Thus, given the disproportionate nature of exclusionary discipline to racial minorities, the negative outcomes for those without high school degrees, and the prevalence of the school-to-prison-pipeline system, it is necessary to understand how a defiance may be situated into the broader discussion of labeling. Furthermore, it is necessary to understand how learning environments may contribute to the criminalization of youths and if this criminalization may lead to future delinquent actions. Furthermore, defiance theory can help explain why some individuals are deterred, some have no reaction to punishment,

and some become defiant to reactions and how this may explain the variance in school disciplinary outcomes.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will address the connection between exclusionary discipline and delinquency, and it will consider the moderating effects of defiant conditions and race and ethnicity. The measurement of defiant conditions as well as other control variables will be discussed in the following section.

Hypothesis 1: Suspension and expulsion from school will be positively associated with subsequent delinquency.

Hypothesis 2: The positive association between suspension/expulsion from school and subsequent delinquency will be moderated by defiant conditions.

Hypothesis 3: The interrelationships between exclusionary discipline, defiant conditions, and subsequent delinquency will be further moderated by race and ethnicity.

CHAPTER III

Methods

Data

The dataset used in this study is the public use sample of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, also known as Add Health (Harris et al., 2009). The study has four waves, the first of which was administered to a nationally representative sample of youths who were enrolled in either middle or high school in the 1994-1995 school year. Participants at Wave I answered an in-school survey, and a subsample of these respondents received an in-home interview as well, which further collected data on participants and their family members. An in-home survey at Wave II was administered the following year to youths who were still in high school following the completion of Wave I. For the purposes of this study, the data are restricted to respondents who completed in the in-home surveys at Waves I and II. In addition, several measures originate from the Wave I parent questionnaire. The longitudinal nature of these data makes them exceptionally useful for addressing this study's hypotheses. Furthermore, the period in which the data were collected reflects the time that school disciplinary structures changed to become more formalized, thus presenting a unique social context in which these interrelationships may be examined (Grioux, 2003; Skiba & Peterson, 1999).

Dependent Variable

Delinquency is the dependent variable and is measured by a scale consisting of 13 items. The questions are as follows: "In the past 12 months, how often did you...Paint graffiti or signs on someone else's property or in a public place?" "...Deliberately damage property that didn't belong to you?" "...Lie to your parents or guardians about

where you had been or whom you were with?” “...Take something from a store without paying for it?” “...Get into a serious physical fight?” “...Drive a car without its owner’s permission?” “...Steal something worth more than \$50?” “...Go into a house or building to steal something?” “...Use or threaten to use a weapon to get something from someone?” “...Sell marijuana or other drugs?” “...Steal something worth less than \$50?” “...Act loud, rowdy, or unruly in a public place?” and “...Take part in a fight where a group of your friends was against another group?” For each measure, the response options include “Never” (= 0), “1 or 2 times” (= 1), “3 or 4 times” (= 2) and “5 or more times” (= 3) in the last 12 months. These questions were combined using a factor analysis (see Appendix A) to create a weighted index. To ensure proper temporal order, this outcome is measured at Wave II.

Independent and Moderating Variables

Exclusionary Discipline.

Exclusionary school discipline, which is understood here as involving the removal of a student from the learning environment, is the independent variable of interest. At Wave I, exclusionary disciplinary measures are captured with the questions, “Have you received an out of school suspension?” and “Were you expelled from school?” Given the relative rarity of expulsion in this dataset, these variables were combined into one dichotomous measure which captures whether each student had ever been suspended/expelled (= 1).

Defiant Conditions

Defiance as an overarching concept is measured by a set of conditions that must be met. These include the unfairness of the sanction, that the sanction is a stigmatizing event, that the individual is poorly bonded, and a refusal to acknowledge shame. Sherman (1993) states that all of these are necessary to measure defiance, and, given that

exclusionary discipline is to be considered the stigmatizing event, the following will measure the other core concepts, which include the unfairness of the sanction, poor bonds, and a refusal to acknowledge shame. Given this issue, the assumption will be made that an experience of exclusionary discipline is inherently stigmatizing and thus is a limitation of the available measurements.

Although the Add Health data do not directly ask students if they found the exclusionary disciplinary reaction unfair, several questions ask about the formal mechanisms of teachers and their fairness. The first question is “Teachers treat students fairly” which is measured by Likert scale from “strongly agree” (= 1), “agree” (= 2), “neither agree or disagree” (= 3), “disagree” (= 4), and “strongly disagree” (= 5). Another measurement of fairness comes from the statement, “Since school started this year, how often have you had trouble getting along with your teachers.” Responses are also measured by Likert scale ranging from “never” (= 1), “just a few times” (= 2), “about once a week” (= 3), “almost every day” (= 4), and “everyday” (= 5). Finally, I include the item, “How much do you feel that your teachers care about you?” The response options include, “very much” (=1), “quite a bit” (=2), “somewhat” (=3), “very little” (=4), and “not at all (=5). These questions, although indirectly related to exclusionary discipline, do measure how the authority figure who is involved in the sanctioning—in this case the teacher—is deemed fair or unfair. Although this is a limitation, it can help understand the attitudinal response among students to their teachers and how they are perceived.

Two types of bonds are measured in this study. First, bonds with school peers are measured with responses to the following three statements: “You feel socially accepted,”

“Since school started this year, how often have you had trouble getting along with other students.”and “How often was each of the following things true during the past seven days...people were unfriendly to you.” These items capture the extent to which respondents experience less societal acceptance and feel more negatively toward their peers. They are both measured by Likert scales. The social acceptance variable is measured using a Likert scale with options ranging from “strongly agree” (= 1) to “strongly disagree” (= 5). The variable of trouble getting along with other students is measured “never” (= 1), “just a few times” (= 2), “about once a week” (= 3), “almost every day” (= 4), and “everyday” (= 5). Finally, the variable capturing unfriendliness from others includes options ranging from “never/rarely” (= 1) to “most/all of the time” (= 4).

Bonds with parents are also an important dimension of defiance theory and are measured with responses to two statements: “How close do you feel to your mother/adoptive mother/stepmother/foster mother?” and, “How close do you feel to your father/adoptive father/stepfather/foster father?” The response options ranges from “extremely close” (= 1) to “not close at all” (= 5). The average across the values of these two items is calculated and used in the analyses.

The final measure is the indirect denial of shame with the statement “You like yourself just the way you are”. The first variable is measured by Likert Scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (= 1) to “strongly agree” (= 5). All of the measures of defiance discussed above are captured at Wave I. Because defiance theory might expect that all of these measures capture different dimensions of the latent construct of defiant conditions, an exploratory factor analysis was used to create a weighted index (see Appendix B).

Race and Ethnicity.

Race and ethnicity are measured by the two Wave I question, “What is your race?” and “Are you of Hispanic or Spanish origin?” These two questions are combined to make four categories: White/non-Hispanic, Black/non-Hispanic, Hispanic, and Other. The Other category is comprised of Asian, Native American, and youths of other, non-specified racial/ethnic groups, the individual sample sizes of which are too small to generate meaningful estimates. White is used as the reference category in the analyses.

Control Variables

The first control variable is sex, which is measured by the question, “What sex are you?” This variable is measured as a binary variable and is taken from Wave I (male =1).

Academic achievement is measured with an average of grades will be taken from four statements “what was your grade in English or language arts?” “... In mathematics?” “... history or social studies?” and “...science?” These four subjects were measured with “A” (= 4), “B” (= 3), “C” (= 2), or “D or Lower” (= 1). Special education status was also measured in Wave I with the question from the parent survey, “During the past 12 months did (he/she) receive any type of special education service?” (yes = 1).

Peer influence is measured in the Wave I parent questionnaire with the question, “What kind of influence is [the respondent’s] best friend—good, bad, or neither?” The response options are treated as ordinal, with options including “a bad influence (=1),” “neither a good nor bad influence (=2),” and “a good influence. (=3)” Finally, the last control variable is school safety which is measured at Wave I with the statement, “How much do you agree or disagree with the following statement...you feel safe in your school.” The Likert response options range from “strongly disagree” (= 1) to “strongly agree” (= 5).

Analytic Strategy

The analyses will proceed as follows, First, univariate statistics will be examined for each of the variables. Next, in a set of the bivariate analyses, *t*-tests will determine the differences of the means between the yes and no categories of exclusionary discipline. Next, Pearson correlation coefficients will be used to investigate the associations between exclusionary school discipline, defiant conditions, race and ethnicity, and delinquency at Wave II. After these associations are established, I will present several sets of multivariate analyses. First, I will use ordinary least-squares regression (OLS) to examine the independent, main effects of school discipline on subsequent delinquency. Then, I will include multiplicative interaction terms between school discipline and the index measure of defiant conditions to assess whether, as theoretically anticipated, defiance moderates the effect of suspension and expulsion on Wave II delinquency. Finally, I will calculate three-way multiplicative interaction terms between school discipline, defiant conditions, and race/ethnicity to test whether this interactive relationship is stronger among Black and Hispanic youths than among White youths.

CHAPTER IV Results

As noted above, Wave II delinquency and defiant conditions were created into weighted indexes using factor analysis (see Appendix A and B). Once these two indexes were created, the descriptive statistics of all variables were assessed as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Mean/%	SD	Range
Independent Variables			
Exclusionary Discipline (yes)*	28.1%		
Defiant Conditions	1.677	.50244	.66-3.84
Race			
White, Non-Hispanic	58.5%		
Black, Non-Hispanic	23.2%		
Hispanic	11.7%		
Other, Non-Hispanic	6.6%		
Control Variables			
GPA	2.848	.7629	1-4
Special Education status	0.010	0.294	0-1
Sex (Male)*	47.9%		
Best Friend Influence	2.640	0.549	1-3
Safety in School	3.829	1.016	0-4
Dependent variable			
Wave II Delinquency	1.531	2.306	0-21.21

Note. Exclusionary Discipline categories are as followed, No =0, and Yes =1. Sex is as follows Female =0, Male =1. Finally, Special Education Status is 0=No, 1=Yes. N= 4,817.

Furthermore, to check for statistically significant differences between means of the independent variables, two-sample *t*-tests were conducted for all variables according to each value of exclusionary discipline (see Table 2). Except for Other, Non-Hispanic, all variables showed significant differences between the “yes” category in exclusionary discipline and the “no” category while using Levene’s test of equality of variance. In the case of GPA, equal variance is assumed.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics by Use of Exclusionary Discipline

Variables	Use of Exclusionary Discipline				Diff.
	Yes		No		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Independent Variables					
Defiant Conditions	1.884	0.540	1.604	0.467	0.280***
Race					
White, Non-Hispanic	0.452	0.498	0.638	0.481	-0.186***
Black, Non-Hispanic	0.348	0.476	0.187	0.390	0.161***
Hispanic	0.135	0.342	0.109	0.312	0.026*
Other, Non-Hispanic	0.065	0.247	0.066	0.249	-0.001
Control Variables					
GPA	2.383	0.726	2.972	0.725	-0.590***
Special Education status	0.160	0.364	0.090	0.280	0.071***
Sex	0.647	0.478	0.413	0.492	0.234***
Best Friend Influence	2.521	0.620	2.676	0.518	-0.155***
Safety in School	3.538	1.175	3.906	0.953	-0.368***
Dependent Variable					
Wave II Delinquency	2.045	2.876	1.323	2.876	-0.722***

Note. $N = 4,817$. Statistical significance of the differences in means/proportions is determined using and Independent Samples T-Test, Specifically Levene's Test for Equality of Variance. SD = standard deviation.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. In the cases of GPA equal variance was assumed.

Next, Pearson correlations were calculated between both all variables and exclusionary discipline and Wave II delinquency scale (see Table 3). Significant associations were found in all correlations with exclusionary discipline except for the racial/ethnic category Other, Non-Hispanic. Furthermore, exclusionary discipline was negatively correlated with White, Non-Hispanic, suggesting an inverse relationship with the variable exclusionary discipline ($p < .001$) and indicating that White students were less likely to receive exclusionary discipline.

Statistically significant correlations with Wave II delinquency were found for all variables except for the categories of White, non-Hispanic, Other, non-Hispanic, and special education status. Furthermore, inverse relationships were found between discipline and GPA ($p < .01$), best friend influence ($p < .01$), safety in school ($p < .01$), and

Black, Non-Hispanic ($p < .01$). This suggests that, at the bivariate level, the lower the GPA of a student the more likely that s/he was to participate in future delinquency, the better the influence of the best friends the less likely an individual was to participate in future delinquency, and those who feel unsafe in school were more likely to participate in future delinquency. Furthermore, Black, Non-Hispanic individuals appear to be less likely than their White peers to commit Wave II delinquency.

Table 3
Pearson Correlation

Variables	Pearson Correlation	<i>N</i>
Correlations with Exclusionary Discipline		
Defiant Conditions	0.248***	4668
White, Non-Hispanic	-0.169***	4815
Black, Non-Hispanic	0.171***	4815
Hispanic	0.036*	4815
Other, Non-Hispanic	-0.002	4815
GPA	0.341**	4687
Special Education Status	0.103**	4311
Sex	0.221***	4817
Best Friend Influence	0.124***	4020
Safety in School	-0.159***	4746
Wave II Delinquency	0.141***	4762
Correlations with Wave II Delinquency		
Exclusionary Discipline	0.155**	4762
Defiant Conditions	0.256***	4618
White, Non-Hispanic	-0.009	4774
Black, Non-Hispanic	-0.046**	4774
Hispanic	0.054***	4774
Other, Non-Hispanic	0.027	4774
GPA	-0.137**	4641
Special Education Status	0.019	4276
Sex	0.083***	4777
Best Friend Influence	-0.086**	3990
Safety in School	-0.087***	4693

*Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed). ****

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). ***

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **

Going forward, the first OLS model estimated shows the main effects of the defiant conditions as it relates to future delinquency (See Table 4). The model was significant with 9.3% of variance explained by the model ($R^2 = .093$). The model shows

that defiant conditions is a significant predictor of future delinquency ($b = 1.210, p < .001$) as is exclusionary discipline ($b = .445, p < .001$), which supports the first hypothesis that exclusionary discipline is associated with future delinquency. Specifically, a being suspended or expelled is associated with a .445-unit increase in future delinquency.

Other main effects found significant to predicting future delinquency are the categories Black, non-Hispanic ($b = -0.043, p < .01$) and Hispanic ($b = 0.046, p < .01$). These findings suggest that, when compared to White, non-Hispanic students Black, non-Hispanic students were less likely to commit future delinquency than their White, non-Hispanic counterparts. However, Hispanic students were more likely than White, non-Hispanic students to participate in future delinquency. The control variables of sex ($b = 0.068, p < .001$), GPA ($b = -0.035, p < .05$), best friend influence ($b = -0.049, p < .01$), and school safety ($b = 0.40, p < .05$) were also found to be significant to the model. This suggests that male students are more likely to commit delinquent acts than female students, the more positive influence a best friend is to an individual the less likely they are to commit delinquency, the higher an individual's GPA the lower the participation in future delinquency, and more an individual feels safe in school the more likely s/he is to commit future delinquency.

Table 4

OLS Model for Main Conditions of Exclusionary Discipline and Defiance Conditions in Predicting Future Delinquency

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t
(Constant)	-0.125	.370		-0.337
Exclusionary Discipline	0.445	0.096	0.080	4.633***
Defiant Conditions	1.210	0.087	0.247	13.890***
Black, non-Hispanic	-0.255	0.097	-0.043	-2.629**
Hispanic	0.371	0.129	0.046	2.884**
Other, non-Hispanic	0.207	0.158	0.021	1.30
GPA	-0.111	0.055	-0.035	-2.004*
Special Education Status	0.016	0.130	0.002	0.123
Sex	0.331	0.078	0.068	4.253***
Best Friends Influence	-0.215	0.069	-0.049	-3.096**
School Safety	0.096	0.041	0.040	2.349*

*Note: The reference category for sex is female. The reference category for race is White. All Likert scale items are treated as continuous-level variables. $P < .05 = *$, $P < .01 = **$, $P < .001 = ***$. $N = 3819$, $R^2 = .093$*

Following the main effects, an OLS model was estimated to show the exclusionary and defiant condition interactions (see Table 5). The model was significant and explained the variance of 9.6% of the variation in delinquency. Significance was found with defiant conditions, ($p < .001$), suggesting that the effect of the defiant conditions in themselves still do affect future delinquency. However, exclusionary discipline as well as the interaction effect between exclusionary discipline and defiant conditions was not significant. This suggests that defiant conditions do not moderate the effects of exclusionary discipline, and thus there is no support for the second hypothesis.

Table 5
OLS Model of Exclusionary and Defiant Condition Interactions in Predicting Future Delinquency

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t
(Constant)	0.021	0.378		0.055
Exclusionary Discipline	-0.098	0.317	-0.018	-0.308
Defiant Conditions	1.116	0.102	0.228	10.988***
Defiant x Exclusionary	0.303	0.169	0.107	1.795
Black, non-Hispanic	-0.249	0.097	-0.042	-2.571**
Hispanic	0.377	0.129	0.047	2.930**
Other, non-Hispanic	0.209	0.158	0.021	1.323
GPA	-0.109	0.055	-0.034	-1.974*
Special Education Status	0.018	0.130	0.002	0.138
Sex	0.333	0.078	0.069	4.274***
Best Friend's Influence	-0.216	0.069	-0.049	-3.108**
School Safety	0.095	0.041	0.040	2.342*

*Note: The reference category for sex is female. The reference category for race is White. All Likert scale items are treated as continuous-level variables. $P < .05 = *$, $P < .01 = **$, $P < .001 = ***$. $N = 3819$, $R^2 = .096$*

The final model introduces the three-way interaction terms involving school discipline, defiant conditions, and race/ethnicity (see Table 6). The effect of defiant conditions is significant ($b = 2.40$, $p < .001$). Furthermore, the main effect of Black, Non-Hispanic was significant ($b = -0.042$, $p < .01$), indicating that, among students who were not excluded and had a score of 0 on the defiant conditions index, Black, Non-Hispanic students were less likely than their White, Non-Hispanic counterparts to commit future delinquent acts. However, all other main effects and interaction effects were not significant. This finding suggests that there are no three-way interaction effects between defiance, exclusionary discipline, and race/ethnicity, meaning that the third hypothesis is not supported in these analyses.

Table 6
OLS Model Exclusionary, Defiant Condition, and Race Interactions in Predicting future Delinquency

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t
(Constant)	-0.185	0.376		-0.492
Exclusionary Discipline	-0.098	0.425	-0.019	-0.230
Defiant Conditions	1.114	0.115	0.240	9.687***
Defiant x Exclusionary	0.221	0.222	0.083	0.995
Black, non-Hispanic	-0.249	0.097	-0.042	-2.571**
Defiant X Black, Non-Hispanic	-0.273	0.242	-0.087	-1.125
Exclusionary X Black, Non-Hispanic	-0.562	0.712	-0.068	-0.790
Exclusionary X Defiant X Black, Non-Hispanic	0.301	0.386	0.070	0.779
Hispanic	-0.705	0.519	-0.092	-1.358
Defiant X Hispanic	0.587	0.317	0.132	1.854
Exclusionary X Hispanic	1.238	0.962	0.094	1.287
Exclusionary X Defiant X Hispanic	-0.570	0.532	-0.081	-1.072
Other, Non-Hispanic	1.070	0.621	0.112	1.724
Defiant X Other, Non-Hispanic	-0.661	0.360	-0.126	-1.834
Exclusionary X Other, Non-Hispanic	0.687	0.652	0.079	1.055
Exclusionary X Defiant X Other, Non-Hispanic	-0.330	1.258	-0.019	-0.262
GPA	-0.078	0.053	-0.026	-1.486
Special Education Status	0.018	0.130	0.002	0.138
Sex	0.293	0.074	0.064	3.961***
Best Friends Influence	-0.191	0.066	-0.046	-2.892**
School Safety	0.097	0.039	0.043	2.499*

*Note: The reference category for sex is female. The reference category for race is White. All Likert scale items are treated as continuous-level variables. $P < .05 = *$, $P < .01 = **$, $P < .001 = ***$. $N = 3819$, $R^2 = .095$*

Overall, the results show some evidence of independent, main effects of exclusionary discipline, defiant conditions, and race/ethnicity. However, as shown in Tables 5 and 6, there is no indication of interaction effects between these different statuses. Therefore, although there is support for the first hypothesis, the second and third hypotheses were not supported by these findings.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

Overall, the current study showed some evidence of an effect of exclusionary disciplinary practices on juvenile delinquency as the main condition. Furthermore, this supports the first hypothesis that suspension and expulsion were expected to be positively associated with subsequent delinquency. Furthermore, the model found a main effect of defiant conditions that were significant in all models. There was also some evidence of the main effect of race and ethnicity. Specifically, Black, non-Hispanic youths were less likely to commit future delinquency than their White, Non-Hispanic counterparts when defiant conditions were zero, and they were not excluded. This finding suggests that Black, non-Hispanic students are more likely to be deterred by sanctions than their White, non-Hispanic counterparts without defiance and exclusionary practices. At least partially, this finding suggests a significant impact of these conditions on Black youths.

However, the current study did not find a three-way interaction between exclusionary disciplinary practices, race/ethnicity, and defiant conditions. However, the main effect of defiant conditions was significant in each model, which suggests that, unlike what was proposed, defiant conditions, instead of moderating the effects of exclusionary disciplinary, are a separate factor. Moreover, the interaction did not reveal that race moderated either exclusionary disciplinary practices or defiant conditions. However, it should be noted that the lack of an interaction effect may instead be caused by low statistical power and overall the number of cases in the Add Health data who had received exclusionary discipline. Further research should look into data with more exclusionary discipline instances and how race/ethnicity impacts these findings.

Furthermore, as with the pursuit of any research project, there are limitations to the study. The first limitation comes from the data itself. The Add Health, although a robust and often-used set of data, does pose some limitations. One such limitation comes from how the questions were asked because it was impossible to ask if individuals felt stigmatization from the exclusionary event itself. Instead, the measurement was broader, asking if the youths felt excluded in general. A more reliable way to test this feature of defiance would be to ask explicitly about feeling stigmatized by an exclusionary event. Furthermore, no direct question asked if the students felt stigmatized by the exclusionary event or found the exclusionary event fair. Although the question was asked if they found the authority figure (in this case, teachers) fair, it may be more apt in the future to ask directly about the event itself.

Another limitation of the study is the Add Health data age, as the first wave collection started in the 90s. Although school discipline trends have stayed broadly similar since that time, newer data collection may reveal issues that may not have been found in this study (Losen & Skiba, 2010; Fabelo et al., 2011; Brooks, Schiraldi & Zeidenberg, 1999; Giroux, 2003; Kupchik & Monahan, 2006). Furthermore, given the age of the data, changes in school discipline may not be fully captured. Additionally, given the relative rarity for expulsions, they were combined with out of school suspensions to have sufficient cases. However, it would be useful to separate both categories to explore whether there are differences between these two sanctions' effects. It may also be possible with newer data collections to have information on in-school suspensions and detentions, which was outside the scope of this project due to the measurement availability.

The study also assumed that exclusionary disciplinary practices were inherently stigmatizing, which may not be the case. As shown by Hirschfield (2008), there is an indication of the normalization of punishments in groups that are over-punished. Future research should disentangle what events are considered stigmatizing and if they are so universally. Although defiance theory does expect the presence of a category of individuals unaffected by punishment, this should be explored more thoroughly.

Future studies should address these limitations, as well as expand defiance theory in general. This expansion would be especially helpful in expanding demographic variables and studying the differences between individuals multidimensionally. The current study has attempted to show the effects, or lack thereof, of race as a mediating factor; however, this and other minority statuses such as gender and LGBTQIA should be specifically considered. Furthermore, it may also be helpful in both collecting data and understanding these interaction effects to produce more qualitative and quantitative research on the area of exclusionary discipline and the effects of these minority statuses interact (see, for example, Morris, 2005, 2007; Snapp, Hoenig, Fields, & Russell, 2014; Kupchik & Ellis, 2008).

Furthermore, future research should further explore the impact of exclusionary disciplinary practices, and they may impact youths' future outcomes such as future academic achievement, job opportunities, and other significant life events. Research has suggested that exclusionary discipline practices affect future academic achievement; however, this should be expanded and explored (Hwang, 2018; Fabelo et al., 2011; Gregory, Skiba & Noguera, 2010).

Additionally, this study suggests an impact of race and ethnicity that may not be fully captured and needs to be examined more closely. Although no interaction effects were found, there are indications that race and ethnicity may play a more complex process than this study suggested. For example, although the study was unable to capture this, black students as a whole are more likely to be disproportionately disciplined (Mendez & Knoff, 2003; Rocque, 2010; Skiba et al., 2002; Skiba et al., 1997; Shaw & Branden, 1990; Skiba et al., 201). This fact, with the current study, suggests that although not directly captured in the models that exclusionary discipline could play a significant part in the outcome of Black, non-Hispanic students. More research should be done at the qualitative and quantitative level to understand this complexity; however, one key takeaway from this study and the previous literature is to be cognizant of these phenomena and craft policies that would lessen this disproportionate. For example, Morris's (2007) qualitative study found that in a school, although the Black female students were doing well academically, they were often targeted disproportionately based on the stereotype of Black women being "loud" and "un-lady like". Not only does this suggest intersectionality between multiple statuses, but it also suggests looking into rules and how they are enforced is a step that schools can take to limit the effects of exclusionary discipline.

Additionally, the study shows that defiant conditions and exclusionary disciplinary practices are associated with increased delinquency. This rather significant finding suggests that school disciplinary practices should reduce exclusionary practices across the board and introduce other disciplinary measures. One suggestion is to highlight the disciplinary structure take a more restorative justice approach to discipline, in which an

individual is brought back into society (Braithwaite 1989; Gonzalez 2012). For example, a student may respond better to punishment if they fully understand what they have done and why that action was disruptive without further alienating them from the classroom (Braithwaite 1989; Gonzalez 2012).

Furthermore, although many of the defiant conditions cannot directly be affected by schools, some such as the care and fairness of teachers are significant in the defiant conditions scale, which in turn can affect student's defiance. This finding suggests that schools continue to play an important part in future delinquency and these complex systems, especially how they may produce a criminogenic or non-criminogenic label outside of the exclusionary discipline practice. Given that fairness is indicated as a more substantial portion of the defiant conditions that this study suggested, improving the procedure of how people are defined delinquent may also mimic Tyler's (1990) focus on legitimacy in compliance. Therefore, another area to explore may follow how to make the disciplinary measures fairer to the students of a school. This shift of practice may involve having student participation in enacting new rules, explaining why rules are put into place, and even allowing students to have a chance to 'defend' or otherwise explain why they committed a deviant action.

School discipline in many ways has mimicked the criminal justice system's crime and punishment model. As such, the themes at the heart of criminal justice research, are seen in school disciplinary practices and can inform how punishment works. Given this study, and the literature surrounding deviance, criminology is under the obligation to understand not only how the ideas of deterrence and labeling play out in arrest but the social situations that happened before arrest are made. As Sherman suggest (1993), more

research needs to be done understand the complicated nature of sanctions. Furthermore, this research needs to be included in broader contexts as well.

REFERENCES

- Amemiya, J., Mortenson, E., & Wang, M.T. (2020). Minor infractions are not minor: school infractions for minor misconduct may increase adolescents' defiant behavior and contribute to racial disparities in school discipline. *American Psychologist*, *75*(1), 23-36.
- Abrah, P.B., (2019). Labeling theory and life stories of juvenile delinquents transitioning into adulthood. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *63*(2), 179-197.
- Adams, M.S., Robertson, C.T., Gray-Ray, P., & Ray, M.C. (2003). Labeling and delinquency. *Adolescence*, *38*, 171-186.
- Augustyn, M.B. & Ward, J.T (2015). Exploring the sanction-crime relationship through a lens of procedural justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *43*, 470-479.
- Albrecht, G.L., & Albrecht, M.H. (1978). A critical assessment of labeling in the juvenile justice system. *The Justice System Journal*, *4*(1), 114-128.
- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force. (2008). Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 852-862.
- Barrick, K. (2013). A review of prior tests of labeling theory. In Farrington, DP. & Murray, J. (Eds.), *Labeling theory: Empirical tests* (pp. 89-112). New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Bates, L., Darvell, M.J., & Watson, B. (2017) Young and unaffected by road policing

- strategies: Using deterrence theory to explain provisional drivers' (non) compliance. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 50(1), 23-38.
- Beccaria, C. (2009) *On Crime and Punishments* (Newman G.R., & Marongiu, Trans.). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis Group (Originally published in 1764).
- Becker, H. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. London, England: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Beger, R.R. (2002). Expansion of police power in public schools and the vanishing rights of students. *Social Justice*, 29 (1-2) 119-130.
- Bentham, J (2012) *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications (Originally published in 1789).
- Bernburg, J.G. (2019) Labeling Theory. In Krohn, M., Lizotte, A., & Hall, G.D., (Eds.) *Handbook on Crime and Deviance*, (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Springer
- Bernburg, J.G., & Krohn, M.D (2003). Labeling life chances and adult crime: the direct and indirect effects of official intervention in adolescence on crime in early adulthood. *Criminology*, 41(4), 1287-1318.
- Bernburg J.G., Krohn, M.D., Rivera C.J (2006). Official labeling, criminal embeddedness, and subsequent delinquency, 43(1) 67-88.
- Blake, J.J., Butler, B.R., Lewis, C.W., & Darenbourg, A. (2011). Unmasking the inequitable discipline experiences of urban Black girls: Implication for Urban educational stakeholders. *Urban Review*, 43, 90-106.
- Blumer, H. (1969) *Symbolic Interaction*. Englewoods Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bouffard, L.A., & Piquero, N.L. (2010). Defiance theory and life course explanations of persistent offending. *Crime & Delinquency*, 56(2), 227-252.

- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brooks, K., Schiraldi, V. & Zeidenberg, J. (2000). *School House Hype: Two years later*. Washington, D.C., The Justice Policy Institute.
- Brooks, T. (2014). *Deterrence*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bruinsma, G.J.N. (2008) Classical Theory: The emergence of deterrence theory in the age of enlightenment. In Nagin, D.S., Cullen, F.T., & Jonson, C.L. (Eds.) *Deterrence, choice and Crime: Contemporary perspectives*. (pp. 6-32) Routledge.
- Christle, C., Nelson, M. & Jolivette K. (2004). School characteristics related to the use of suspension. *Education and Treatment of Children*. 27(4), 509-526.
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human Nature and the Social Order*. New York, NY: C. Scribner's Sons.
- DeVoe, J.F., Peter K., Noonan, M., Snyder, T.D., & Baum, K. (2005). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety*. Washington, D.C.: US Departments of Education and Justice.
- Downs, W.R., Robertson, J.F., & Harrison L.R. (1997). Control theory, labeling theory, and the delivery of services for drug abuse to adolescents. *Adolescence*. 32(125), 1-24.
- Fabelo, T., Thompson, M.D., Plotkin, M., Carmichael, D., Marchbanks, M.P., & Booth, E.A. (2011). *Breaking schools' rules: A statewide study of how school discipline relates to students' success and juvenile justice involvement*. New York City, New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center.
- Frazier, C.E. & Cochran, J.K. (1989). Official intervention, diversion from the juvenile

justice system, and dynamics of human services work: effects of a reform goal based on labeling theory. *Crime & Delinquency*, 32(2), 157-176.

Ganao, J.S.D., Silvester, F.S. & Glenn, J.W. (2013). Assessing the differential impact of contextual factors on school suspension for Black and White students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 82(4), 393-407.

Giroux, H. (2003) Racial injustice and disposable youth in the age of zero tolerance. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(4), 553-565.

Goode, E. (1975). On behalf of labeling theory. *Social Problems*, 22, 570–583.

Gonzalez, T. (2012). Keeping kids in schools: Restorative justice, punitive discipline, and the school to prison pipeline. *Journal of Law & Education*, 41(2), 281-336.

Gottfredson, G., Gottfredson, D., Payne, A., & Gottfredson, N. (2005). School climate predictors of school disorder: Results from a national study of delinquency prevention in schools. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42, 412-44.

Gordon, R., Piana, L.D., & Keleher, T. (2000). Facing the consequences: An examination of racial discrimination in U.S. public schools. Oakland, CA: Applied Research Center.

Grasmick, H.G., & Bryjak G.J. (1980) The deterrent effect of perceived severity of punishment. *Social Forces* 59(2), 471-491.

Gregory, A., Skiba, R.J., & Noguera, P.A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher*, 39(1), 59-68.

Gregory, A., & Weinstein, R.S. (2008). The discipline gap and African Americans:

- Defiance or cooperation in the high school classroom. *The Journal of School Psychology, 46*, 455-475.
- Harris, K.M., Halpern, C.T., Whitsel, E., Hussey, J., Tabor, J., Entzel, P., & Udry, J.R. (2009). *The national longitudinal study of adolescent to adult health: research design*. URL: <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design>.
- Heckert, A. & Heckert, D. (2010). Differential labeling theory. *Sociological Imagination, 46*(2),24-40.
- Hinojosa, M.S. (2008). Black-White differences in school suspension: Effect of student beliefs about teachers. *Sociological Spectrum, 28*, 175-193.
- Hirschfield, P. J. (2008). The declining significance of delinquent labels in disadvantaged urban communities. *Sociological Forum, 23*(3), 575-601.
- Hirschi, T. (1980). Labelling theory and juvenile delinquency: An assessment of the evidence. In W. Gove (Ed.), *The labelling of deviance: Evaluating a perspective* (pp. 271–302). (2nd ed) New York: Wiley.
- Horner, S.B., Fireman, G.D, & Wang, E.W. (2010). The relation of student behavior, peer status, race, and gender to decisions about school discipline using CHAID decision trees and regression modeling. *Journal of School Psychology, 48*, 135-161.
- Huang, F.L., & Cornell, D.G. (2017). Student attitudes and behaviors as explanations for the Black-White suspension gap. *Children and Youth Services Review, 73*, 298-308.
- Hwang, N. (2018). Suspensions and achievement: Varying links by type, frequency, and subgroup. *Educational Researcher, 20*(10), 1-12.

- Jackson, D.B., & Hay, C. (2012) The conditional impact of official labeling on subsequent delinquency: considering the attenuating role of family attachment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 50(2), 300-322.
- Johnson, L.M., Simons, R.L., & Conger, R.D. (2004). Criminal justice system involvement and continuity of youth crime: A longitudinal analysis. *Youth & Society*, 36(1), 3-29.
- Kavish, D.R., Mullins, C.W., & Soto, D.A. (2016). Interactionist labeling: Formal and informal labeling's effects on juvenile delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency*, 62(10), 1313-1336.
- Klein, M. W. (1986). Labeling theory and delinquency policy: An experimental test. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 13,47–79.
- Krezmien, M.P., Leone, P.E., & Achilles, G.M. (2006). Suspension, race and disability: Analysis of statewide practices and reporting. *Journal of emotional and behavioral disorders*. 14(4), 217-226.
- Kupchik A. (2009). Things are tough all over: Race, ethnicity, class and school discipline. *Punishment & Society*,11(3), 291-317.
- Kupchik A. (2016). *The real school safety problem: Long-term consequences of harsh school punishment*. Oakland, CA: Univ. Calif. Press
- Kupchik, A. & Ellis, N. (2008). School discipline and security fair for all students? *Youth & Society*, 39(4), 549-574.
- Kupchik, A. & Monahan, T. (2006) The new American school: preparation for post-industrial discipline. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(5), 617 – 631.
- Kovandzic, T. (2001). The impact of Florida's habitual offender law on crime.

Criminology, 39, 179-204.

Lee, H.W. (2017) Taking deterrence seriously: The wide-scope deterrence theory of punishment. *Criminal Justice Ethics*, 36(1), 2-24.

Leone, P. E., Mayer, M. J., Malmgren, K., & Meisel, S. M. (2000). School violence and disruption: Rhetoric, reality, and reasonable balance. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 33(1), 1–20.

Lemert, E. (1967). *Human deviance, social problems and social control*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Lopes, G., Krohn, M.D., Lizotte, A.J., Schmidt, N.M., Vasquez, B.E., Bernburg, J.G. (2012). Labeling and cumulative disadvantage: The impact of formal police intervention on life chances and crime during emerging adulthood. *Crime & Delinquency*, 58(3), 456-488.

Long, A. G., & Rand Corporation. (2008). *Deterrence: From Cold War to Long War: Lessons from Six Decades of Rand Deterrence Research*. RAND Corporation.

Losen, D. J., & Skiba, R. J. (2010). *Suspended education: urban middle schools in crisis*. UCLA: *The Civil Rights Project / Proyecto Derechos Civiles*.

Mahoney, A.R. (1974). The effect of labeling upon youths in the juvenile justice system: a review of the evidence. *Law & Society Review*, 8(4), 583-614.

Matsueda, R. L. (1992). Reflected appraisals, parental labeling, and delinquency: specifying a symbolic interactionist theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(6), 1577-1611.

Matsueda, R. L. (2014). The natural history of labeling theory. In D. P. Farrington & J.

- Murray (Eds.), *Labeling theory: Empirical tests* (13-44). New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Matthews, S. K., & Agnew, R. (2008). Extending deterrence theory: Do delinquent peers condition the relationship between perceptions of getting caught and offending? *Journal on Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *45*(2), 91-118.
- Mayer, M.J. & Leone, P.E. (2007). School violence and disruption revisited: Equity and safety in the schoolhouse. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, *40*(1), 1-28.
- Meade, A.C (1974). The labeling approach to delinquency: state of the theory as a function of method. *Social Forces*, *53*(1), 83-91.
- Mendez, L. M. & Knoff, H. (2003) Who gets suspended from school and why: a demographic analysis of schools and disciplinary infractions in a large school district. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *26*(1), 30-51.
- Musu-Gillette, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., Kemp, J., Diliberti, M., and Oudekerk, B.A. (2018). Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2017 (NCES 2018-036/NCJ 251413). National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, DC.
- Morris, E.W. (2005). "Tuck in that shirt!" race, class, gender, and discipline in an urban school. *Sociological Perspectives*, *48*(1), 25-48.
- Morris, E.W. (2007) "Ladies" or "Loudies? Perceptions and experiences of Black girls in Classrooms. *Youth and Society*, *38*(4), 490-415.
- Morgan, M.A. & Wright, J.P. (2018) Beyond Black and White: Suspension disparities for

- Hispanic, Asian, and White Youth. *Criminal Justice Review*, 43(4) 377-398.
- Mowen, T. J., & Brent, J.J. (2016). School discipline as a turning point: the cumulative effect of suspension on arrest. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 53, 628-653.
- Nagin, D. S (2013) Deterrence in the twenty-first century. *Crime and Justice*, 42 (1), 199-263.
- Nagin, D. S., & Paternoster, R. (1991). The preventive effects of the perceived risk of arrest: Testing an expanded conception of deterrence. *Criminology*, 29(4), 561-588.
- Nagin, D. S., & Pogarsky, G. (2001) Integrating celerity, impulsivity, and extralegal sanction threats into a model of general deterrence: Theory and evidence. *Criminology*, 39(4) 865-892.
- Novack, A. (2019). The school-to-prison pipeline: an examination of the association between suspension and justice system involvement. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 46(8), 1165-1180.
- Patchin, J.W., & Hinduja, S. (2018) Deterring teen bullying: Assessing the impact of perceived punishments from police, schools, and parents. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 16(2), 190-207.
- Paternoster, R. (2010). How much do we really know about criminal deterrence? *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 100(3), 765–823.
- Paternoster R. & Iovanni, L. (1986) The deterrent effect of perceived severity: A

- reexamination. *Social Forces*, 64(3), 751-777.
- Paternoster R. & Iovanni, L. (1989) Labeling perspective and delinquency: An elaboration of the theory and an assessment of the evidence. *Justice Quarterly*, 6 (3) 359-394.
- Peguero, A.A. & Shekarkhar, Z. (2011). Lation/a student misbehavior and school punishment. *Hispanic Journal or Behavioral Sciences*, 33(1), 54-70.
- Peguero, A.A., Popp, A.M., Latimore, T.L., Shekarkhar, Z. & Koo, D.J. (2011) Social control theory and school misbehavior: examining the role of race and ethnicity. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 9(3), 259-275.
- Petras, H., Masyn, K.E., Buckley, J.A., Ialongo, N.S. & Kellam, S. (2011). Who is most at risk for school removal? A multilevel discrete-time survival analysis of individual- and context-level influences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(1), 223-237.
- Petrosino, A., Turpin-Petrosino, C., & Guckenburg, S. (2010). Formal system processing of juveniles: Effects on delinquency. Oslo, Norway: The Campbell Collaboration.
- Piquero, N.L. & Bouffard, L.A. (2003). A preliminary and partial test of specific defiance. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 26 (1), 1-21.
- Pratt, T.C., Cullen, F.T., Blevins, K.R., Daigle, L.E., & Madensen T.D., (2008) The Empirical status of deterrence theory: a meta-analysis. In. Cullen, F.T., Wright, J.P., & Blevins, K.R. (Eds.), *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory*. (pp. 367-395). (Vol. 15) Transaction Publishers.
- Oreopoulos, P. (2007) Do dropouts dropout out too soon? Wealth health and happiness from compulsory schooling. *Journal of Public Economics*, 91(11-12), 2213-2229.

- Ray, W.C., & Downs, W.R., (1986) An empirical test of labeling theory using longitudinal data. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 23(2), 169-194.
- Restivo, E.C., & Lanier, M. M. (2014) The impact of extra-legal factors on the labeling of juveniles as 'offenders' *Acta Criminologica: Southern African Journal of Criminology*, 27(1), 30-46.
- Restivo, E.C., & Lanier, M. M. (2015) Measuring the contextual effects and mitigating factors of labeling theory. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(1), 116-141.
- Rocque, M. (2010) Office discipline and student behavior: Does race matter? *American Journal of Education*, 166, 557-581.
- Scheff, T. J., & Retzinger (1991) *Emotions and Violence: Shame and Rage in Destructive Conflicts*. Lexington, Ma.: Lexington Books.
- Schneider, A. L., & Ervin, L. (1990). Specific deterrence, rational choice, and decision heuristics: Applications in juvenile justice. *Social Science Quarterly*, 71(3), 585-601
- Scimecca, J. A. (1977). Labeling Theory and Personal Construct Theory: Toward the measurement of individual variation. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 68(4), 652-659.
- Shaw, S.R. & Braden, J.P. (1990). Race and gender bias in the administration of corporal punishment. *School Psychology Review*, 19(3), 378-383.
- Sherman, L.W. (1993). Defiance, deterrence, and irrelevance: A theory of the criminal sanction. *Journal of research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(4), 445-473.
- Skiba, R. (2000). Zero tolerance, zero evidence: An analysis of school disciplinary Practice (Policy Research Report #SRS2), Bloomington, IN: Indiana Education

Policy Center.

- Skiba, R. J., Arredondo, M.I., & Williams, N.T. (2014a). More than a metaphor: The contribution of exclusionary discipline to a school-to-prison pipeline. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 47*(4), 546-564.
- Skiba, R. J., Chung, C., Trachok, M., & Baker, T.L. (2014b). Parsing disciplinary disproportionality: Contributions of infraction, student, and school characteristics to out-of-school suspension and expulsion. *American Educational Researcher Journal, 51*(4), 640-670.
- Skiba, R.J., Horner, R.H., Chung, C., Rausch, M.K., May, S.L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review, 40*(1), 85-107.
- Skiba, R.J., Michael, R.S., Nardo, A.C. & Peterson, R.L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *The Urban Review, 34*(4), 317-342.
- Skiba, R. & Peterson, R. (1999). The dark side of zero tolerance: Can punishment lead to safe schools? *The Phi Delta Kappan, 80*(5) 372-382.
- Skiba, R. & Peterson, R. (2000). School discipline at a crossroads: From zero tolerance to early response. *Exceptional Children, 66*(3) 335-247.
- Skiba, R., Peterson, R. & Williams, T. (1997). Office referrals and suspension: Disciplinary intervention in middle schools. *Education and Treatment of Children, 20*(3), 295-315.
- Slocum, L.A, Wiley, S.A., & Esbesen F.A. (2016). A longitudinal exploration of police

- contact, procedural injustice, and subsequent delinquency. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 43(1) 7-26.
- Snapp, S.D., Hoenig J.M., Fields, A., & Russell, S.T. (2014) Messy, butch, and queer: LGBTQ youth and the school-to-prison pipeline. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 30(1), 57-82.
- Stafford, M. C., & Warr, M. (1993). Reconceptualization of general and specific deterrence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(2), 123-135.
- Tannenbaum, F. (1938). *Crime and community*. Boston, MA: Ginn.
- Tittle, C. (1980). Labeling and crime: An empirical evaluation. In W. Gove (Ed.), *The labelling of deviance: Evaluating a perspective* (pp. 241–263). (2nd ed.) New York: Wiley.
- Tomlinson, K.D. (2016) An examination of deterrence theory: Where do we stand? *Federal Probation*, 80(3), 33-38.
- Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why People Obey the Law*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Quist-Adade, C. (2018). *Symbolic Interactionism: The Basics*. Wilmington: Vernon Press.
- Ward, R. H. (1971). The labeling theory: Critical analysis. *Criminology*, 9(3), 268-290.
- Wallace, J.M., Goodkind, S., Wallace, C.M., & Bachman, J.G. (2008). Racial, ethnic, and gender differences in school discipline among U.S. high school students: 1991-2005. *The Negro Educational Review*, 59(1-2), 47-126.
- Way, S.M. (2011) School discipline and disruptive classroom behavior: The moderating effects of student perceptions. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52, 346-375.
- Welch, K. (2018) The effect of minority threat on risk management and the “new

disciplinology” in schools. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 59, 12-17.

Welch, K. & Payne A.A. (2010) Racial threat and punitive school discipline. *Social Problems*, 57(1), 25-48.

Wright, J.P., Morgan, M.A., Coyne, M.A., Beaver, K.M. & Barnes J.C. (2014). Prior problem behavior accounts for the racial gap in school suspensions. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42, 257-266.

Wu, S., Pink, W., Crain, R. & Moles (1982). Student Suspension: A critical reappraisal. *The Urban Review*, 14(4), 245-303.

APPENDIX A

Factor analysis Loadings for Delinquency at Wave II

Factor	Factor Loading
Participated in Graffiti	.589
Damaged Property	.648
Lie to Parents About Whereabouts	.503
Shoplifting	.701
In a Serious Physical Fight	.416
Steal a Car	.511
Steal something worth More than \$50	.663
Steal something worth Less than \$50	.695
Burglarize a Building	.648
Use or Threaten Someone with A Weapon	.542
Sell Drugs	.542
Be Loud or Rowdy in a Public Place	.541
Take Part in a Group Fight	.529

APPENDIX B***Factor analysis Loadings for Defiant Condition***

Factor	Factor Loading
Teachers are Fair	.624
Trouble with Teachers	.573
Teacher Care	.620
Socially Accepted	.586
People are unfriendly	.438
Trouble with Students	.478
Parental Bond	.426
Do Everything Just Right	.574

VITA
Curriculum Vitae

Addison Kobie

Education

M.A., Criminal Justice and Criminology, Expected 2020

Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Tx

B.A. Criminal Justice, B.A. in Psychology 2018

Minor in Philosophy

Rockhurst University, Kansas City, MO

Research Interests

Teaching interests

Corrections

Research methods

Juvenile delinquency

Corrections

Program Evaluation

Juvenile delinquency

Academic Positions

Teaching assistant at Sam Huston State University

Fall 2018 – Present

Honors and Awards

Teaching Assistant Certification (TAC); Sam Houston State University (Spring 2019)

Huntsville, TX

Summa Cum Laude; Rockhurst University (Spring 2018)

Kansas City, MO

Dean's Scholarship; Rockhurst University (Fall 2014 – Spring 2018)

Kansas City, MO

Dean's List (fall 2014 – Spring 2018)

Kansas City, MO

Memberships

American Society of Criminology

Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences

Graduate Student Organization for Criminal Justice (Fall 2018 – present)

Regular member