

PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL
AND FAMILY PSYCHOLOGIES
OF THE 1950s

1950s

Published in volume 19
1950s
Lena L. ...
... ..

18887

This is an authorized facsimile
and was produced by microfilm-xerography
in 1975 by
Xerox University Microfilms,
Ann Arbor, Michigan,
U.S.A.

This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received 68-2923

SUMPTER, III, G. Roy, 1941-
PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT AND FAMILY SURROGATES
OF THE YOUTHFUL OFFENDER.

The Florida State University, Ph.D., 1967
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT AND FAMILY SURROGATES
OF THE YOUTHFUL OFFENDER

By
G. ROY SUMPTER, III

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate School of
Florida State University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

James E. ...
Professor Directing Dissertation

Harvey Tschirgi

Ruth J. Dale

Michael J. Sporalowski

Vernon Fox

Thomas R. Lewis
Dean of the Graduate School

December, 1967

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the members of my committee for their continual help and suggestions. I would like to especially thank Dr. James Walters for his guidance and encouragement throughout my program of study and dissertation. I am grateful to Dr. Ruth J. Dales for her very able assistance during the illness of my major professor. My appreciation is also extended to the administration, staff, and inmates of Apalachee Correctional Institution and to the Institute of Personality and Ability Testing for the use of their personality inventory.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	11
LIST OF TABLES	1v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Hypotheses	
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Family	
Personality	
III. PROCEDURE	13
Selection of Sample	
Description of Questionnaire	
Administration of Questionnaire	
Scoring of the Instrument	
Analysis of Data	
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	22
Description of the Sample	
Hypotheses Examined and Discussion	
V. SUMMARY	37
REFERENCE	40
VITA	45

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. GLUECK SOCIAL PREDICTION SCALE	20
2. SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL DATA	26
3. ORDER OF SURROGATE CHARACTERISTICS	32
4. SURROGATE IDENTIFICATION	33
5. SEX OF SURROGATE	33

I. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

In the classical studies of Burt (1925), Healy and Bronner (1929), Reckless (1940), and Shaw (1929), juvenile delinquency is viewed as fundamentally a psychological problem involving personality variables. Psychological and psychiatric studies of young offenders by Birnbaum (1949), Bromberg (1937), Gregory (1935), Karpman (1937), Levy (1932), Louttit (1936), and Snyder (1931), stress the necessity of accepting delinquency, particularly adolescent delinquency, as a function of personality traits, as do the studies of the Gluecks (1950). The researches of Hathaway and Monachesi (1953) recognize, in a broad sense, that delinquency is but one of the many activities of human beings, that it involves the same human tendencies present in other types of behavior, and that it is a reaction of the personality, normal or abnormal, to society with its restrictions, customs and requirements.

In his study of delinquent personalities, Lowrey (1944) reported that it is the affective reactions to conditions and situations which have significance for understanding the juvenile delinquent, and concluded that delinquency is probably most frequently due to the subtle effects of interactions between individuals and environment, leading to the establishment of particular personality sets. The relationship between the home environment and the delinquent personality is well documented in the literature, particularly by Friedlander (1947), the Gluecks

(1962), Gregory (1935), Hattwick (1929), Karpman (1937), Lowrey (1944), Louttit (1936), and Zakolaki (1949). In his appraisal of the Lander study, Greenwood concluded (1956, p. 157), "Ultimately, it is the close and careful study of individuals, in the context of their families and neighborhoods, that will test the validity of the...delinquency causal hypotheses." These studies suggest also, that within the family and social environment, the most important variables involved in the delinquent personality are those which theoretically can be called social adjustment or self-confidence variables.

In summary, delinquency research has been primarily of two different types. The first has involved the classification and quantification of delinquent behavior. The summation categories used by courts, police departments, and other public organizations have been of this type.

The second has utilized an etiological approach in which the focus has been on an examination of antecedent events leading to the delinquency. This research has led to causative theory, much of which is gradually being refuted by more controlled research techniques.

In the Glueck (1939, 1950) studies, for example, one of the most important results was the identification of factors that were similar in incidence among delinquents and non-delinquents. Among these were the family, economic, cultural, and ethnic background of parents, the physical home background of the boy, school and recreational activities, and health and intelligence, all of which have been stressed for many years as being significant in the origins of delinquency.

Significance of the family

Several researchers have disclosed a positive relationship between inmate adjustment and marital status. Cavan and Zemans (1958) stated that marital and family contacts were a vital part of the life of anyone. Marriage gives structure to one's personal life and fulfills human needs for affection, emotional security, encouragement, and approval.

Wilson (1964) found a positive relationship between family interests and the highly adjusted inmate. A significant relationship between family rejection and the occurrence of delinquency was shown by Sumpter (1965). The Gluecks (1950) concluded that the main variable related to delinquency was the parent-child relationship.

Necessity of identification

Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray (1956) noted that "insulation" against delinquency on the part of potential delinquents may be viewed as an ongoing process reflecting an internalization of non-delinquent values and conformity to the expectations of significant others. While their study suggested that a socially acceptable concept of self served as an insulator against delinquency, the research did not indicate the manner in which the boy in the high delinquency area acquired his self-image. It may have been acquired by social definition of role from significant figures in his milieu, such as a mother, a relative, a teacher, settlement house worker, a peer. According to Aichorn (1938), the normal child becomes socially adjusted because he can achieve satisfactory identification and relationships with significant others.

Hypotheses

Most recent studies examining the parent and/or family-child relationship have found a significant relationship between the child's perception of his acceptance and delinquency (Reckless, 1957). It has been found, however, that not all those who have a high delinquency potential actually become delinquent. Some seem to develop an insulation between themselves and their environment while at the same time internalizing acceptable social values. This may be the result of a meaningful relationship with some type of parental and/or family surrogate or surrogates.

This study proposed to examine the following hypotheses:

- (1) There is no significant relationship between personal adjustment of the youthful offender and family interaction.
- (2) There is no significant relationship between personal adjustment and parental and/or family surrogates.
- (3) There is no significant relationship between personal adjustment and criminal involvement.
- (4) There is no significant relationship between family interaction and parental and/or family surrogates.
- (5) There is no significant relationship between family interaction and criminal involvement.
- (6) There is no significant relationship between parental and/or family surrogates and criminal involvement.

It was believed that such a study would allow one to better understand the youthful offender. There have been consistent findings over large samples which suggest some aspects of personality are associated with delinquency. The importance of the family in channeling and molding the personality is ordinarily

assumed by clinicians concerned with the adjustment of children. According to Aichorn (1938), the normal child becomes socially adjusted because he can achieve satisfactory identification and relationships with significant others. Because of these indications, four major areas came under the consideration of this investigation: (1) personality adjustment as reflected in four main personality composites of anxiety, extravertism, tough poise, and independence; (2) family interaction consisting of father discipline, mother supervision, father and mother affection, and family cohesiveness; (3) family and/or parental surrogates; and (4) degree of criminal involvement.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Family

There is much evidence to suggest that the parents of delinquents tend to be discontented, short-tempered people, whose qualities affect not only their attitudes toward their children, but also toward each other. On questions relating to cheerfulness, "hot-headedness," and the like, the most delinquent group in Nye's (1958) study tended to see the dispositions of both parents as "unfavorable" or "intermediate." Among those who said their parents had "favorable" dispositions, 80 per cent were in the least delinquent group. The children in the high delinquency sample also tended to say their parents were unhappy in marriage.

In the Gluecks' (1950) research, 65 per cent of the parents of non-delinquents, but only 37 per cent of parents of delinquents, were said to be reasonably compatible and free from undue quarreling. Disturbed relationships between fathers and mothers were common among the delinquent families studied by Bennett (1960) than among families where the child had some kind of neurosis. McCord, McCord, and Gudeman (1960) found relationships to be "affectionate" in only 12 per cent of 78 criminal families examined. The attitudes between parents tended instead to be antagonistic or, still more often, indifferent.

The importance of parental love is ordinarily assumed by clinicians concerned with the adjustment of children. Lewis (1954), studying family backgrounds of children at a diagnostic

placement center, found a pattern result similar to that reported by Hewitt and Jenkins (1946). Unsocialized aggressive delinquents had more parental rejection in their backgrounds, socialized delinquents showed histories of neglect and maintained undesirable associations, while the inhibited neurotic child tended to have experienced excessive constraint.

The Gluecks' (1950) found that indifference, rejection, and outright hostility were very commonly displayed by the parents of delinquents, especially by fathers. This was in contrast to the warmth and affection which the vast majority of "normal" parents gave their children.

One of the earliest studies to stress the importance of discipline was that by Healy and Bronner (1929), who found that 40 per cent of a sample of 4000 delinquents in Chicago and Boston came from homes where parents failed to exert even a minimum of good discipline. In Burt's (1925) more carefully controlled investigation, "defective discipline" emerged as the most important background determinant of delinquent behavior. Merrill (1947) found that three-fourths of her group of delinquents came from homes where parents were too lax, too severe, or erratic.

It was the mothers of delinquents, mainly, who were guilty of extreme laxity, though the fathers of delinquents also appeared lax significantly more often than the fathers of non-delinquents. Excessively strict discipline, on the other hand, was primarily directed by fathers toward sons. Strict mothers were rare in all groups. Similar findings were reported by Bandura and Walters

(1959), who found the mothers of aggressive boys to be less demanding of obedience than the mothers of controls, to place fewer restrictions on the boys in the home, and to make fewer demands for school achievements. Both parents were inclined to use physical punishment and deprivation of privileges, but it was the fathers who were seen as the very strict ones.

Family interaction and its relationship to delinquent behavior has been investigated extensively by the Gluecks. They were early proponents of the use of prediction methods. As early as 1934 with the publication of One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents, they began a series of exhaustive studies concerned with causes of juvenile delinquency. A series of studies concerning the validity of the Gluecks' scale of social factors was conducted by Thompson (1952, 1957). In his first study, he attempted to analyze the predictive methods involved in the Cambridge-Sonnerville Youth Study. Without knowledge of the boys' ultimate status, Dr. Eleanor Glueck was asked to predict the delinquent and non-delinquent behavior of 100 boys based on her scale of five social background factors. At the completion of her selection, Dr. Glueck had correctly predicted 91 of the 100 boys as delinquent or non-delinquent.

In his second validation study, Thompson took a sample comprised of fifty boys who had appeared in the Boston Juvenile Court in 1959 and fifty girls committed by the Juvenile Court to the care of the Massachusetts Youth Service Board during 1954-55. As in the first study, the Scale accurately predicted over 92 per cent delinquent from non-delinquent in both males and females.

Two smaller studies using the Glueck Scale were the 1953 study done by the New Jersey State Department of Institutions and Agencies on fifty-one parolees and the 1956 study done by clinicians of the Thom Clinic in Boston on 57 "antisocial" children (Rexford, 1959). In both of these studies it was found that in nine out of ten instances the offenders involved would have been correctly identified at the age of six as potentially persistent offenders.

The Black-Glick and Axelrad-Glick (Black & Glick, 1957) studies both took samples of 100 boys and applied the Glueck prediction scale in order to test the predictive possibilities of the recidivism rates of their respective institutions. Both studies claim that the prediction table could have foretold the probable rate of recidivism.

The interest in the Glueck study has spread across the world. In Japan the first attempt to apply the Scale was made on thirty delinquents appearing before a juvenile court in Moricki, Japan and a control group of thirty non-delinquents from the same neighborhood. The results show eighty-seven per cent of the delinquents and ninety-two per cent of the non-delinquents were correctly identified by the Scale, (Glueck, 1960). This finding is particularly significant when one takes into consideration the marked cultural differences.

In France the Scale was applied to forty-six delinquents. It was found that 91.4 per cent of the boys would have been correctly identified as potential delinquents had the Scale been applied at the age of six (Glueck, 1960).

The studies using the Glueck Scale have all been retrospective in nature and have attested to the validity of the Scale. However, there have been few prospective studies and herein lies the true value of the Scale. At present there are two studies in process: the New York Youth Board Study (1957) and the Maximum Benefit Project (Glueck, 1960) in Washington, D. C. The identification of the delinquent and non-delinquent is being attempted before a clear evidence of their status is apparent in both these studies. Unfortunately, the data collected and analyzed have been incomplete at this time and the evidence is still inconclusive. It can be noted, though, that in both instances high accuracy figures have already been reported.

A criticism of the Gluecks' Scale was found in the review of their work in Federal Probation (1951). Men from various fields of endeavor contributed their views concerning the scale. Three of the men, a sociologist (E. W. Burgess), a psychiatrist (J. W. Statten), and a sociologist-attorney (Sol Rubin) emphasized some negative aspects of the study. These reviewers were critical of what they believed was a failure by the Gluecks to match the delinquents and non-delinquents adequately and that the Gluecks had given a one-sided interpretation of the significance of the findings. It was questioned whether the Scale that was developed for older children could be used with younger children.

Personality

In a series of studies (Hathaway & Monachesi, 1929, 1953; Hathaway, Monachesi, & Young, 1960; Wirt & Briggs, 1959), a group of psychologists and sociologists at the University of Minnesota

have studied the relationship of personality characteristics as measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) to the rate of juvenile delinquency in large samples of both rural and urban children. The children were tested when they were in the ninth grade, and follow-up data in regard to delinquent activity have been collected after lapses of two, four, and five years. All of these studies have all demonstrated that high scores on certain combinations of the MMPI scales measuring tendencies toward psychopathic deviation, schizophrenia, and hypomania are associated with a rate of later delinquency higher than that for the entire population while high scores on scales for social introversion, depression, and masculinity-femininity represent a lower rate of delinquency than that for the entire sample. These consistent findings, utilizing large samples, provide evidence that some aspects of personality are associated with later delinquency.

Reckless and his associates (1957) have provided a number of studies in which various personality measures have been applied to groups of boys judged to be delinquency-prone and control groups judged to be relatively delinquency-immune. All of the subjects resided in an urban area where delinquency rate was high. Results indicated that the groups were similar with respect to social factors as might be expected due to the method of selection. However, fewer of the "insulated" boys came from broken homes. On his Socialization Scale the potentially delinquent boys scored significantly lower than did the "good" boys; the same was true for

the Responsibility Scale. The results of the self-concept measure indicated that a more socialized self-image had been developed in the insulated group.

In a second paper, Reckless (1957) reported additional data on the potentially delinquent group. Twenty-four of these boys were found to have had police contact for some delinquent act. When these twenty-four were compared with the remaining seventy-seven, it was found they scored significantly lower on the socialization and responsibility portions and perceived themselves to be more likely to get into more trouble and less likely to finish high school.

The literature suggests that the family situation, as perceived by the child, can greatly affect that child's behavior. It also indicates that various personality traits are more closely related to criminal behavior than others. Research has further suggested that a child's self concept may be significantly affected by his identification with some meaningful individual.

III. PROCEDURE

Selection of Sample

The sample was drawn from among those inmates incarcerated in Apalachee Correctional Institution in Florida. It included approximately 300 inmates. From this group all those questionnaires which showed evidence of deliberate falsification, were incomplete, reflected academic inability, or which had a lie score of greater than one or a personality distortion score of greater than twelve were eliminated. This left a total sample of 203.

Description of Questionnaire

Biographical information

A biographical sheet was utilized to obtain biographical information as age, race, and the specific information needed to determine socio-economic class.

Social-economic status

The Hollingshead two factor index of social position was utilized to determine social status. It relates educational attainment and occupation position to social-economic standing. Each level of educational attainment and occupational position carried a numerical value. Each value is then multiplied by a weighted factor of four for education and seven for occupation. Their totals are then added. This final score represents the

individual social-economic status. This scale has been used in repeated studies and has been carefully validated by its author in his study Social Class and Mental Illness (1958, pp. 398-407).

Personality adjustment

The Institute for Personality and Ability Testing (IPAT) Sixteen Personality Factor Test was utilized to obtain a measure of personality. Personality adjustment was reflected in four main personality composites of anxiety, extravertism, tough poise, and independence. The anxiety score shows the level of anxiety in the commonly accepted sense, which may be either manifested for normal situational reasons or may be neurotic in origin. A high score on the extroversion--introversion scale indicates a socially outgoing, uninhibited person, good at making contact, while the low score indicates an introvert, both shy and self-sufficient. On the tough poise--responsive emotionality scale a high score indicates an enterprising, decisive, imperturbable personality. The low score indicates a person more deeply emotionally sensitive guided by emotions, and liable to more frustration and depression. With the final category, independence--dependence, a high score indicates an aggressive, independent, self-directing person; low scores, a group-dependent, agreeable, passive personality. A split-half reliability for each of the factor scales ranged from .71 to .93, averaging .84. Internal construct validity ranged from .73 to .96, averaging approximately .88 (Buros, 1965, p. 174). Form D was utilized because of its short length, 105

items, and because of its greater strength in those personality areas traditionally associated with delinquents.

Family interaction

The Gluecks' scale of social factors was used to determine family interaction. Included in their scale were the following items: (1) Discipline of boy by father (a) Overstrict: The father is harsh, unreasoning, demands obedience through fear. (b) Erratic: The father varies between strictness and laxity, is not consistent in control. (c) Lax: He is negligent, indifferent, lets the child do what he likes. (d) Firm but kindly: Discipline is based on sound reason which the child understands and accepts as fair. (2) Supervision of boy by mother (a) Unsuitable: The mother is careless in her supervision, leaving the child to his own devices without guidance, or in the care of an irresponsible person. (b) Fair: Mother, though, at home, gives only partial supervision to child. (c) Suitable: If the mother does not work outside the home and is not ill, she personally keeps close watch on the child or provides for his leisure hours in clubs or playgrounds; if she is ill or out of the home a great deal, there is a responsible adult in charge. (3) Affection of father for boy (4) Affection of mother for boy (a) Indifferent: The parent does not pay attention to the child; relationship is neither warm, over-protective, nor hostile. (b) Hostile: The parent rejects the child. (c) Warm: The parent is sympathetic, kind, attached, even over-protective. (5) Cohesiveness of family (a) Unintegrated: The home is just a place to "hang your hat"; self-interest of the members exceeds group interests. (b) Some elements of cohesion:

Even if the family group may not be entirely intact (because of the absence of one or more members), the remaining group has at least some of the characteristics of the cohesive family.

(c) Cohesive: There is a strong "we" feeling among members of the immediate family as evidenced by cooperativeness, group interests, pride in the home, affection for each other.

In order to objectify the more subjective categories a questionnaire was constructed utilizing material gathered from those studies (Babb, 1963; Johnson, 1963) using the scale. Several studies (Thompson 1952, 1957; Black-Glick, 1957; Glueck, 1960) have sought to assess the validity of the scale of social factors. In all, the ability of the scale to accurately identify the potential delinquent ranged from eighty-five to ninety-four per cent.

Lie scales

Five questions which represent cultural universals were selected for use in the lie scale. They were: (1) Your mother would scold you, (2) Occasionally your parents would get mad at each other, (3) You would occasionally have problems with your family, (4) Occasionally your parents would blame each other when they should not have, (5) As a child you would fight with your sisters and brothers. Each item was repeated once and appropriately placed within the questionnaire. Any individual who showed a marked inconsistency in answering each pair was eliminated.

The IPAT Sixteen Personality Factor questionnaire also contained a scale which indicates distortion in responses. Any individual with a score greater than twelve was eliminated.

Parental surrogates

Questions were utilized to obtain information concerning parent and/or family surrogates. They sought to identify the surrogates, their importance to the individual, and their personality characteristics, as perceived by the respondents. Such items as helpfulness, dependability, acceptance, understanding, consideration were utilized to assess the qualities of character that were important to the subjects. Many of these personality characteristics were suggested in a study done by Bills (1953).

Criminality participation

Basic crime categories were utilized in an effort to identify the type and amount of delinquent behavior. These categories have been used in several studies (Kettle, 1966; Sumpter, 1966) for this purpose and have been able to provide differential information. This portion utilized a Likert-type construction ranging from never, to participation from 1-5 times, 6-10 times, and 10 or more times. To achieve a more accurate indication of the individual's actions, two categories were used. The first was titled "Known" indicating those crimes for which the individual had actually been arrested, and a second category entitled "Unknown" for which the person had participated but had not been officially apprehended.

Validity and reliability

The questionnaire represented a composite of several instruments. The validity of each instrument described herein has been established by its author.

These instruments were designed primarily for use with adolescents. The Hollingshead two factor index of social position has been used with high school groups as has the Bills' index. Form D of the IPAT Sixteen Personality Factor Test was specifically designed for older adolescents and adults. The Gluecks' scale of social factors has been used with several age groups including the older teenager. The criminal involvement portion of the questionnaire was originally designed by the investigator for use with inmates of a correctional institution.

Pre-test

Although many of the instruments contained in the questionnaire have been utilized in research similar to the present investigation, a pre-test was administered to a small group of slow learners. Results of the pre-test were analyzed. Those items which appeared to be ambiguous or unable to yield the desired information were altered.

Administration of Questionnaire

The questionnaire was administered by the investigator to three groups of approximately one hundred each at the Apalachee Correctional Institution in Florida. The questionnaires were distributed to the participants. The investigator explained each section giving illustrations and answered any questions that arose. The respondents took the next hour to complete the questionnaires with individual help given as needed.

Scoring of the Instrument

Each scale was individually scored. The IPAT Sixteen Personality Factor Test yields specific personality scores ranging from zero to twenty. The Gluecks' scale of social factors is subdivided into areas of interaction. Each subdivision carries a standard weighted value. See Table 1. The total family interaction score represents the summation of the sub-categories with a higher score representing a warm, cohesive family.

The parental and/or family surrogate portion of the questionnaire utilized a Likert-type construction ranging from never to seldom to occasionally to frequently. Its score represents the summation of the appropriate responses with a higher score indicating a more meaningful and important surrogate.

The portion dealing with criminal participation also utilized a Likert-type construction ranging from never, to participation from 1-5 times, 6-10 times, and 10 or more times. To achieve a more accurate indication of the individuals actions, two categories were used. The first was titled "Known" for which the person had participated but had not been officially apprehended. The second was entitled "Unknown" for which the person had participated but had not been officially arrested.

In order to adjust for the frequency of participation, each category, never, one-five, six-ten, and ten or more, received a numerical value from one to four respectively. Because some of the crime categories represent more serious crimes than others a weighted value was also attached. Those crimes which represented a more serious violation were multiplied by three, those

TABLE 1

GLUECK SOCIAL PREDICTION SCALE

FIVE FACTORS COMPRISING SOCIAL PREDICTION SCALE
WITH INTERACTION SCORE OF EACH SUBCATEGORY

Category	Score
1. Discipline of Boy by Father	
Overstrict or erratic	9.3
Lax	59.8
Firm but kindly	72.5
2. Supervision of Boy by Mother	
Unsuitable	9.9
Fair	57.5
Suitable	83.2
3. Affection of Father for Boy	
Indifferent or hostile	33.8
Warm (including overprotective)	75.9
4. Affection of Mother for Boy	
Indifferent or hostile	41.3
Warm (including overprotective)	86.2
5. Cohesiveness of Family	
Unintegrated	20.6
Some elements of cohesion	61.3
Cohesive	96.9

representing serious crimes were multiplied by two, and those of a less serious nature remained as they were. The criminality score, therefore, represented the total summation of these values.

Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed with the use of Pearson product-moment correlation, partial correlation, multiple correlation, and analysis of variance.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Description of the Sample

The sample was drawn from among those inmates incarcerated in Apalachee Correctional Institution in Florida. It included approximately 300 Caucasian males between the ages of fifteen and twenty-three, who were of the lower class, and unmarried. From this group all those questionnaires which showed evidence of deliberate falsification, were incomplete, reflected academic inability, or which had a lie scale of greater than twelve were eliminated. This left a total sample of 203 for which the average was 19.6 years.

Hypotheses Examined and Discussion

From the data obtained, the following hypotheses were examined:

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant relationship between personal adjustment and family interaction. The null hypothesis was rejected. Personal adjustment was related to family interaction, especially to the affectional aspects.

Personality adjustment of the youthful offender was examined by means of four main personality composites, anxiety, extroversion, tough poise, and independence. The anxiety score shows the level of anxiety in the commonly accepted sense, which may be neurotic in origin, correlated with psychiatric evaluations

of anxiety level. A high score on the extravertism vs. introversion scale indicates a socially out-going, uninhibited person, good at making contacts, while the low score indicates an introvert, both shy and self-sufficient. High "tough poise" scores indicate an enterprising, decisive, imperturbable personality. The low score, responsive emotionality, points to a person more deeply emotionally sensitive, guided by emotions, and liable to more frustration and depression. High scores on the independent scale betoken an aggressive, independent, self-directing person; low scores, dependent, a group-dependent, agreeable, passive personality.

Family interaction was represented by several categories. The first subscale concerned the father's discipline which ran from erratic, to lax, to firm but kindly. The second subscale concerned mother's supervision and ran from unsuitable, to fair, to suitable. The third and fourth subscales involved father and mother affection and was based on a continuum from indifferent, to hostile, to warm. The last subscale involved family cohesiveness and included unintegrated, some elements of cohesion, and cohesive. An overall picture of a family's interaction was achieved by totaling its individual subcategories.

In order to determine the effect of family interaction upon the development of normal anxiety, an analysis of variance was used. Those falling within the mid-range in the anxiety scale were significantly related to mother affections, $p=.01$. When supplied the stability of a mother's affection, extreme anxiety disappears.

An analysis of variance was utilized to discover the relative importance of mother supervision, father affection, and mother affection upon those cases falling within the average range on the extroversion scale. Though none of the three categories showed a significant relationship, there was indication of their importance, $p=.15$, $p=.15$, $p=.15$. All three of these factors gave the child a base of security from which to venture out and test reality and others.

Toughness and family cohesiveness were positively correlated, $+0.388$, $p=.001$. Toughness was, however, negatively related to overall family interaction, -0.153 , $p=.05$. In order to further examine the toughness scale, a multiple correlation was run. Family cohesiveness and independence were significantly related to toughness, $.541$, $p=.001$.

A partial correlation was utilized to examine toughness and family cohesiveness controlling for independence, and toughness and overall family interaction controlling for family cohesiveness. A negative correlation was found for each, $-.408$, $p=.01$, and $-.594$, $p=.001$.

Tough poise vs. responsive emotionality is positively correlated to both independence and family cohesiveness, $+0.388$, $p=.01$, and $+0.423$, $p=.01$. The relationship between tough poise and independence is understandable since both require an individual who is decisive and self-directing. The positive relationship between family cohesiveness and tough poise may be accounted for by the security afforded a child from a closely knit family group (Glueck, 1950).

When relating tough poise to the family interaction a strong negative correlation was obtained. This may indicate a child's reaction to compensate for a poor family environment by assuming a role of ineffectiveness or imperturbability (Glueck, 1950). It was also found that those who re resented the mid-range on the tough poise scale where those who received the greatest amount of father affection (Goldfarb, 1945).

There were no significant correlations related to independence. In examining the effects of father affection and mother affection, it was noted that in an analysis of variance both were related positively to those falling within the mid-range of the independence scale. Although this relationship was not statistically significant, there was a strong indication of its importance, $p=.06$, and $p=.06$.

Table 2 gives a summary of the statistical data.

In hypothesis 1 adjustment was found to be related to family interaction, especially to the affectional aspects. When the positive affection of the mother was examined in relation to normal anxiety development it was found to be highly significant. Hattwick (1936) in his work involving child behavior and home factors noted that those who came from a home where the mother's affection was negligible manifested traits of emotional tensions and insecurity. The Gluecks (1950) also noted a high incidence of anxiety among those children reared in unaffectionate homes.

Parental affection was significantly related to the development of normal extroversion. This finding substantiates the work of Baldwin (1949) concerning home environment and

TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL DATA

Categories ^a	Analysis of Variance		Correlation		Partial Correlation			Multiple Correlation		
	Var.	P	Var.	r P	Var.	r	P	Var.	R	P
Anxiety	AS	.001	AE	+.169 .05						
	AMa	.01	AT	-.369 .001						
Extroversion	EMs	.15	ET	+.315 .001						
	EFa	.15	EI	+.254 .001						
	EMa	.15								
Toughness	TFa	.05	TI	+.388 .001	TFc.I	-.408 .01		T.FaI	.541	.001
			TF	-.152 .05	TF.Fc	-.594 .001				
			TFc	+.423 .01						
Independence	IFa	.06								
	IMa	.06								
Criminality			CE	-.196 .01	CFa.I	-.257 .07		C.IFa	.369	.001
			CI	+.274 .001				C.IFaE	.374	.001
			CFa	-.255 .10						
Surrogates	SA	.001	SFd	-.781 .001	SF.Fd	-.542 .001				
			SMS	-.715 .001	SF.Ms	-.366 .01				
			SFa	-.595 .001	SF.Fa	-.069 .90				
			SMa	-.883 .001	SF.Ma	-.625 .001				
			SFc	-.746 .01						

^aA-Anxiety, E-Extroversion, T-Toughness, I-Independence, C-Criminality, S-Surrogates, Fd-Father discipline, Ms-Mother supervision, Fa-Father affection, Ma-Mother affection, Fc-Cohesion

behavior. Homes that reflected affectional warmth provided the security necessary for children to develop into active, socially outgoing youths.

A decisive and imperturbable personality appears to be related to family cohesiveness. The Gluecks (1950) indicate that as the child experiences a warm and supportive home environment, feelings of resignation and passivity become less apparent.

The literature would imply that an affectional environment provides an opportunity for the child to become independent. Harlow (1960) in his studies with macaque (monkeys) found that those who had a positive mother surrogate used it as a source of security, a base of operation. When faced with a new situation, with the mother surrogate absent, the monkeys frequently froze in a crouched position. Delinquents from an unaffectionate home atmosphere, also, demonstrated feelings of inferiority and a hesitancy to be more self-assertive.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant relationship between personal adjustment and parental and/or family surrogates. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Adjustment was not meaningfully related to parental and/or family surrogates with the exception of one. Those who received the higher surrogate scores, those for whom the surrogates had the greatest importance, fell within the mid-range on the anxiety scale.

Personality adjustment was examined by means of four main personality composites of anxiety, extravertism, tough

poise, and independence. Each respondent was asked to indicate those who had been special friends or acquaintances who had meant a great deal to them. These were to be individuals who were of particular or special importance and without whom their lives would have been quite different than they were today.

In order to determine the effect of family surrogates upon the development of normal anxiety, an analysis of variance was used. It was shown that those falling within the mid range on the anxiety scale were significantly related to a positive family surrogate score, $p=.001$.

Those able to establish meaningful relationship with parental surrogates appeared to develop normally on the anxiety scale. These surrogates appear to provide the necessary base of security and support to overcome feelings of inferiority. There was no other meaningful correlation or statistical relationship between personality adjustment and family surrogates.

Hypothesis 3

There is no significant relationship between personality adjustment and criminal involvement. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Though there were some definite indications that certain personality types were more likely to participate in criminal behavior, no one factor demonstrated a strong predisposition to criminality.

Personality adjustment was examined by means of four personality composites of anxiety, extroversion, tough poise, and independence. Criminal involvement represents the respondent's

participation in criminal activity. Basic crime categories were used with the subject indicating the frequency of his participation.

In relating criminality to personality adjustment it was found that it was positively related to independence, $+ .274$, $p = .001$, but negatively correlated to extroversion, $- .196$, $p = .01$. In order to examine criminality further, a multiple correlation was used. When independence and father affection were considered, a correlation of $.369$, $p = .001$, was obtained. Where extroversion was considered the correlation was $.374$, $p = .001$.

Hathaway and Monachesi (1929, 1953) found delinquents to be high on the MMPI scale of hypomania. This would indicate an enthusiastic, confident, and aggressive individual. The IPAT scale of independence is also closely associated with the frequency of criminal activity. The Gluecks (1950) also found that delinquents were more dynamic and energetic, more aggressive and adventurous.

Hathaway and Monachesi (1929, 1953) again found that delinquents scored high on the psychopathic scale of the MMPI. Such traits as moodiness, resentfulness, inability to experience deep emotional responses characterize this scale. This person may, however, appear likeable and intelligent. This investigation found a negative correlation between extroversion and criminal involvement. This would indicate an introvert, both shy and self-sufficient. The Gluecks (1950) found that delinquents rather typically reacted to stress situations and resulting emotional tensions by extrovert activity while the non-delinquent responded by introvert activity.

Hypothesis 4

There is no significant relationship between family interaction and parental and/or family surrogates. The null hypothesis was rejected. It was generally true that as the family became dysfunctional, surrogates became more meaningful and of greater importance.

Family interaction was subdivided into discipline of father, supervision of mother, affection of father and mother, and family cohesiveness. Family surrogates included those whom the respondents felt were of specific importance.

In relating family and/or parental surrogates to family there was a strong and significant relationship. The correlations were $-.781$, $p=.001$, for father discipline, $-.715$, $p=.001$, for mother supervision, $-.595$, $p=.001$, for father affection, $-.883$, $p=.001$, for mother affection, and $-.746$, $p=.001$, for family cohesiveness.

When controlling for the various subdivisions of family interaction, the same negative relationship appeared for all with the exception of father affection. They were: $-.542$, $p=.001$, controlling for father discipline, $-.366$, $p=.01$, controlling for mother supervision, $-.069$, $p=.90$, controlling for father affection, $-.625$, $p=.001$, controlling for mother affection, and $-.486$, $p=.01$, when controlling for family cohesiveness.

For those falling within the mid range on the anxiety scale, a .001 level of significance was obtained when an analysis of variance was used to examine anxiety and surrogates.

Table 3 indicates the characteristics of the surrogates, their rank, and importance. The rank score represents the meaningfulness of each characteristic with the larger score indicating more importance. Table 4 enumerates the individuals who became surrogates. Their frequency of occurrence is indicated for each age grouping as well as for their overall appearance. Table 5 indicates the sex of the surrogates for each age range.

The surrogates did become more meaningful and of greater importance to the individual as the family interaction deteriorized. This substantiates a finding by the Gluecks (1950) which indicates that to a far greater extent than the non-delinquent, delinquents have substitute parents. Parental and/or family surrogates seem, therefore, to be much more relied upon by those from unhappy homes. The only exception to this was when surrogates were related to family interaction while controlling for father affection. Here the relationship dropped from an average correlation of $-.400$ to $-.069$ indicating that once father affection was allowed to explain what it could, only a slight relationship remained.

The individual identification of the surrogates appeared to shift from adult figures to peer relations as the child became older. This gradual shift from same-sex identification early in life to a heterosexual identification in later teens supports other research (Aichorn, 1938).

Throughout the investigation one aspect of family interaction has become more and more pronounced. The parental affection that is perceived by the child, particularly from the father, appears to be closely interwoven throughout the major variables.

TABLE 3
ORDER OF SURROGATE CHARACTERISTICS

Order	Characteristics	Rank Score
1	Helpful	487
2	Dependable	471
3	Accepting	463
3	Understanding	463
5	Considerate	460
6	Truthful	459
7	Popular	454
8	Keeps a secret	448
9	Friendly	446
10	Sincere	445
11	Reasonable	439
11	Happy	439
11	Kind	439
14	Generous	431
15	Fair	428
16	Always had time	419
17	Clever	417
18	Patient	414
19	Successful	413
20	Always around	409
21	Good listener	395
22	Competent	379
23	Model or hero	318

TABLE 4
SURROGATE IDENTIFICATION

Individual	Age 6-11 %	Age 12-14 %	Age 15-18 %	Total %
School counselor	4.26	2.23	2.72	2.96
Teacher	6.39	13.33	4.65	8.15
Minister	2.12		2.72	1.48
Employer	2.12	4.44	4.65	3.70
Brother or sister	19.14	11.11	7.37	12.59
Relative	31.91	11.11	7.37	17.78
Other adult		4.44	2.72	2.22
Friend	31.91	51.11	60.43	47.41
Other	2.12	2.23	7.37	3.7

TABLE 5
SEX OF SURROGATES

Sex	Age 6-11 %	Age 12-14 %	Age 15-18 %
Male	52.0	46.5	29.5
Female	48.0	53.5	70.5

Interestingly enough, the actual means of discipline did not appear to share the overall influence of affection.

Orlansky's (1949) critical review of research on the effects of early discipline upon later personality development has received wide attention. His findings have been largely negative in nature. This lead Orlansky to develop a theory of personality development which emphasized the importance of constitutional factors and of the total cultural situation in personality formation.

Orlansky's findings were later reinforced by the work of Sewell (1952) concerning child training and personality. He concluded that the personality adjustments and traits of children who had undergone varying training experiences did not differ significantly. He suggested that the atmosphere, the whole personal-social situation in which the specific discipline methods find their expression, may be the meaningful factor.

The present investigation also suggests that the specific means of discipline may not be as important as the attitudes that accompany the discipline. The research of Baldwin (1949), the Gluecks (1950), and of Goldfarb (1945) point to the importance of parental attitude and emphasize the necessity of parental affection.

Hypothesis 5

There is no significant relationship between family interaction and criminal involvement. The null hypothesis was not rejected. There was no clear indication, with the exception of father affection, that the family interaction alone was significantly related to criminality.

Family interaction was subdivided into five areas:

(1) father discipline, (2) mother supervision, (3) father affection, (4) mother affection, and (5) family cohesiveness. Criminal involvement represents the subjects participation in criminal activity.

In order to examine criminality a multiple correlation was used. When independence and father affection were considered, a correlation of .369, $p=.001$, was obtained. When extroversion was considered, the correlation was .374, $p=.001$. A partial correlation was also done to examine criminality and father affection while controlling for independence. A negative relation was obtained, $-.257$, $p=.07$.

Lewis (1954) studying family backgrounds of unsocialized, aggressive delinquents found a pattern of parental rejection. The Gluecks (1950) found that indifference, rejection, and outright hostility were commonly displayed by the parents of delinquents, especially by fathers. This investigation noted a meaningful negative correlation between father affection and criminal involvement.

Hypothesis 6

There is no significant relationship between parental and/or family surrogates and criminal involvement. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Though surrogates were significantly related to many areas of this investigation, they did not appear to be significantly related to criminality.

Family surrogates include those whom the respondent felt were of specific importance. Criminal involvement represents the subjects participation in criminal activity. There was no significant relationship between family surrogates and criminal behavior.

Reckless (1957), Aichorn (1938) suggested that those children who experienced an unhealthy home environment might turn to some type of surrogate, family or parental. If the surrogate were socially acceptable to society at large, and if this child were to identify with it, then criminal involvement would be expected to decrease. In the present study there was no significant relationship between surrogates and criminality. It may have been that the questionnaire was not able to adequately differentiate the needed information. The identification may have taken place but may not have been of sufficient strength to cause the child to internalize the surrogate's values. The surrogate's values may have also been criminal.

Personality adjustment, family interaction, parental and/or family surrogates, and criminal involvement are uniquely interwoven. Future study might clarify specific relationships which may yield direct causative theory. Many relationships have been suggested, though not substantiated, which would warrant further research.

V. SUMMARY

There have been consistent findings with large samples which suggest that some aspects of personality are associated with delinquency. The importance of the family in channeling and molding the personality is ordinarily assumed by clinicians concerned with the adjustment of children. According to Aichorn (1938), the normal child becomes socially adjusted because he can achieve satisfactory identification and relationships with significant others. Because of these indications four major areas came under the consideration of this investigation: (1) personality adjustment as reflected in four main personality composites of anxiety, extrovertism, tough poise, and independence; (2) family interaction consisting of father discipline, mother supervision, father affection, mother affection, and family cohesiveness; (3) family and/or parental surrogates; and (4) degree of criminal involvement.

The following hypotheses were examined: (1) There is no significant difference between personal adjustment and family interaction. (2) There is no significant difference between personal adjustment and parental and/or family surrogates. (3) There is no significant difference between personality adjustment and criminal involvement. (4) There is no significant difference between family interaction and parental and/or family surrogates. (5) There is no significant difference between family interaction and criminal

involvement. (6) There is no significant difference between parental and/or family surrogates and criminal involvement.

In order to examine the above hypotheses a questionnaire was constructed containing five major sections. A biographical sheet was used to obtain such information as age, race, and the specific information needed to determine socio-economic class. The second section utilized IPAT Sixteen Personality Test, Form D. With this, several dimensions of personality were explored and four principle composites were established: anxiety, extrovertism, tough poise, and independence. The third section contained the Gluecks' scale of social factors. This scale evaluated the family's interaction. The fourth section was designed to evaluate and identify the surrogates, their importance to the individual, and their personality characteristics, as perceived by the respondent. The final section pertained to criminal involvement. Basic crime categories were utilized in an effort to identify the type and amount of criminal behavior.

The sample was drawn from among those inmates incarcerated in Apalachee Correctional Institution in Florida. It included approximately 300 Caucasian males between the ages of fifteen and twenty-three, who were of the lower class, and unmarried. From this group all those questionnaires which showed evidence of deliberate falsification, were incomplete,

reflected academic inability, or which had a lie scale score greater than one or a personality distortion score of greater than twelve were eliminated. This left a total sample of 203 for which the average was 19.6 years.

The pertinent findings of this study were:

1. Personal adjustment was related to family interaction, especially to the affectional aspects.

2. Personal adjustment was not meaningfully related to parental and/or family surrogates with the exception of one. Those who received the greatest surrogate scores, i. e., those for whom the surrogates had the greatest importance, fell within the mid-range on the anxiety scale.

3. Though there were some definite indications that certain personality types were more likely to participate in criminal behavior, no one factor demonstrated a strong predisposition to criminality.

4. It was generally true that as the family became dysfunctional, surrogates became more meaningful and of greater importance.

5. There was no clear indication, with the exception of father affection, that the family interaction alone was significantly related to criminality.

6. Though surrogates were significantly related to many areas of this investigation, they did not appear to be significantly related to criminality.

REFERENCES

- Aichorn, A. Wayward youth. New York: Viking Press, 1938.
- Babb, Kathleen C. Use of the Glueck social prediction scale in spotting potential delinquents according to achievement scores of fourth grade students in Tampa, Florida. Unpublished master's thesis. Florida State University, 1963.
- Baldwin, A. L. The effects of home environment on nursery school behavior. Child Development, 1949, 20, 49-61.
- Bandura, A. & Walters, R. H. Adolescent aggression. New York: Ronald, 1959.
- Bennet, I. Delinquency and neurotic children. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Bills, R. E. Index of adjustment and values and level of aspiration. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1953, 17, 206-212.
- Birnbaum, K. A. A court psychiatrist's view of juvenile delinquency. Annals of the American Political and Social Science, 1949, 26, 55-63.
- Black, B. J. & Glick, S. J. Research monograph. New York: Jewish Board of Guardians, 1957.
- Bridges, Katherine. A study of social development in early infancy. Child Development, 1933, 4, 36-49.
- Bromberg, W. & Thompson, C. D. The relation of psychosis, mental defect and personality type of crises. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1957, 28, 1-6.
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.) Mental measurements yearbook, 6th edition. Highland Park: Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Burt, C. The young delinquent. New York: Appleton, 1925.
- Cavan, Ruth & Zemans, E. S. Marital relationships of prisoners. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1958, 49, 50-59.
- Connor, R., Johannis, T. B., & Walters, J. Parent-adolescent relationships. Journal of Home Economics, 1954, 46, 183-203.
- Eaton, J. W. & Polk, K. Measuring delinquency. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961.

- Fiedlander, Kate. The psycho-analytic approach to juvenile delinquency. New York: International University Press, 1947.
- Glueck, Sheldon & Eleanor. Delinquents in the making. New York: Harper, 1952.
- _____. Efforts to identify delinquents. Federal Probation, 1960, 24, 49-56.
- _____. Family environment and delinquency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962.
- _____. 500 criminal careers. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1930.
- _____. One thousand juvenile delinquents, their treatment by court and clinic. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- _____. Predicting delinquency and crime. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- _____. Spotting potential delinquents: can it be done? Federal Probation, 1956, 20, 7-13.
- _____. Unraveling juvenile delinquency. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1950.
- Goldfarb, W. Psychological privation in infancy and subsequent adjustment. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1945, 15, 247-255.
- Greenwood, E. New directions in delinquency research: a commentary on a study by Bernard Lander. Social Service Review, 1956, 2, 147-157.
- Gregory, M. Psychiatry and problems of delinquents. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1935, 91, 773-781.
- Harlow, H. F. The nature of love. In Haimowitz, C. H. (Ed.) Human development. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Co., 1960.
- Hathaway, S. R. & Monachesi, E. Analyzing and predicting juvenile delinquency with the MMPI. New York: Mcmillan, 1929.
- _____. Analyzing and predicting juvenile delinquency with the MMPI. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1953.
- Hathaway, S. R., Monachesi, E., & Young, L. A. Delinquency rates and personality. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1960, 50, 433-440.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

- Hattwick, Berta. Interrelations between the preschool child behavior and certain factors in the home. Child Development, 1936, 7, 200-226.
- Healy, W. & Bronner, A. Delinquents and criminals: their making and unmaking. New York: Mcmillan, 1929.
- Hewitt, L. F. & Jenkins, R. L. Fundamental patterns of maladjustment: the dynamics of their origin. Springfield: State of Illinois, 1946.
- Hollingshead, A. B. & Redlick, F. Social class and mental illness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.
- Johnson, Lillian. Potential delinquents revealed by the Glueck social prediction scale, Tampa City School District, Hillsborough County, Florida. Unpublished master's thesis. Florida State University, 1963.
- Karpman, B. D. Crime and adolescence. Mental Hygiene, 1937, 21, 389-396.
- Kettle, R. C. A comparative study of detected and undetected violational behavior among white male students in attendance at the Florida State University and white male inmates incarcerated at Apalachee Correctional Institution. Unpublished master's thesis. Florida State University, 1966.
- Levy, J. A mental hygiene study of juvenile delinquents: its cause and treatment. Americal Journal of Psychiatry, 1932, 12, 73-142.
- Lewis, Hilda. Deprived children. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Louttit, C. Clinical psychology: a handbook of children's behavior problems. New York: Harper, 1936.
- Lowrey, L. Delinquent and criminal personalities. In Hunt, J. (Ed.) Personality and the behavior disorders, Vol. II. New York: Roland Press, 1944, Pp. 794-821.
- McCord, W. & Gudeman, J. Origins of alcoholism. Palo Alto: Standford University Press, 1960.
- Merrill, Maud A. Problems of child delinquency. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1947.
- Muste, Myra J. & Sharpe, Doris F. Some influential factors in the determination of aggressive behavior in pre-school children. Child Development. 1947, 18, 11-28.

- New Jersey, State Department of Institutions and Agencies. Predicting juvenile delinquents. Research Bulletin, 1955, 24.
- New York City Youth Board. An experiment in the validation of the Glueck prediction scale. New York: By the Board, 1957.
- Orlansky, H. Infant care and personality. Psychological Bulletin, 1949, 46, 1-48.
- Reckless, W. C. Child development. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1940.
- _____. The self-component in potential delinquency and potential non delinquents. Americal Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 566-570.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S., & Murray, Ellen. Self-concept as an insulator against delinquency. Americal Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 744-746.
- Rexford, Evealon N., Schleifer, M., & Van Amerongen, Suzanne T. A follow-up of a psychiatric study of fifty-seven anti-social young children. Mental Hygiene, 1956, 40, 196-214.
- Rubin, S. Illusions in a research study: Unraveling juvenile delinquency. Crime and Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Oceana Publication, Inc., 1958.
- Sewell, W. H. Infant training and the personality of the child. American Journal of Sociology, 1952, 58, 150-159.
- Shaw, C. Delinquent areas. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1929.
- Snyder, Marquerite A. Comparisons of mental traits and attitudes of delinquent boys and girls. Journal of Juvenile Research, 1931, 15, 181-191.
- Sumpter, G. R. A comparison of the common background factors in Negroid and Caucasian children who have been adjudicated delinquent by the age of eleven. Unpublished manuscript, Florida State University, 1965.
- _____. Religiosity and criminality. Research Study. Tallahassee: Florida Division of Corrections, Research and Statistics Section, January, 1967.
- Thompson, R. E. A validation of the Glueck social prediction. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1952, 43, 451-470.

Thompson, R. E. Further validation of the Glueck social prediction table for identifying potential delinquents. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1957, 43, 140-151.

Wilson, E. R. Relationship between family contacts and inmate adjustment within a correctional institution. Unpublished master's thesis, Florida State University, 1964.

Writ, R. D. & Briggs, P. F. Personality and environmental factors in the development of delinquency. Psychological Monographs, 1959, 73, 485.

Zakolski, F. C. Studies in delinquency: prediction of delinquency in boys. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1949, 74, 119-123.

VITA

Mr. G. Roy Sumpter was born on May 27, 1941 in Seattle, Washington. He graduated from Queen Anne High School in June, 1959. He attended Highland College, Pasadena, California, the University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, and Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina from which he received his B.A. degree in January, 1963 majoring in religion and social studies. He later attended graduate school at Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida. In March, 1966 he received his M.S. in criminology and corrections writing his thesis on "Religiosity and Criminality." He continued at Florida State University and completed his Ph.D. in child development, to be awarded in December, 1967. He is a member of Psy Chi, a honorary group of psychology.

Mr. Sumpter has worked with youth in connection with several agencies. His primary emphasis has been with the high school male and juvenile delinquent. He has taught and worked in a Head Start Institute and is presently employed as an Assistant Professor at Auburn University in the area of human development and family relations.

END

7 ab-les/rmc-1