Cross-national study on the attitude of normal and juvenile youngsters towards social limits

STRIJKER, J., & RINK, J.E.

Abstract

For an early detection of youngsters with an increased risk of juvenile delinquency efforts are being directed to develop an instrument measuring the attitude of youngsters towards social limits. For this purpose a cross-national study on attitude of normal youngsters has been conducted in eight different countries. The differences between nationalities proved to be moderate. In addition, cross-national research was also conducted on the attitude of juvenile offenders. In spite of the effects of the different nationalities it was possible to differentiate between normal youths and juvenile offenders on a cross-national level. The results will stimulate the development of an instrument that is useful for clinical assessment.

Key words: juvenile delinquency, attitude, cross-national comparison

Introduction

Juvenile delinquency is a problem, for both society and the juvenile offenders themselves and the costs involved for recovery, monitoring and treatment are immense. Because of its social implications, juvenile delinquency is also the focus of attention in scientific research (see e.g. review by Loeber, Slot, & Sergeant, 2001a). One of the problem areas in detecting young offenders is the lack of adequate screening methods (Loeber, Slot & Sergeant, 2001b). The screening may be directed to either detecting potential youth offenders or classifying young offenders into categories to determine appropriate punitive measures (Scholte & Dorelijers, 2001). According to Scholte and Dorelijers (ibid.) screening of potential offenders is crucial to deal with juvenile delinquency, as the right preventive programs should be tuned to the right group at risk. In order to treat juvenile offenders, sound screening methods and subsequent diagnosis should be geared to an effective treatment program. The problems involved are twofold. Firstly, early detection of potential offenders involves assessing certain risk factors. Diagnostic instruments measuring risks among youngsters who are already in contact with a care agency, cannot be used in a community survey. A different strategy is to ask the youngsters themselves about their attitude towards law, rules, norms and values. Rink, Vos, Van Lokven and Slagveer (1989) speak of 'attitude to social limits'. According to Eagly and Chaiken (1998) attitude can be seen as a psychological tendency to evaluate a certain entity (object, person, stimulus, event) with a certain preference or disapproval. Various studies have shown a consistent relationship between a certain attitude and its (compatible) behavior (see e.g. Armitage & Connor, 2001). Attitude is considered the antecedent of the behavior, whereby

behavior may ultimately change a certain attitude. From this perspective, a deviant attitude to social limits is considerated to be a risk factor for delinquent behavior. An instrument that screens youths on deviant attitudes can be used in a survey. It is also a valuable addition to the set of existing assessment instruments. The second problem involved concerns establishing the effect of the treatment of residential juvenile delinquents. In order to evaluate the effect of treatment, it should be determined to what extent a residential young offender deviates from the 'normal' youngster, meaning the profile of a group of youngsters without registered police contacts. Rink et al. (1989) reported that this evaluation was strongly biased by the group leader's personal frame of reference. From the overview by Van Yperen, Van den Berg and Eijgenraam (2002) it appears that over the past years initiatives have been taken to develop instruments for residential care, but that an instrument for evaluating treatment within residential care is still lacking. The two problems described above formed the basis for exploring the possibilities for developing an instrument that measures the attitude of youngsters to social limits. In addition, criterion validity is also required, meaning that residential offenders are to deviate systematically on the instrument from other youngsters in the predicted direction. For this purpose, Rink et al. (ibid.) developed the Standard Reaction Instrument (SRI). The nineties saw various studies conducted with the use of the SRI. Three key questions are being addressed in this article:

1. What is the standard picture of the attitude to social limits in normal groups? This question is addressed from a cross-national level, which means that data sampling will be carried out in different countries to study differences and similarities to find out if there is a universal picture.
2. What is the attitude of groups of residential juvenile offenders to social limits? Like question one, this question is also addressed from a cross-national level: is it possible to establish a universal picture?
3. Do the groups of normal youngsters and groups of residential juvenile offenders differ from each other with respect to their attitude to social limits (criterion validity)?
   If empirical support for the criterion validity is found, the instrument may be used for clinical assessment.

Research method

Instrument

The second relevant part of the SRI consists of 10 so-called 'critical incidents': short stories in the form of social limit situations relating to the experiences of 12 to 20 year-olds. The stories were based on three social limits (Nijboer & Dijksterhuis, 1981; Rink, Vos, Van Lokven & Slagveer, 1989; Rombouts, 1981):

- a social limit whose overstepping results in a financial offence
- a social limit whose overstepping results in a violent offence
- a social limit whose overstepping results in breaking the rules or not sticking to agreements.

An illustration of an incident involving a financial limit is the following situation: 'You are standing near the coffee machine and you spot a wallet, which someone has left there, containing € 35 ...'.

The subject is asked to respond to the three following questions:

1. In what ways could you respond to a situation like this? This question appeals to all possible ways in which the subject can respond to a situation like this.
2. What would *you* do in a situation like this? This question is directed to the subject's choice of action.
3. Why would you prefer to do this? This question refers to the motivation of the subject.

The same three questions are asked after reading each of the other nine incidents. The subject is asked to give a written, descriptive response to each situation, in the form of a story or statement. In the first incident of the coffee machine two possible answers are 'stay honest' and 'nick the purse'. Subsequently, a codebook is used to classify the answers. The answers to the first question 'In what ways could you respond to a situation?' are categorized as either Adjusting, Overstepping, Negotiating or Withdrawal. In the incident of the coffee machine 'stay honest' would fall into the category Adjusting and 'nick the purse' into the category Overstepping. Dichotomous scores are computed per category for each limit situation: the subject can either be included in or excluded from a certain category. In the coffee machine incident the youngster scores 1 on Adjusting and 1 on Overstepping and 0 on Negotiating and Withdrawal. The total score on the ten incidents is calculated, the values on the four categories range from 0 to 10 (a maximum of 10 incidents). The values on the categories are considered at interval level, therefore the term 'scale' rather than 'category' will be used.

The response format to the second question (What would *you* do in a situation like this) is similar to that of the first question: the answers belong to one of the categories Adjusting, Overstepping, Negotiating and Withdrawal. Only one answer is allowed for the second question, whereas in the first question more answers are possible. After summing up the scores over the incidents four scales emerge: Adjusting, Overstepping, Negotiating and Withdrawal, each with a score ranging from 0 to 10. Two categories are used to categorize the answers to the third question (Why would you prefer to do this?): Here and now and Other Person/Future-oriented. More options are possible (as in question 1).

In sum, the SRI has a total of 10 scales reflecting the attitude of youngsters to social limits. The four scales referring to the knowledge of social limits ('In what ways could you respond to a situation like this?') belong to the cognitive component of attitude, which is indicated as 'K' (known). The four scales are identified as Adjusting (KA), Overstepping (KB), Negotiating (KC) and Withdrawal (KD). The four scales concerning the subject's choice of action ('What would *you* do in a situation like this?') are placed in the conative component of attitude and abbreviated with the letter 'P' (preferred). The four scales and abbreviations are Adjusting (PA), Overstepping (PA), Negotiating (PC) and Withdrawal (PD). The two other scales referring to motivation (Why would you prefer to do this?) are grouped in the motivational component of attitude and abbreviated as 'M' (motivation). These two scales and abbreviations are I/Here-and-now oriented (Ma) and other Person/Future-oriented (Mb).

The mean inter-rating reliability (Kappa) for three experienced raters was .89 and for inexperienced raters .88. The reliability was measured using lambda-2. Coefficient lambda-2 is a coefficient in a series to verify the reliability of a test. These reliability coefficients can be ranked according to size. Cronbach's alpha is the lower limit of reliability and lambda-2 the second lowest limit. It is recommended to compute the lambda-2 (Drenth & Sytsma, 1990), which in this study is carried out in both samples and for all scales. Results show that lambdas range between .42 and .69.

Evidence for the construct validity of the SRI was shown by Grietens (1999), who found an effect (η^2) of 18.2% between the SRI and delinquent behavior.

Research group

The research group consisted of nine groups of normal youngsters and three groups of residential juvenile offenders. The groups of normal youngsters were from Northern Europe (Estonia) Central Europe (Slovakia), Western Europe (Netherlands, Belgium and Germany), North America (Canada), Central America (Mexico) and New Zealand. Data were collected of 3447 youngsters by researchers living in the same country as the youngsters. Table 1 gives a more detailed description of the nine groups of normal youngsters.

The percentage of boys in the group is between 42.0% and 63.4% and the mean age is between 14.6 and 16.4. The groups are representative for the geographical area in which the studies were conducted.

Data were also collected from four groups of residential juvenile offenders living in penitentiary facilities in Belgium, Netherlands, Estonia and Mexico respectively. Research was conducted by researchers living in the same countries as the subjects. The total number of juvenile offenders was 450.
Table 2 presents the description of the groups of juvenile offenders.

Table 1
Composition of the groups of normal youngsters

Nationality	Researcher	Year data sampling	N	Boys (%)	Age *M* (*sd*)	Description of the research group
Belgium	Grietens	1995	390	50.3	14.6 (2.0)	Sample from schools and classes in two provinces
Canada	Latchford	1992	473	47.0	15.6 (1.9)	Sample from school and classes in New Brunswick
Holland	Rink *et al.*	1987	1.179	54.0	14.8 (1.6)	Sample from schools and classes in the northern and middle part of Holland
Estonia	Petersell	1996	82	63.4	14.8 (0.8)	Four schools in Estonia, representative sample of classes
Germany	Dickscheit	1994	355	54.4	14.8 (1.7)	Sample from schools and classes in the surrounding area of Rostock and Oldenburg
Slovakia	Potocarova & Krankus	1999	69	42.0	16.0 (2.0)	Schools in and around Bratislava
New Zealand	Barclay & Everts	1999-2002	93	52.7	16.0 (1.2)	Schools in and around Auckland with Pacific Islanders
Mexico	Oudhof	2003	293	50.5	15.8 (1.8)	Schools in Toluca

Table 2
Composition of the groups of residential juvenile offenders

Nationality	Researcher	Year data sampling	N	Boys (%)	Age *M* (*sd*)	Description of the research group
Belgium	Grietens	1995	85	83.5	16.4 (0.9)[a]	All penitentiary youth facilities in northern Belgium
Holland	Vos	1989	242	82.2	16.1 (1.4)	All penitentiary youth facilities in Holland
Estonia	Petersell	1996	24	100	16.4 (0.9)[a]	Single penitentiary youth facility in Estonia
Mexico	Oudhof	2003	99	77.8	16.9 (1.4)	Single penitentiary youth facility in the province

a: the mean age and standard deviation are the same in the groups from Estonia and Belgium.

The percentage of boys in the four groups varies between 77.9 and 100 and the mean age is between 16.1 and 16.9 year.

Procedure

The Dutch version was translated into English (Latchford, 1992; Barclay & Everts, 2000), Flemish (Grietens, 1999), German (Dickscheit, 1998) and Spanish (Oudhof, 2002). The English translation was used for the Slovakian (Potocarova & Krankus, 1999) and Estonian (Petersell, 1997) version. For the latter minor linguistic adjustments were required as typically Dutch expressions were used to describe social limit situations, which made them inaccessible to foreign language speakers. In the groups of normal youngsters, the SRI was administered in classroom situations. In the juvenile offenders group, the SRI was administered either individually or in small groups with a maximum of three subjects. Prior to administration of the questionnaires in the aforementioned groups the purpose of the study was explained. An example of how to answer a question was given. To ensure anonymity subjects were asked not to write down their names. The time needed to conduct the SRI amounted to 60 minutes. As all studies were conducted according to the same procedure, it can be assumed that there are no significant differences in methodological quality between studies.

Results

The first research question is "What is the standard attitude of normal youths to social limits?". Table 3 reflects the group means and standard deviations on the scales.

Tabel 3
Means and standard deviations per nationality of normal youths

	Holland $N=1179$	Belgium $N=390$	Germany $N=697$	Estonia $N=82$	Slovakia $N=126$	Canada $N=473$	Mexico $N=293$	N. Zealand $N=209$
KA	9.3 (1.2)	9.3 (1.1)	9.0 (1.5)	9.6 (1.0)	7.7 (2.0)	8.9 (1.5)	9.0 (1.1)	8.7 (1.9)
KB	8.8 (1.5)	8.0 (2.1)	7.4 (2.1)	8.8 (1.4)	4.1 (2.6)	8.1 (1.8)	7.0 (2.3)	7.4 (2.4)
KC	1.8 (1.3)	1.5 (1.2)	1.3 (1.2)	2.3 (1.9)	.8 (.9)	1.2 (1.1)	1.4 (1.2)	1.6 (1.3)
KD	2.6 (1.5)	2.7 (2.0)	2.8 (1.6)	4.1 (1.8)	1.2 (1.2)	2.7 (1.7)	2.0 (1.5)	3.2 (1.7)
PA	5.7 (1.9)	6.2 (1.9)	5.8 (1.9)	5.8 (1.5)	6.7 (1.6)	5.8 (1.9)	6.3 (1.7)	5.7 (2.0)
PB	2.9 (1.9)	2.3 (1.9)	2.5 (1.8)	2.8 (1.4)	2.4 (1.4)	2.7 (2.0)	2.4 (1.7)	2.6 (2.0)
PC	.8 (.8)	.8 (.8)	.6 (.8)	.7 (.9)	.6 (.8)	.7 (.8)	.7 (.9)	.7 (.8)
PD	.4 (.6)	.5 (.7)	.6 (.8)	.4 (.6)	.6 (.7)	.5 (.7)	.5 (.7)	.6 (.7)
Ma	8.2 (1.3)	7.5 (1.4)	7.4 (1.8)	7.1 (1.9)	6.8 (1.4)	7.7 (1.6)	8.5 (1.4)	7.9 (1.8)
Mb	3.6 (1.6)	2.9 (1.5)	3.1 (1.6)	3.9 (1.8)	4.1 (1.4)	3.3 (1.6)	3.0 (1.6)	3.2 (1.8)

Within the cognitive component (the K-scales, known reactions) the ranking of means is the same for all nationalities: $M_{KA} > M_{KB} > M_{KD} > M_{KC}$. When confronted with social limits, youngsters on average demonstrate more adjustment reactions (KA) than reactions of overstepping (KB), more reactions of overstepping than reactions of withdrawal (KD), more reac-

tions of withdrawal than reactions of negotiation (KD). The ranking of means for the conative component (the P-scales, preferred reactions) is generally as follows: $M_{PA} > M_{PB} > M_{PC} > M_{PD}$. As the P-scales add up to 10 incidents, we may conclude that when confronted with social limits, youngsters tend to adjust (PA) to the situation, rather than overstep a boundary. The tendency to overstep a limit does, however, exceed the tendency to negotiate (PC). Finally, youngsters are, on average, least likely to withdraw (PD) from the situation. Within the motivational component (the M-scales) the ranking of means is found to be $M_a > M_b$, implying that when confronted with a social limit, youngsters show more I-oriented reactions than Other Person-oriented reactions. The mean coefficient of agreement between nationalities across ten scales expressed in Pearson's r amounts to .96 (after Fisher's $r \rightarrow z \rightarrow r$ transformation). In order to study differences between nationalities on the scales, a multivariate variance analysis was carried out with the scales of each component as dependent variables and nationality as classification variable. Considering the differences between groups with regard to age and gender (see table 1), age and gender effects were eliminated by including these variables as covariates in the analysis. Standard deviations on the scales PC and PD were found to be small, which is why the lambda on these scales was also small (.23 and .13 respectively). For this reason the scales PA, PC and PD were joined together to form the scale Conformity (lambda-2 = .64). Scale PB remained the same (to be called Nonconformity, lambda-2 = .63). The mean on the scale Conformity could be obtained by computing the means on the scales PA, PC and PD. In view of the number of tests the alpha was set at .01. In the MANCOVA model Nationality shows a statistically significant score on the variation in the scale scores of the cognitive component. $F(28,13784) = 40.02$, $p <. 0005$. In addition, Nationality produced statistically significant effects on the variation in the scale scores of the conative component, $F(14,6856) = 10.97$, $p < .0005$, and motivational component, $F(14,6874) = 29.96$, $p < .0005$. ANCOVAs were performed in case significant effects in the MANCOVAs were found. The results of these analyses are reflected in table 4.

Table 4
Table of explained variance for significant nationality effects ($p < 01$) on the attitude scales with gender and age as covariates

Scale	Nationality	Gender	Age
KA	6.4	4.0	< 1
KB	20.0		< 1
KC	6.0	4.1	< 1
KD	6.7	< 1	< 1
Conformity	1.7	4.6	-[a]
PB (Nonconf.)	1.2	4.2	-[a]
Ma	7.2	1.1	-[a]
Mb	3.5	< 1	-[a]

a Univariate analysis did not occur as age in the MANCOVA was not found to contribute significantly

From the univariate ANCOVAs age appeared to contribute statistically significant to the variance on five scales, though the effect size was found to be less than 1%, which according to Cohen's criteria (1988), is considered small. Gender has a statistically significant effect on seven scales, the size of which is rated as 'small to moderate', according to Cohen's criteria. By the same criteria, the effect is considered substantial for the scales Adjustment (KA), Negoti-

ating (KC), Withdrawal (KC) and Overstepping (KB). The scales Conformity and Nonconformity also show statistically significant effects, the size of which is small, according to Cohen's criteria. The effect is considered moderate as to I-orientation (Ma) and small as to the Other Person-orientation (Mb). Summarizing, the differences between the nationalities are greater on the cognitive and motivational components than on the conative component. This enables us to conclude that when confronted with a social boundary, normal youngsters from different countries show minor differences with regard to attitudes towards conformity or nonconformity.

The second research question is "What is the attitude of residential juvenile offenders to social limits?".
Table 5 reflects the group means and standard deviations by nationality on the SRI scales.

Table 5
Means and standard deviations by nationality of residential juvenile offenders

	Holland $N=242$	Belgium $N=85$	Estonia $N=24$	Mexico $N=99$
KA	8.1 (2.4)	8.4 (2.0)	8.0 (2.7)	8.1 (1.5)
KB	8.2 (1.9)	8.0 (1.9)	8.6 (2.4)	5.1 (3.1)
KC	1.1 (1.3)	1.1 (1.1)	2.1 (2.3)	.8 (1.0)
KD	2.4 (2.0)	3.7 (4.7)	3.5 (2.5)	1.1 (1.3)
PA	4.3 (2.0)	4.0 (1.9)	3.9 (1.7)	6.4 (2.0)
PB	4.5 (2.1)	4.8 (2.1)	4.1 (2.1)	2.3 (2.2)
PC	.5 (.7)	.4 (.7)	.5 (.7)	.5 (.7)
PD	.6 (.8)	.6 (.6)	.6 (1.0)	.5 (.7)
Ma	7.9 (2.1)	7.3 (1.6)	8.2 (3.5)	7.9 (2.1)
Mb	3.5 (1.9)	2.9 (1.6)	4.8 (2.8)	3.8 (2.1)

Within the cognitive component (K-scales, known reactions) the ranking of means is as follows for Belgium and Mexico $M_{KA} > M_{KB} > M_{KD} > M_{KC}$. This ranking corresponds with the ranking found for normal youngsters. The ranking in descending order for Holland and Estonia is: $M_{KB} > M_{KA} > M_{KD} > M_{KC}$. Within the conative component (P-scales, Known reactions) the ranking for the means in Holland, Belgium and Estonia is $M_{PB} > M_{PA} > M_{PD} > M_{PC}$. When confronted with a social limit, detained offenders are more likely to overstep a social limit (PB) than to adjust (PA) and the tendency to withdraw (PD) is more likely than the tendency to negotiate (PC). This is a pattern different from that of normal youngsters, whose ranking order is Adjusting, Overstepping, Negotiating and Withdrawal. Within the motivational component the ranking of means is $M_a > M_b$: when confronted with a social limit, residential offenders show more I-orientation than Other Person-orientation. This pattern does not deviate from that of normal youngsters. In sum, the ranking of means on the scales within the cognitive and conative components is not the same across nationalities. The mean coefficient of agreement between nationalities expressed in Pearson's r is .95.
In order to examine the differences in means across nationalities a MANCOVA was conducted, with age and gender as covariates. The scales PA, PC, and PD were combined to form the scale Conformity and the alpha is determined at .01. Nationality shows statistically significant effects on the cognitive component (K-scales), $F(12,1329) = 15.90$, $p < .0005$, the cona-

tive component, $F(6,888) = 16.84$, $p < .0005$ and the motivational component, $F(6.888) = 4.97$, $p < .0005$. As significant effects were found in the MANCOVAs, ANCOVAs were indicated. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 6.

Table 6
Percentage of explained variance for significant effects ($p < .01$) of nationality on the attitude scales with gender and age as covariates.

Scale	Nationality	Gender	Age
KA	_c	_a	_b
KB	25.5	_a	_b
KC	5.2	_a	_b
KD	9.9	_a	_b
Conformity	14.7	_a	_b
PB (Nonconf.)	16.5	_a	_b
Ma	_c	1.7	_b
Mb	4.2	_c	_b

a Univariate analysis was not conducted as gender did not contribute statistically significantly to the MANCOVA
b Univariate analysis was not conducted as age did not contribute statistically significantly to the MANCOVA.
c No statistically significant differences between group means, hence no effect is reported.

The univariate analyses show that gender has a statistically significant effect on the scale Other Person-orientation (group mean for girls scoring higher than boys), although the effect is considered small according to Cohen's criteria. (In the MANCOVA gender did not produce a statistically significant effect on the other scales.) Nationality has statistically significant effects on six of the eight scales. According to Cohen's criteria the effects are substantial for Overstepping (KB), Conformity and Nonconformity. A moderate effect is found for Withdrawal (KD) and small effects for Negotiating (KC) and on the motivation scale for Other Person-orientation. In sum, the mean differences between nationalities are more substantial on the conative component than on the cognitive and the motivational component. When confronted with social limits, detained offenders from different cultures show significant differences in attitudes towards conformity or nonconformity. It can be concluded from Table 5 that this difference is caused by the group of residential young offenders from Mexico.

The third research question is "Do residential young offenders differ from normal youngsters as to their attitude to social limits?".
To answer this question a two-way MANCOVA was carried out, with between-group variables nationality (Belgium, Holland, Estonia and Mexico) and status (categories 'residential young offenders' and 'normal youngsters'). The analysis was only applied to the group of boys, with age as covariate. Status has a statistically significant effect on the cognitive component, $F(12,3987) = 32.89$, $p < .0005$, the conative component, $F(2,1325) = 24.91$, $p < .0005$ and the motivational component, $F(2,1329) = 296.87$, $p < .0005$. Next, univariate ANCOVAs were carried out. The results are shown in Table 7.

It appears from the univariate ANCOVAs that age contributes significantly to the variance on three scales, although the effect size is considered small according to Cohen's criteria. Nationality and status contribute statistically significantly to the variance on all scales, except Known

ences in rearing system and legal system. The small size of this effect, is, in our opinion, caused by the group of Mexican residential young offenders who seem to differ little from normal youngsters. Oudhof (2002) gives two possible explanations for this deviant pattern. Firstly, sixty-five per cent of the Mexican offenders were convicted for theft and burglary. It is likely that this type of offence was motivated by the poor conditions in which these youngsters lived. This type of offence could be seen as a product of poverty rather than a deviant attitude. The second explanation is the difference in type of facility. Residential facilities in Europe are detention centres for individual persons, the facility in Mexico was set up as a rehabilitation school for living groups. In these so-called schools there is no room for privacy, group members are always together, group activities are central to treatment. This type of setting and the pressure of the group are factors that may change a person's behavior during his stay.

In view of these encouraging preliminary results, further development of this instrument can be recommended. The first step is to extend the questionnaire by including more incidents, which will make the questionnaire more reliable. Secondly, attention should be focused on demonstrating the predictive validity. This means that a present attitude must be shown to lead to a certain type of behavior, for instance overstepping behavior. If this can be successfully demonstrated, the instrument will be applicable in community surveys, such as groups of youngsters in school situations. Youngsters who emerge from the study as youths at risk, can subsequently be subjected to further assessment. Special attention should be given to the cut-off score that is determining the limit score on the instrument. If the youngster shows a higher score than this limit value he will be classified as a youngster with a risk of overstepping behavior. However, the test instrument shows not only a youngster's chance of overstepping behavior (and 'normal' behavior) but also a chance that the youngster has been incorrectly classified, the so-called false positive and false negative classification. In the false positive classification the test mistakenly classifies the youngster as overstepping (which is not the case) and in the false negative classification the youngster is erroneously included in the 'normal' category (when he is in fact deviant). By determining the cut-off scores at different values the proportions between the chances of correct and incorrect classification keep changing. Statistical procedures are useful in establishing the optimal cut-off score but the question remains whether this statistically determined value should also be considered the optimal point from a moral and social point of view. Using the instrument may result in preventive treatment of these youngsters, who have been erroneously classified as 'youngsters displaying overstepping behavior'. The youngsters are stigmatized for no reason. This is why we recommend researchers to determine the cut-off score conservatively so that there will be a minimum chance of incorrect classification.

This instrument can also be a valuable asset to clinical practice. For instance, it enables us to compute the ratio of reactions between the cognitive and conative component. A youngster who is known to show a great deal of adjusting reactions but who tends to overstep limits needs another treatment than a youngster who shows the same tendency but who has little capability of adjusting.

Literature

ARMITAGE, C.J., & CONNOR, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*, 471-499.

BARCLAY, K., & EVERTS, H. (2000). Pacific Island adolescents and sociale limits. A New Zealand perspective. In K. RINK, W. OTT, & M. WITTROCK (red.), *Youngsters between freedom and social limits. Volume III* (pp. 49-65). Oldenburg: Carl von Ossietzky Universität.

COHEN, J. (1988). *Statistical power for the social sciences.* Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
DICKSCHEIT, J. (1998). Jugendliche in der Konfrontation mit sozialen Grenzsituationen. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
DRENTH, P.J.D., & SYTSMA, K. (1990). *Testtheory.* Houten/Zaventem: Bon Stafleu Van Loghum.
EAGLY, A.H., & CHAIKEN, S. (1998). Attitude structure and function. In D.T. GILBERT, S.T. FISKE, & G. LINDZEY (Ed.), *The handbook of social psychology. Volume I.* Boston: McGraw-Hill.
GRIETENS, H. (1999). *Attitudes towards social limits, undersocialized behavior, and self-presentation in young people.* Leuven: Leuven University Press.
LATCHFORD, S. (1997). Discipline and limit overstepping in the RPR-Canada. In K. RINK, & W.
LOEBER, R., SLOT, N.W., & SERGEANT, J.A. (2001a). *Serious and violent youth delinquency.* Houten/Diegem: Bohn Stafleu Van Loghum.
LOEBER, R., SLOT, N.W., & SERGEANT, J.A. (2001b). Why do we have to worry about serious criminal and violent youngsters? In R. LOEBER, N.W. SLOT, & J.A. SERGEANT (Ed.). *Serious and violent youth delinquency* (pp. 27-49). Houten/Diegem: Bohn Stafleu Van Loghum.
OTT (red.), *Youngsters between freedom and social limits. Volume I* (pp. 95-103). Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant.
OUDHOF, J. (2002). *The attitudes of Mexican youngsters with respect to social limits.* Maastricht: Shaker Publishing BV.
OYSERMAN, D., COON, H.M., & KEMMELMEIJER, M. (2002). Cultural psychology, a new look: Reply to Bond (2002), Fiske (2002), Kitayama (2002), and Miller (2002). *Psychological Bulletin, 128,* 110-117.
PETERSELL, O. (1997). *Delinquency and reaction pattern research in a transition society: The case of Estonia.* Tartu: University of Tartu. Master Thesis.
POTOCAROVA, M., & KRANKUS, M. (1999). The reaction pattern research in Slovakia (RPR-S). In W. OTT, & K. RINK (red.), *Youngsters between freedom and social limits, Volume II* (pp. 111-117). Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
RINK, J.E., VOS, R.C., VAN LOKVEN, H.M., & SLAGVEER, C.M. (1989). *Borderlines. The attitude of youngsters towards social limits. Part I. Dutch youngsters.* Leuven: Acco.
SCHOLTE, E.M., & DORELIJERS, T.A.H. (2001). Screening of seriously delinquent and violent behavior. In R. LOEBER, N.W. SLOT, & J.A. SERGEANT (Ed.), *Serious and violent youth delinquency* (pp. 245-264). Houten/Diegem: Bohn Stafleu Van Loghum.
VAN YPEREN, T., VAN DEN BERG, G., & EIJGENRAAM, K. (2002). *Project 'Registration severity problems'. First part: concepts, goals, and instruments.* Utrecht: NIZW.
VOS, R.C. (1991). *The attitude of youngsters in juvenile institutions towards social limits.* Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit. PhD thesis.

Author note

Dr. J. Strijker
University of Groningen
Department of Special Education
Grote Rozenstraat 38
9712 TJ Groningen
The Netherlands
E-mail: j.strijker@ppsw.rug.nl

Dr. J. Strijker
Associate professor at the Department of Special Education of the University of Groningen

Prof. dr. J.E. Rink
Professor at the Department of Special Education of the University of Groningen