A COMPARISON OF DELINQUENT TYPOLOGIES AND THEIR....

E. Kissling, 1969

Published on demand by
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.
University Microfilms Limited, High Wycombe, England

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

A COMPARISON OF DELINQUENT TYPOLOGIES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO AGE AND RACE

by

Eugene John Kissling, B.S., M.S.

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Saint Louis University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1969

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY:

Professor John G. Napoli, Chairman

Professor Harvey R. Austrin

Assistant Professor Gary K. Burger

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. John Napoli, chairman of the committee and advisor, Dr. Harvey Austrin, and Dr. Gary Burger, for their consistent encouragement and assistance in the completion of this dissertation. He would also like to thank Judge Theodore McMillian and the staff and co-workers of the St. Louis Juvenile Court and Detention Center, Judge Noah Weinstein and the staff of the St. Louis County Juvenile Court and Detention Center, and Mr. George E. Ryan, Superintendent of Missouri Hills, for their cooperation.

Greatest appreciation is extended to the author's wife for her encouragement and assistance throughout graduate training and the preparation of this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problems in Delinquency

Both the number of reported offenses committed by juveniles and the rate of delinquency continue to increase with each passing year. This generally accepted fact, in addition to providing periodic political campaign oratory, puts a serious strain on the existing legal and correctional machinery, resulting in a consistent gap between the number of delinquents handled and the staff and physical facilities provided to do the job. One of the obvious, but important results of such a gap is the decreasing percentage of delinquents for whom professional clinical diagnosis or treatment is available. Thus, the "line" worker in the field of corrections, whether court probation officer or institutional corrections officer, assumes more responsibility for correcting, treating, or in some way modifying the socially deviant and often destructive behavior of the delinquent. With justifiable expectancy, he looks to psychology and sociology for explanations

of this kind of behavior and recommendations on how to deal with it. More importantly, he looks for help that is both practical and effective.

Psychology has a relatively short but fairly productive history of contribution to the field of juvenile delinquency. But until recent years, much of the emphasis has been on an approach to delinquents which views them as a homogeneous group identifiable and distinguishable from several other groups on the basis of a combination of psychological factors, some of which remain to be uncovered. Thus the search for intellectual and personality differences between "delinquents" and "non-delinquents" typified by the earlier work of the Gluecks (1950) to some degree continues even today.

The implications of such investigations into the etiology and functioning of "the delinquent" is that one general approach to treatment, if the correct one could be found, would have beneficial results for all delinquents. In her report to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, Warren (1966) points out that:

> Like the humanitarian reform movement itself, trade training, increased facilities for socially acceptable outlets of aggression, individual and group counseling have each been thought of as <u>the</u> answer to the crime

> problem. While movements in behalf of these causes have undoubtedly made important contributions to the field of corrections, they have tended to be viewed as cure-alls, and it is a matter of record that we do not cure all delinquents and criminals (p. 1).

Yet, in the same report, Warren is also able to state flatly that "One of the few agreed-upon 'facts' in the field of corrections is that offenders are not all alike (p. 1)."

Actually, psychological theorists have for some time recognized this diversity. Ferdinand (1966) points out that "In the last 50 years there have been at least a dozen attempts to derive a typology of delinquency or criminality by appealing to psychological theory, and among those most active in this regard have certainly been the students of Freudian psychology (p. 152)." The limiting factor in providing practical help to the field of corrections has been that the activity was chiefly on a theoretical level, the typologies being applicable to individual delinquents only on the basis of diagnosis by trained clinicians. Kessler (1966) provides a representative, Freudian-oriented classification system. She suggests that delinquency is a disorder in the functioning of the superego, including: 1) its absence, 2) lacunae, 3) weakness, and 4) abeyance.

A fifth category, "identification with socially inadequate models" is included as the "normal" delinquent. Further limiting the wider use of these delinquency models is the fact that little in the way of specific treatment is suggested. In fact, with the possible exception of the "neurotic" delinquent, the prognosis is uniformly poor. A large class of delinquents labeled psychopaths (Kessler's absence of superego) have traditionally been considered untreatable (Bender, 1947). Various forms of individual therapy and institutional milieu-therapy have been attempted, but the majority of urban delinquents must be dealt with by the juvenile court worker while the delinquent remains in the community. It is for this population that effective treatment strategies, capable of being employed by court workers, need to be developed.

Admittedly, this is a difficult assignment. The author recognizes and has previously pointed out the problem inherent in understanding the etiology and dynamics of delinquency within the framework of a single theory, or even one discipline (Kissling, 1968). But in recent years, several typological theories which both lend themselves to wide use and suggest specific forms of treatment have been developed.

Delinquent Typologies

Foremost among these has been the work of Warren and her associates (1966) with the California Youth Authority. Based on a combination of ego psychology and social learning principles, the theory of interpersonal maturity levels was initially described by Sullivan, Grant and Grant (1957). The theory and procedures involved in the classification will be reviewed in detail in Chapter II. Briefly, delinquents are placed into one of nine subtypes which comprise three levels of interpersonal maturity (I-2, I-3, I-4). Warren and associates (1966) have derived treatment strategies for each subtype on the basis of theoretical assumptions about the nature of psychological functioning characteristic of that level. Classification was initially made on a clinical basis, utilizing a structured interview and a sentence completion test. Jesness (1968) has experimented with other methods, including his Jesness Inventory (1966). In his work at the California Youth Authority's Preston School, he has recently reported a scoring procedure for the Inventory which allows classification on an objective basis.

From a different theoretical framework, Quay and his associates (Quay and Peterson, 1964) have also developed an objectively scored instrument which has been used to place delinquents into several categories.

His questionnaire, the Personal Opinion Study, yields scores on three personality "dimensions" which he has labeled Unsocialized-Aggressive or Psychopath (P), Neurotic-Disturbed (N), and Socialized-Subcultural (S). The three separate scales are based on factor analytic techniques and are described as "factorially independent." While Quay makes no specific treatment recommendations, the scales have been used to separate delinquents into groups of "psychopaths" and "neurotics," to whom traditional clinical characteristics of these diagnostic labels have been attributed. This use of the scales and its implications will also be reviewed in Chapter II.

These two systems appear to have much in common in their descriptions of delinquent types, despite the differences in origins. In a general way they suggest three basic types which are also found within many other, diverse classification systems: The antisocial or asocial psychopath (I-2 and P) -- the disturbed, anxious neurotic (I-4 and N) -- and the psychologically normal, cultural delinquent (I-3 and S). In 1966, the National Institute of Mental Health sponsored a conference of researchers in this area, including Warren and Quay. Two reports of that conference make it clear that a good deal of agreement was achieved.

Rubenfeld (1967) notes that "In view of these multiple differences ... there appears to be a striking convergence, at least on a descriptive and conceptual level, among the categories of several person-oriented typology systems (p. 67)." Warren (1966) concludes that

> It is important to note that, not only is it possible to find similarities in the descriptions of offender characteristics across typologies, but also consistency is evident in descriptions of etiological and background factors and in treatment prescriptions for seemingly similar subtypes... The ultimate test of such a cross-classification would come from a study in which typing of individuals in a single population was conducted by experts in the use of each of the various classification systems (p. 8).

The current availability of two systems with objective methodology for classification presents an opportunity for such direct comparison, without the handicap of requiring experts in their use.

Purpose

It is the chief purpose of this investigation then, to conduct a cross-classification study of a single population of male delinquents, using the instruments and methodology developed by Quay and by Jesness and Warren. This makes possible an examination of both the conceptual overlap and degree of

agreement between the two systems in their designations of individual delinquents.

An additional purpose is to investigate the possible relationship of the organismic variables of race and age, to the various subtypes resulting from each system. The importance of such a relationship was suggested by the results of a pilot study conducted by the author at the St. Louis Juvenile Court in which the Personal Opinion Study was administered to 144 male delinquents then at the Juvenile Detention Center. Both age and race were shown to be significantly related to scores on the P scale, while age alone was related to scores on the N scale. An additional investigation of relationships between delinquents scoring high on the P and N scales and several categories of delinquent behavior failed to yield significant results.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The classification of delinquents into several categories has proceeded along diverse lines, depending upon the investigator's discipline, theoretical orientation, and conception of the task the classificatory scheme is to accomplish. Perhaps the most unfortunate tendency, though a natural one, has been to view delinquent behavior strictly within the confines of one behavioral discipline, as if only the variables of interest to the investigator could cause or be related to delinquency.

Psychoanalytically-oriented theories have traditionally classified delinquents on the basis of various kinds of superego and ego disturbances. Kessler's (1966) classification has already been mentioned, but there are many others. Abrahamsen (1944), Friedlander (1947), Sanford (1943), Weinberg (1952), and Redl and Wineman (1957) all followed Aichorn (1935) in the application of psychoanalytic theory to the understanding of delinquency and crime. While the number of categories and the characteristics of each vary somewhat, there is general agreement on

several points.

All of these authors focus on motivational and attitudinal factors associated with delinquency. Most employ the id, ego, and superego as basic concepts, viewing delinquent behavior as the result of a weakness, malfunction, or failure to develop adequately one or more of these parts of the personality structure. Reviewing these typologies, Ferdinand (1966) comments on their similarity and uses them to prepare his own typology "phrased in terms of psychoanalytic theory." He attempts to combine them into a scheme containing three basic types: "The impulsive delinquents whose anti-social orientation is rooted in the very core of their personalities; the neurotic delinquent, whose delinquency stems from the fact that the normal expression of his personality is thwarted by a disorganizing anxiety; and the symptomatic delinquent, who is compelled to violate the laws and mores of his society by the pressures of his unconscious (p. 179)." Of greater interest here than the three major categories are some of their subtypes, for they relate directly to the two systems being compared.

Ferdinand suggests four "types" within the "class" of the impulsive delinquent, including 1) the

unsocialized aggressive child, 2) the self-centered indulgent child, 3) the psychopath, and 4) the sexual pervert. The inclusion of the unsocialized aggressive child and the psychopath within one class, and the manner in which they are differentiated are most relevant to the issue of conceptual overlap to be examined. Ferdinand's unsocialized aggressive child is a primitive, "animal-like" personality, whose ego controls are virtually non-existent. He does not exhibit remorse or guilt, and is in fact "remarkable for his gaiety in the face of disaster and defeat (p. 180." Ferdinand acknowledges his debt to Hewitt and Jenkins (1946) in describing this type, an important point because it will be seen that Quay's classification draws heavily on their earlier work.

But unlike Quay, Ferdinand distinguishes the psychopath from the unsocialized aggressive child. He states that both "combine a volatile impulsivity, a capacity for intense violence... (p. 184)." But the "true" psychopath is described as less primitive, and more exploitive and manipulative. "His problem, therefore, centers upon an emotional callousness that fails the attempt of others to influence or control his behavior (p. 185)." This is basically the description of the psychopath given by Weinberg (1952). It

also agrees with Cleckley's (1950) classic picture of the psychopath. For him a superficial charm and good intelligence characterize the psychopath, as well as the usual impulsivity, egocentricity and incapacity for real emotional relationships.

In the view of most authors, then, a psychopath is socially more adequate, if superficial, than the unsocialized aggressive individual. In psychoanalytic terms the disturbance is more in the functioning of the superego than the ego for the psychopath, while the unsocialized aggressive child is impaired in both of these areas.

Characteristic of considering behavior from a single theoretical viewpoint, most of the authors already mentioned include one category for those delinquents who do not display significant personality disorganization. This is the normal, or cultural delinquent, who is behaving appropriately in terms of the deviant values he has internalized, and as a result of identification with an anti-social model. It is precisely this group, of course, identified by psychoanalytic theorists chiefly by an absence of psychopathology, on which the sociologist focuses. From a sociological point of view, most delinquency can be explained on the basis of social force fields,

class or gang membership, or community structure.

The earliest sociological investigators concentrated on the ecology of delinquency. Rather than identifying specific types of delinquents, they focused on types of social structures which produced, or were at least highly correlated with, high rates of delinquency. Characterized by the early work of Shaw and McKay (1942), these studies related delinquency to poverty areas, population movements, and gang memberships. Crime and delinquency were seen as perpetuated in certain areas by cultural transmission. Cohen (1955) rejected this theory, suggesting instead that delinquent behavior in the lower class is the result of a collective "reaction formation," a rejection of middle-class values and an assertion of autonomy. Amond middle-class children, delinquency is most often an attempt to exhibit masculine behavior, usually the result of the absence of the father from the home for long periods.

Walter Miller (1958) suggests that delinquency is a distinctive pattern of behavior for the lower class, deriving directly from the characteristics of the culture rather than as a reaction to the middle class. He describes several "focal concerns" of the lower-class delinquent, including

unusual concern with luck or fate, evaluating an act on the basis of avoiding trouble rather than whether it is right or wrong, and emphasis on being tough, "smart" and seeking excitement.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) come somewhat closer to a typology of delinquents, though they too are concerned with group characteristics. They state that delinquent subcultures can be differentiated into three major types: criminal, conflict, and retreatist, depending upon the existing "opportunity structure" within the community, and the amount of communication available between the adolescent and older persons. The criminal type emerges when adolescents are recruited, as it were, into crime by older, professional criminals. When youth are isolated and on their own, achievement and status are more likely to be derived from conflict with rival gangs. The retreatist group is characterized by being failures in both delinquent and more conventional circles, leading to a search for "kicks" through use of alcohol and drugs.

Although based primarily on sociological concepts, this typology does recognize the importance of the individual reaction to social stimulation. The authors suggest that individual differences in

perception will largely determine whether the child will blame the social order or himself for his failure, and that this in turn will determine the nature of his reaction. Warren (1966) is speaking of this typology when she states that "It is now possible to find investigators who are attempting to link theoretically the sociological, psychological and situational variables which are all relevant to a completely satisfactory taxonomy (p. 5)."

Certainly a knowledge of the social structure and how it contributes to delinquent chavior is essential for corrections personnel. And, while sociological theory has obvious significance in the area of planning overall programs and management of large groups, it has little to contribute to individual treatment prescription. Obviously, the reality of individual differences within social classes renders treatment based on such broad categories difficult. Perhaps of more importance to the urban courts is the fact that most of the youth with whom they must deal are from essentially the same (lower) class.

A third major area of research involves the empirical development of subgroups or types without reference to a particular personality or sociological theory. The procedure involves the administration of

a large number of items (chiefly questionnaire and behavior ratings) and several intercorrelations of results using the methods of factor analysis. Results are several "clusters" of items, those in each cluster correlating highly with each other and poorly with those of the other clusters. For this reason the clusters are said to be statistically independent of each other.

The early prominent work in this area was done by Hewitt and Jenkins (1946) and Jenkins and Glickman (1947). By intercorrelating behavior traits of a population of children referred to a child guidance clinic, and later of a delinquent population, three patterns were identified: unsocialized aggressive, emotionally disturbed, and socialized. And, the following assumptions were made about the personality characteristics underlying these patterns:

Unsocialized Aggressive: This child feels rejected, lacks affectionate ties to adults, is hostile, bitter, impulsive, and without a sense of guilt.

Emotionally Disturbed: This delinquent is also rejected and hostile, but shows a disorganization of the personality and feels "psychologically crushed, beaten and bewildered."

Socialized: This group shares with theories already examined the description of a psychologically normal delinquent who has identified with anti-social standards of his environment.

These three basic patterns are to be seen again and again in the literature of empirical typologies as well as others, and some similarity is noted with the psychoanalytic theories. The question of whether these suggested personality variables do in fact underlie the classifications has never been fully answered. R. C. Miller (1958) investigated this problem by administering several personality tests (group TAT, selected scales from Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the California Psychological Inventory and the MMPI) and comparing the results with Jenkins' classifications. He failed to confirm the hypothesis regarding distinct personality patterns being related to what he called the Jenkins "behavioral types." His positive finding, most relevant to the present investigation, was that only two distinct personality patterns could be identified: the "socialized" and the "unsocialized-disturbed." That is, the unsocialized aggressive and emotionally disturbed types identified empirically could not be distinguished on the basis of personality test results.

Miller concluded that both were "suffering a severe personality disorganization due to deep and intense hostility (p. 24)." He also suggested that both of these types had "basically schizophrenic personalities."

In a series of investigations using the factor analytic method, Quay and his associates have developed subgroup classifications based on case history data (Quay, 1964), behavior ratings (Quay, 1964a), and questionnaire responses (Peterson, Quay, and Cameron, 1959; Peterson, Quay, and Tiffany, 1961; Quay and Peterson, 1964). The procedure employed in these studies is as described above for the empirical method. The results are generally reported as follows, using the personality questionnaire investigation as an example: "The majority of the variance of all the questionnaires could be accounted for by three orthogonal factors. These factors were labeled psychopathic delinquency, neurotic delinquency, and delinquent background or subcultural delinquency (Quay and Peterson, 1964, p. 1)."

It is important to note that the factors are rationally labeled. Thus Quay and Peterson (1964) explain the meaning of the factors as follows:

> Psychopathic delinquency was interpreted as reflecting tough, amoral, rebellious qualities, coupled with impulsivity, a conspicuous distrust of authority, and a relative freedom from family and other interpersonal ties.
>
> The neurotic delinquency factor also reflected impulsive and aggressive tendencies, but in this case accompanied by tension, guilt, remorse, depression and discouragement.
>
> The subcultural delinquency factor appeared to mirror attitudes, values and behaviors commonly thought to occur among members of culturally and economically disadvantages delinquent gangs in whom personality maladjustment per se is not clearly evident (p. 1).

This statement has been quoted in full because it represents the most complete description of the meaning of scores on the three scales outside of the reported intercorrelations with behavioral traits. The descriptions are, as stated, "interpretations" based on item content. In the same article, Quay and Peterson claim "factorial validity" for the scales and state that "concurrent validity for the separation of known delinquents from officially nondelinquent public school students is present in varying degrees for the three scales (p. 4)." However, he adds that "The basic purpose for which the scales have been developed is that of making useful differentiations with (sic) the delinquent group itself. We can

offer only meager evidence at this time that the factor scales have differential relationships with other measures within a delinquent sample (p. 5)."

Thus, despite the lack of validity in terms of relationships between scores on the factor scales and any other personality measure, the factors continue to be referred to as "personality dimensions." Of more significance, they have been used to identify "personality types" based on the interpretations provided above by the authors. This is despite the fact that Quay (1965) seems to warn against such usage: "... it is imperative that such constructs as unsocialized aggressive, neurotic delinquent, and weak ego be considered as dimensions of personality associated with delinquency rather than as types of delinquents. It is true that individuals can be found whose characteristics are quite predominantly those of a single dimension. But these individuals will be the exception and should be recognized as such (p. 165)." Results of the current investigation support this conclusion, as will be shown.

Nevertheless, Quay and others have used the scales to type and compare individuals. Quay and Hunt (1965) used the Personal Opinion Study to identify psychopaths and neurotics in a verbal conditioning

study with adult prisoners. In the usual manner in which the scales are employed, subjects scoring above the mean on the P scale and below the mean on the N scale were labeled psychopath; those above the mean on N and below on P were labeled neurotics. In this procedure, scores on the S scale are ignored. Results of this study confirmed the hypothesis that "psychopaths" would be slower to condition verbally than "neurotics." This was seen as supportive of the view that the psychopath is relatively unresponsive to social reinforcement, a traditional clinical view.

Bryan and Kapche (1967) however, found no differences between "psychopaths" and "normals" in amount of influence by social approval. They identified psychopaths as above, and called subjects normal if they scored below the mean on both P and N scales.

Finally, Quay (1967) has recently employed the scales to predict institutional adjustment of delinquents. He correlated a number of criterion variables, including type of release, length of stay in the institution, segregation time, physically aggressive offense, work-release success, and grades on adjustment, with the P, N and S scales. All three methods, questionnaire, case history, and behavior ratings were used. P scores from the questionnaire

correlated significantly with nine of the twelve criterion variables, three at the .05 level of significance and six at the .01 level. N scores correlated with only three of the variables. Most notable among the reported "demographic" variables reported is race; the Negro/white variable also correlated significantly with nine of the criterion variables, seven at the .01 level. Also, the court from which the boys were committed (Washington, D. C. vs. other federal courts) correlated with nine of the criterion variables, and in fact appears to have been the best single predictor of adjustment. Quay notes that boys from the Washington, D. C. court are "more likely to be Negro and are thought by institution staff to be more aggressive (p. 5)." Nevertheless, no data comparing white and Negro subjects on any of the scores are reported. On the basis of the reported correlations with criterion variables, one might conclude that race and court of committment, or some combination of these, are clearly superior to the factor scales in prediction.

In the above study, psychopaths and neurotics were not identified as such, indicating a use of the scales as dimensions rather than types. This points up a limitation of the scales. By definition (mean

score relationships) a large percentage of any sample will be unclassified when types are identified. In experimental studies in which it is possible to include in the sample only a small proportion of the total subjects tested, those who score at the extremes of the scales, this is defensible. But in recommending specific programs to correctional institutions, in which the entire population must be assigned to some treatment condition, this method is impractical.

Despite these limitations, the Personal Opinion Study does provide objective, easily obtained scores which have been shown to have at least factorial independence; few other instruments designed specifically for investigation of differences within a delinquent population are available.

One group of typologies which has produced several recommendations for treatment is that based on ego psychology. For example, Hunt and Hardt (1965) suggest five developmental stages based on a socialization-conceptual theory of interpersonal orientation. While the major application has been in education, these authors do suggest differential treatment methods for delinquents functioning at particular stages of development. The method requires individual

diagnosis, utilizing a sentence completion technique, a device much in use among ego psychology theorists.

A theoretical statement of interpersonal maturity development by Sullivan, Grant, and Grant (1957) has been quite influential in the development of subsequent typologies of delinquency. The theory is based on gradually expanding perceptions and expectations of the manner in which one's needs are met. This is largely determined by a "cognitive restructuring of experience and expectancy" in response to "increasing involvement with people, objects, and social institutions," resulting in a new level of integration. These levels are defined by "a crucial interpersonal problem which must be solved before further progress toward maturity can occur (p. 2-3)." The "I-levels" range from I-1, at which a discrimination of differences between self and nonself occurs, through I-7, the integration of relativity, movement, and change, an almost idealized level of maturity which few ever attain.

The occurrence of delinquent behavior is said to be most likely at the following levels:

I-2: The differentiation of the environment into persons and objects, characterized by a demanding dependency, impulsivity, and lack of regard for the feeling of others.

I-3: The integration of rules, within which there is recognition of responsibility and some ability to delay impulses, but a lack of empathy and tendency to manipulate.

I-4: The integration of conflict and response, characterized by introjection and social anxiety; delinquents at this level attempt to balance inner stresses through delinquent behavior.

The authors do not make specific treatment recommendations in this article, but utilizing this theory, Warren and her associates (1966) have developed a classification and treatment system which has been applied within the California Youth Authority. In her development of the theory, Warren viewed I-level as an indicator of how the delinquent perceives the environment. Within each of the three I-levels, several subcategories were constructed on the basis of possible reactions to the perceptions and behavior involved in meeting needs. A description of the subtypes from Jesness (1968) is contained in Appendix A.

The Community Treatment Project, the title given to the California Youth Authority program using the Warren classification scheme, used a clinical procedure to arrive at I-level subtype designations. This included a structured interview, sometimes taped

and rated by a second rater, a sentence completion test, and a staff meeting at which each case was discussed and final classification agreed upon.

In attempting to apply this classification scheme to institutionalized delinquents, Jesness (1968) developed a shorter procedure consisting of a 30 minute interview, a sentence completion test, and the Jesness Inventory (1966). Final classification was made on the basis of results of all three. In an effort to further simplify and objectify the classification procedure, Jesness Inventory scales for each of the nine subtype classifications were developed, complete with separate norms for different age groups. Jesness (1968) describes the development as follows:

> Procedures used in establishing the inventory as a classification instrument for use in determining I-level subtype are an example of a 'bootstraps' operation. The first step in this process involved an item analysis of the Jesness Inventory responses of the 202 subjects previously diagnosed by the staff of the Community Treatment Project. These 202 cases, selected from a larger pool of approximately 400 subjects, were felt to have been diagnosed with a high degree of confidence. On the basis of this item analysis, scales were built for each of the nine I-level subtypes. Raw scores were converted to T scores based on a large reception center sample of delinquents (n = 1924). Norms were established for each age from 8 to 18 for each of the nine subtypes (p. 59).

The scores of these 202 subjects, expressed in T

scores, were used for further statistical analysis described as "multiple discriminant analysis." Jesness has subsequently repeated this testing and statistical procedure several times, and reports that items for the nine subtype scales are based on the responses of a total 1355 cases (Jesness, 1969). Thus, at least a preliminary objective scoring procedure is now available for placing delinquents into one of nine subtypes and three I-levels. Appendix B contains the tables for converting raw Inventory scores to standard scores on the subtypes, for each of the age levels.

CHAPTER III

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND HYPOTHESES

The basic question under investigation is whether there is agreement between the Quay and Jesness methods of classifying delinquents. Both offer the advantages of self-administered, objectively scored paper and pencil tests. The fact that they were constructed out of dissimilar theoretical viewpoints, and yet yield classifications which appear to have a high degree of agreement, suggests what Warren (1966) calls "at least a partial 'truth' about the population rather than simply a convenient fantasy in the mind of the criminologist (p. 28)." Descriptively, I-2 and P are similar, as are I-4 and N; if these descriptions represent "truth" rather than "fantasy" and if the two instruments are measuring that truth, there should be substantial agreement when both are administered to the same population.

However, there are several factors which would mitigate against this and form the basis for hypothesizing a low degree of agreement. Both instruments are True-False questionnaires which require

responses to statements which may be construed as attitudes and value judgments about self, society, and their relationship. Both also specifically attempt to tap attitudes toward authority figures and institutions (parents, police, school) and the prospect of meeting needs through socially approved behavior.

There is reason to believe that minority group membership generates particular social attitudes which may affect responses to such a questionnaire. In addition to the frequently reported public opinion surveys which indicate that Negroes as a group are more alienated than whites, Lefcourt and Ladwig (1965) have measured these attitudes in a prison population. They found that adult Negroes were more alienated than whites, using Dean's (1961) Powerlessness and Normlessness scales. These differences were highly significant, and the authors concluded that "Negro inmates appear even more pessimistic about socially acceptable means than white inmates (p. 380."

Quay Factors

In the article reporting the development of the scales, Quay and Peterson (1964) indicate only the age range of the subjects, 12 to 17. The following

correlations between race (Negro) and scale scores are reported: P = -.16, N = .14, S = .06. No other race or age comparisons are made. They also note that "considering that the operation of various possible response sets (acquiescence, social desirability, faking 'good,' faking 'bad') would all serve to bring about positive correlations between the scales, the obtained intercorrelations are surprisingly low (p. 4)." The correlations between P and N for three delinquent and two non-delinquent groups are reported as follows: .17, .42, .30, .46, .59.

Since the scales were intended to "be of most use in the study of differential etiologic factors, and differential responsiveness to remediational measures (Quay and Peterson, 1964, p. 4)," the present author initiated a pilot study using the scales at the St. Louis Juvenile Court in 1968.

The Quay scales were administered to 144 male delinquents at the Juvenile Court. Inspection of mean scores on the P, N and S factors when grouped by race and age suggested the following tentative conclusions:

1. Negroes were significantly higher than whites on P scores at all age levels.

2. Younger Negroes (ages 11 to 13) were

significantly higher on P scores than older Negroes (ages 14 to 16). No such age relationship was evident among white subjects.

3. N scores were also inversely related to age for both races, but not significantly.

4. S scores were not related to either age or race, and contained much less variance than P or N scores.

5. Neither P, N nor S scores were related in any way to age, race, or delinquent offense pattern (including offenses against person, property, and other).

These results suggested a possible interaction effect of age and race in the resulting P scores, and to a lesser degree, N scores. The concept of alienation as outlined by Seeman (1959) and measured by Dean (1961) has already been suggested as a possible factor in determining racial differences on the Quay scales. A possible reason for the age relationship is suggested by inspection of the items making up the P scales, many of which may be construed as self-damaging, and most of which are keyed "true." Both of these factors are also evident in the N scale, but to a lesser degree. For example, 91% of the P items, and 80% of the N items

are keyed "true."

Since the testing of delinquents is generally carried on in an "official" setting, one might assume that the more sophisticated, socially aware subject would be less willing to admit to the pathology implied in the P and N scale items. And, younger subjects would be expected to be less sophisticated and cautious about such admissions. Further, while an acquiescence response set may not be evident for a large group of varying ages, it may well be operating for the younger subjects.

Thus, race and age may both affect P scores; to the extent that N scale items are less self-incriminating, keyed less in one direction, and perhaps less related to alientation, a relatively weaker relationship of these organismic variables to N scores is expected.

I-Level

I-level and subtype designations are expressed in T scores. Since separate norms for each age 8 to 18 are provided in determining these scores, age would not be expected to be a factor. In addition, the I-level scales are much more balanced than the Quay scales in terms of being keyed in both directions.

Another basic difference is that most subtype designations are based on overlapping items. That is, the same item may contribute to scores on several subtypes. For these reasons, inspection of the items does not suggest a definite relationship between subtypes or I-level, and age of the subjects.

Jesness (1968) and Warren and Palmer (1965) have both reported that a greater proportion of I-4 subjects are white. There was also a tendency in the Preston School Study for more Negroes to be classified Aa, though the Ap subtype was racially balanced (both are I-2 subtypes). The concept of alienation has been discussed as possibly relevant to scores on both tests. Since the Jesness Inventory was originally designed to yield scores on 10 personality characteristics, and two of these appear by description to be similar to what has been described as alienation, some predictions seem plausible.

The Inventory personality characteristics are listed with a brief description of each in Appendix A. Inspection of these suggests that those characteristics labeled Social Maladjustment (Sm) and Alienation (Al) reflect distrust of authority and a low expectancy for success through socially approved means, similar to what has been called alienation.

And, since more items from these two scales appear in the two subtypes making up the I-2 level than in any other, there is reason to believe that Negroes would score higher on the I-2 subtypes, and thus be more often classified at the I-2 level. This is in addition to the already reported tendency of whites to be classified I-4.

Hypotheses

1. Overall agreement between the classificatory systems in terms of Psychopath - I-2, and Neurotic - I-4, will be low.

2. Overall agreement for white subjects will be higher than for Negro subjects.

3. Agreement between I-2 and Psychopath will be lower than that between I-4 and Neurotic, based on the expectation that effects of age and race will be more pronounced on the P scores than on the N scores.

4. More Negroes will be classified Psychopath than whites, while more whites will be classified Neurotic.

5. More Negroes will be classified I-2 than whites, while more whites will be classified I-4.

6. Negroes will have higher P scores than whites.

7. Age and P scores will be negative correlated among Negroes only.

8. There will be a significant interaction between age and race in relation to P scores.

While not central to the issue of cross-classification and effects of age and race, two secondary hypotheses can be made on the basis of the previous discussion.

9. On the Jesness Inventory, Social Maladjustment (Sm) and Alienation (Al) scores for Negroes will be higher than for whites.

10. Sm and Al scores will be positively correlated with P scores for Negroes.

CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Subjects

The delinquent population under investigation consisted of 106 males confined at the Detention Centers of the St. Louis and St. Louis County Juvenile Courts, and at Missouri Hills, a St. Louis City institution for the rehabilitation of delinquent boys. Selection was initially based on an attempt to achieve equal numbers of white and Negro subjects, and within each racial group an equal number in age groups. No other criteria were used, selection being at random within these guidelines at each institution. As indicated in Table 1, equal age groups were not achieved, primarily because of the unavailability of younger subjects.

Materials

All subjects completed the Personal Opinion Study (Quay and Peterson, 1964) and the Jesness Inventory (Jesness, 1966). The Personal Opinion Study, which was used with the permission of Herbert Quay, is available from him upon request (see Quay, 1969).

Table 1

Age and Distribution of Subjects

Race	Age 9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total	Mean Age
White	1	1	2	1	6	8	18	15	52	14.50
Negro	0	0	2	3	10	10	14	15	54	14.41
Total	1	1	4	4	16	18	32	30	106	14.45

The Jesness Inventory was scored for the 10 personality variables following the procedure outlined in the Manual and using the material which accompanies it (Jesness, 1966). A list and brief description of these variables is contained in Appendix A. The Inventory was also scored for the nine subtypes which comprise the three I-levels, using scoring keys and norms provided by Jesness and available from him upon request (see Jesness, 1969). A list and brief description of the nine subtypes and three I-levels is contained in Appendix B, taken from Jesness (1968).

Classifications

The following method, as used by Quay and Hunt (1965) and Bryan and Kapche (1967) was used to

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

designate Psychopath and Neurotic subjects:

1. Mean scores for the entire sample on the P, N and S scores were determined.

2. Psychopath classification was assigned to all subjects above the sample mean on the P scale, and below the sample mean on the N scale.

3. Neurotic classification was assigned to all subjects above the sample mean on the N scale, and below the sample mean on the P scale.

I-level was determined by peak T scores on the subtypes. Thus, I-2 was assigned to all subjects with a peak T score on either the Aa or Ap subtypes, I-3 to all subjects with a peak T score on Cm, Cc, or Mp subtypes, and I-4 to any subject with a peak T score on the Nx, Na, Se, or Ci subtypes. In some cases there were ties for the highest T score, but in all cases these were within the same I-level.

It is obvious that classification in this way presents only a partial picture of test results. For example, only 47 of the 106 subjects could be classified Psychopath or Neurotic. While all subjects could be assigned an I-level, in many cases T scores on the second highest subtype were only slightly lower and within a different I-level. For these reasons an investigation of the agreement

between the systems in terms of the "conceptual overlap" noted in Chapter I required comparison in two ways. The systems are viewed as typologies which produce nominal categories; the two instruments are also viewed as personality tests which produce scores on all classifications within the system. Comparisons between the systems and their relationships to race and age are made in both ways.

Procedure

Subjects were tested in groups ranging in number from 4 to 12. Order of administration of the two tests was reversed for each successive group.

Subjects were told that they would be asked to express their opinions and feelings on a large number of issues of concern to most boys their age. They were assured that the results of the tests were for purposes of research only, and would not be seen by police, court officials, or their parents. They were urged to be frank and honest in expressing their opinions.

On the basis of the pilot study experience, it was concluded that some of the younger subjects could not adequately understand the printed items.

Therefore, subjects were provided with answer sheets only; instructions and all test items were presented verbally by the experimenter.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of the two tests in light of the specific hypotheses. Results are presented in three basic sections, dealing with degree of agreement, relationship of scores to race, and relationship of scores to age. Within each section the results are viewed as both nominal classificatory "types" and as continuous variable "dimensions."

Cross-Classification of Types

Table 2 indicates the number of subjects classified at the three I-levels who scored above the means on P, N, or S, and on various combinations of these. Of the total of 106 subjects, Quay classifications are made on only those above the mean on P or P and S (Psychopath), and on N or N and S (Neurotic), a total of 47 subjects. Table 3 indicates the relationship with I-level of these subtypes for these 47 subjects; Table 4 repeats the same data broken down into racial groups.

Table 2

I-Level Classification of Subjects and Their Relationship to Mean Scores on Psychopath(P), Neurotic (N), and Subcultural (S) Factors

Subjects Scoring Above Mean on Factor	I-2	I-3	I-4	Total
P only	5	2	3	10
Psychopath				
P and S	6	3	0	9
N only	3	2	4	9
Neurotic				
N and S	11	3	5	19
S only	4	3	6	13
P and N	11	1	2	14
P, S and N	9	5	3	17
Below mean on all factors	2	7	6	15
Total	51	26	29	106

Table 3

Cross-Classification of Psychopath and Neurotic Types with I-Level Classification

	I-2	I-3	I-4	Total
Psychopath	11	5	3	19
Neurotic	14	5	9	28
Total	25	10	12	47

Table 4

Cross-Classification of Psychopath and Neurotic Types with I-Level Classification by Race

	I-2		I-3		I-4		
	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	Total
Psychopath	3	8	0	5	2	1	20
Neurotic	4	10	5	0	7	2	28
Total	7	18	5	5	9	3	48

There are several ways of considering the degree of agreement. Since individuals are assigned to a single type, it would appear of most interest to determine the number or percentage of individuals in a given population who would be assigned types which agree. A percentage of the total agreement was computed by adding the eleven I-2 - Psychopaths and the nine I-4 - Neurotics, and dividing this "correct" total by the forty-seven subjects classified. A similar procedure was followed in determining percent of agreement for race groups and types separately. This data is presented in Table 5, which includes all agreements in percentages.

Separate figures for agreement with and without those subjects classified I-3 are provided in Table 5. This was felt necessary because it may validly be argued that inclusion of I-3 subjects introduces an unwarranted number of errors; that is, all I-3 subjects represent errors whether classified Psychopath or Neurotic, since there is no Quay classification comparable to I-3. Thus, with Quay's scores and I-3 excluded, a direct comparison of I-2 and Psychopath, and I-4 and Neurotic, results in an overall agreement of 54%.

Table 5

Percentages of Agreement Between I-Level Classifications and Psychopath - Neurotic Types for White, Negro, and Total Subjects

	I-3 Included	I-3 Excluded
White Subjects		
I-2 - P	60.0	60.0
I-4 - N	43.8	63.6
Total	47.6	62.6
Negro Subjects		
I-2 - P	57.1	88.7
I-4 - N	16.7	16.7
Total	38.4	47.6
Total Subjects		
I-2 - P	57.9	78.6
I-4 - N	32.2	39.1
Total	42.5	54.0

Hypothesis 1 stated that the overall agreement would be low. Since the degree of agreement is expressed in a percentage, various interpretations of whether results are "low" are, of course, possible. The 54% agreement may be considered technically satisfactory considering the various limitations of instruments of this kind. However, the practical applicability of the systems to a delinquent population for the purpose of determining treatment strategies is not enhanced by agreement at this level. If treatment based on the four classifications of Psychopath, Neurotic, I-2, and I-4 were prescribed, nearly one-half of the subjects would receive conflicting treatments (i.e., one treatment for Psychopath -- I-2, and another for Neurotic -- I-4). In this sense it is felt that the overall agreement may be described as low.

Cross-Classification as Dimensions

An alternate way of viewing agreement is by examination of the correlations between the Quay scores and the I-level subtypes. Table 6 indicates these Pearson product-moment correlations for both white and Negro subjects, with the correlations of interest underlined.

Table 6

Intercorrelations Between I-Level Subtype Scores and Psychopath (P), Neurotic (N), and Subcultural (S) Factors

		P			N			S		
		White	Negro	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro	Total
I-2	Aa	.60	.57	.59	.39	.51	.44	-.03	.03	.05
	Ap	.48	.40	.45	.58	.47	.51	-.02	.03	.07
I-3	Cm	-.36	-.35	-.34	-.25	-.59	-.43	-.02	-.23	-.10
	Cc	.50	.52	.51	.01	.06	.03	-.01	-.11	-.03
	Mp	-.07	-.15	-.11	-.46	-.51	-.49	-.08	-.14	-.11
	Na	.32	.16	.22	-.05	.39	.14	-.01	.22	.04
	Nx	-.44	-.48	-.47	.24	.16	.19	.19	.23	.15
	Se	-.62	-.60	-.62	-.44	-.54	-.49	-.05	-.08	-.10
	Ci	-.46	-.41	-.44	-.55	-.58	-.57	-.01	-.15	-.10

r of .20 or more significant at .05 level For total subjects
r of .26 or more significant at .01 level
two tailed test

Disregarding I-3 and S, it may be seen that the P scores correlate positively with the I-2 subtype scores and negatively with three of the four I-4 subtype scores, all at a significant level. But the correlations between N and I-2 subtype scores are also significantly positive, and nearly as high as those with P scores. In addition, N scores correlate negatively with two of the four I-4 subtype scores.

These results suggest an association between P, N and I-2, with the I-4 subtypes of Se and Ci being negatively related to this group of variables. Possible interpretations will be explored in Chapter VI; in terms of overall agreement, the Neurotic -- I-4 discrepancy appears most important.

Cross-Classification of Types and Race

Hypothesis 2 was that overall agreement between Psychopath and I-2, and Neurotic and I-4 among white subjects would be higher than that among Negro subjects. At 62.2% the agreement for whites is higher than that for Negroes, which is 47.6%; but a test of the significance of the difference between the two proportions yielded a z score of .16, which is not significant.

Hypothesis 3 also failed to be confirmed. For the total sample, the I-4 - N agreement of 39.1% is much lower than the I-2 - P agreement of 78.6%, which is in the opposite direction of that which had been predicted. Inspection of the data for the two groups in Table 5 makes it obvious that the Negro subjects' very high rate of I-2 - P agreement, and very low rate of I-4 - N agreement are responsible for the rejection of this hypothesis. For example, it may be seen that within the Negro sample of 12 subjects classified Neurotic, only 2 are classified I-4, while 10 are classified I-2.

Individual Types and Race

Tables 7 and 8 present the distribution and chi-square value of I-level and Psychopath and Neurotic types by race. Within both typologies, race is a significant factor, with Negroes being over-represented in the Psychopath and I-2 categories as predicted. Hypotheses 4 and 5 are confirmed.

Scores as Dimensions and Race

Tables 9 and 10 present t test comparisons of mean scores between white and Negro subjects on the Quay factors and subtype scales.

Table 7

Distribution and Chi-Square Value of I-Level Classifications for White and Negro Subjects

	I-2	I-3	I-4	Total
White	17	13	22	52
Negro	34	13	7	54
Total	51	26	29	106

Chi-square = 13.5, significant at .05 level

Table 8

Distribution of Chi-Square Value of Psychopath and Neurotic Types for White and Negro Subjects

	Psychopath	Neurotic	Total
White	5	16	21
Negro	14	12	26
Total	19	28	47

Chi-Square = 4.35, significant at .05 level

Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations and t Test Comparisons of Psychopath (P), Neurotic (N), and Subcultural (S) Factors for White and Negro Subjects

	White	S.D.	Negro	S.D.	t
P	14.85	9.31	16.74	7.97	1.12
N	17.67	4.36	17.89	4.68	.25
S	15.87	3.08	17.22	2.92	2.33*

*Significant at .05 level two tailed test

In Table 9 it may be seen that there are no significant differences between white and Negro subjects for P and N scores, even though as typologies such a difference was found. There is a significant difference in S scores, which was not predicted but is interesting in light of total results and will be discussed later. Thus Hypothesis 6 is not confirmed.

The results in Table 10 are consistent with the race relationship with I-level as types. Negroes are significantly higher on both I-2 subtypes, and lower on two of the I-4 subtypes.

As typologies, neither system is free of significant relationship with race. As dimensions, only I-level subtypes show such relationship.

Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations and t Test Comparisons of I-Level Subtype Scores for White and Negro Subjects

Subtype		White $\bar{X}$	White S.D.	Negro $\bar{X}$	Negro S.D.	t	p*
I-2	Aa	54.38	8.09	58.43	7.67	2.65	.01
	Ap	55.35	8.09	59.98	8.58	2.86	.01
I-3	Cm	43.13	8.31	44.22	8.29	.68	
	Cc	51.77	9.08	54.20	8.66	1.40	
	Mp	46.92	8.64	46.54	8.96	.22	
I-4	Na	52.79	10.76	48.20	8.34	2.44	.05
	Nx	49.50	9.40	45.87	8.08	2.12	.05
	Se	43.94	7.94	41.24	8.00	1.74	
	Ci	43.73	8.13	42.37	8.60	.84	

*two tailed test

Typologies and Age

Hypothesis 7 states that age and P scores will be negatively correlated for Negroes. Complete results regarding the age-type and age-dimension relationship are presented, following the pattern of this Chapter.

Tables 11 and 12 indicate the Psychopath - Neurotic classifications and I-level designations by age. Because of the small number of subjects at the 9 through 14 year old age levels, these were grouped to form a single age category, allowing the chi-square comparison in Table 11. In Table 12, ages 9 to 13 were combined.

As typologies, neither system is related to age. This is as expected for I-level, since separate age norms are provided. And while classified Psychopaths and Neurotics show no relationship with age, these subjects represent less than half of the sample. A better indication of the possible relationship is presented in the next section.

Scores as Dimensions and Age

The test of Hypothesis 7 is contained in Table 13. It is seen that age and P scores are

Table 11

Distribution and Chi-Square of Psychopath, Neurotic, and Subcultural Types for Age Groups

Ages	Psychopath	Neurotic	Total
9-14	7	11	18
15	8	7	15
16	4	10	14
Total	19	28	47

Chi-Square = 1.86, not significant

Table 12

Distribution and Chi-Square Value of I-Level Classifications for Age Groups

Ages	I-2	I-3	I-4	Total
9-13	11	5	10	26
14	10	5	3	18
15	15	8	9	32
16	15	8	7	30
Total	51	26	29	106

Chi-square = 3.05, not significant

negatively correlated for both Negroes and whites, but only significantly so for Negroes, as predicted. The additional finding of negative correlations between age and N scores for Negroes, and age and S scores for whites was not predicted, and will be discussed in Chapter VI.

Table 13

Intercorrelations Between Age and Psychopath (P), Neurotic (N), and Subcultural (S) Factors for White, Negro, and Total Subjects

	White	Negro	Total
P	-.10	-.30*	-.19
N	.00	-.25*	-.12
S	-.33*	-.15	-.25*

* Significant at .05 level two tailed test

Table 14 presents age correlations with I-level subtype scores. Only two of nine subtypes for the full sample show significant correlations with age, again consistent with the results by I-level alone.

Table 14

Intercorrelations Between Age and I-Level Subtype Scores for White, Negro, and Total Subjects

		White	Negro	Total
I-2	Aa	.19	.19	.18
	Ap	.05	.16	.09
I-3	Cm	-.23	-.04	-.14
	Cc	.27*	.34*	.29**
	Mp	-.05	-.07	-.06
I-4	Na	.21	-.06	.11
	Nx	-.16	-.28*	-.20*
	Se	-.12	-.13	-.12
	Ci	-.19	-.15	-.16

*Significant at .05 level

**Significant at .01 level two tailed test

Age and Race Interaction

Hypothesis 8 was that age and race would show an interaction effect on P scores. Table 15 presents the means for P, N and S scores for each age group within the two races.

Table 15

Means of Psychopath (P), Neurotic (N), and Subcultural (S) Factors for White and Negro Subjects by Age Groups

	P		N		S	
	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro
9-12	17.00	23.00	18.40	19.00	19.00	18.80
13	12.33	14.90	16.33	19.30	16.33	17.70
14	13.00	21.90	17.75	19.70	16.50	16.40
15	17.88	15.50	17.83	16.71	15.00	17.36
16	11.80	13.60	17.73	16.47	15.33	16.80

In Table 16 the results of separate analysis of variances for P, N and S scores are shown. Interaction effects are not present for any of the Quay factors, and Hypothesis 8 is not confirmed. As has been suggested by previous results, age is a significant factor in the P scores, and race a significant factor in S scores.

Jesness Inventory Personality Variables

Both of the secondary hypotheses regarding personality variable scores were confirmed. Hypothesis 9 stated that Inventory Social Maladjustment and

Table 16

Analysis of Variance of Scores on Psychopath (P), Neurotic (N), and Subcultural (S) Factors by Race and Age Groups

Source of Variation	d.f.	M.S.	F	p*
Psychopath				
Age	4	183.0	3.1	.05
Race	1	95.0		
Age X Race	4	97.7		
Error	96	58.3		
Neurotic				
Age	4	12.8		
Race	1	1.2		
Age X Race	4	17.9		
Error	96	21.1		
Subcultural				
Age	4	19.4		
Race	1	48.8	6.6	.05
Age X Race	4	6.6		
Error	96	7.4		

*Two tailed test

Alienation scores would be higher for Negroes than for whites. Table 17 presents t test comparisons of means between the races for all ten of the personality variables. Negroes are significantly higher on not only Social Maladjustment and Alienation, but on Value Orientation, Immaturity, and Repression as well. In fact, Negro subjects score higher on all ten scores, but only those mentioned above reach significance.

In Hypothesis 10 a positive correlation between P scores and both Sm and Al scores was predicted. Table 18 presents correlations between all ten personality variables and the P, S and N scores. The hypothesis is confirmed by correlations of .40 between Sm and P, and .52 between Al and P, for Negroes. However, correlations of nearly the same magnitude hold for white subjects. It is also interesting to note that the N scores correlate with the personality variables in a pattern nearly identical to that of the P scores. These and other results regarding possible interpretations of P and N scores will be discussed in Chapter VI.

Additional Results

Although not directly related to any of the hypotheses, several additional comparisons were thought to be of interest.

Table 17

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Test Comparisons of Jesness Inventory Personality Scores for White and Negro Subjects

Subtype	White $\bar{X}$	White S.D.	Negro $\bar{X}$	Negro S.D.	t
Sm	67.97	9.31	73.54	9.40	3.07**
Vo	59.13	8.62	63.24	7.82	2.57**
Im	52.48	10.35	58.07	11.34	2.65**
Au	58.92	8.61	61.13	9.41	
Al	57.44	10.69	62.63	10.30	2.54*
Ma	56.54	9.51	57.76	9.31	
Wd	58.92	9.84	60.15	8.38	
Sa	50.46	10.25	50.61	8.59	
Rp	49.71	9.39	54.20	12.08	2.44*
Dn	42.87	8.98	44.31	8.74	

*Significant at .05 level

**Significant at .01 level

Table 18

Intercorrelations Between Jesness Inventory Scores and Psychopath (P), Neurotic (N), and Subcultural (S) Factors for White, Negro, and Total Subjects

	P			N			S		
	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro	Total	White	Negro	Total
Sm	.32	.40	.37	.48	.47	.46	.01	.08	.11
Vo	.59	.58	.59	.34	.41	.37	-.14	-.16	-.08
Im	.17	.26	.23	.15	-.04	.05	-.07	-.01	.03
Au	.32	.46	.40	.44	.38	.40	.04	-.03	.03
Al	.58	.52	.56	.28	.29	.28	-.13	-.16	-.09
Ma	.59	.40	.51	.32	.52	.42	.03	.17	.11
Wd	.12	-.10	.03	.42	.34	.38	-.07	.10	.02
Sa	-.15	-.23	-.18	.45	.27	.36	.22	.33	.26
Rp	-.18	-.05	-.09	-.09	-.42	-.28	-.04	-.19	-.07
Dn	-.38	-.39	-.37	-.44	-.66	-.55	.07	-.12	.00

For white and Negro subjects: r of .23 or more Significant at .05 level
r of .33 or more Significant at .01 level

For Total subjects: r of .17 or more Significant at .05 level
r of .23 or more Significant at .01 level
two tailed tests

Table 19

Intercorrelations Between Psychopath (P), Neurotic (N) and Subcultural (S) Factors for White, Negro, and Total Subjects

	White		Negro		Total	
	S	N	S	N	S	N
P	-.04	.21	-.15	.36**	-.06	.28**
N	.18		.29*		.24*	

*p .05 two tailed test
**p .01

Table 20

Intercorrelations Between I-2 and I-4 Subtype Scores

	White				Negro				Total			
	Na	Nx	Se	Ci	Na	Nx	Se	Ci	Na	Nx	Se	Ci
Aa	.34	-.48	-.92	-.82	.25	-.42	-.94	-.86	.23	-.48	-.93	-.83
Ap	-.03	-.18	-.81	-.81	.00	-.10	-.82	-.82	-.08	-.19	-.82	-.81

In Tables 19 and 20, the intercorrelations of P, N and S scores, and those of I-2 and I-4 subtype scores are presented. The positive, significant correlation between P and N, and the negative correlations between I-2 and I-4 subtype scores are noted, for they have a bearing on the independence of these factors.

Subjects above the mean on both P and N scores were not classifiable as either Psychopath or Neurotic by the method employed in this research. However, in Table 21 it may be seen that these subjects would be predominantly classified I-2, again with Negroes being over-represented in the I-2 category. Both of these additional results will be discussed in the following chapter.

Table 21

I-Level Classifications of White and Negro Subjects Above the Means on Psychopath (P) and Neurotic (N) Factors

	I-2		I-3		I-4		
	White	Negro	White	Negro	White	Negro	Total
Subjects	6	14	3	3	4	1	31

Summary of Results

The primary hypotheses concerned the degree of agreement between the Jesness and Quay systems of classifying delinquents, and the relationship of age and race to those classifications. Two secondary hypotheses predicted relationships between personality variables on the Jesness Inventory and Quay's P score.

Four of the eight primary hypotheses were confirmed, as were both of the secondary ones. Overall agreement between the systems was interpreted as low; it was better for white than for Negro subjects, but not at a significant level. The I-4 - Neurotic agreement was higher than the I-2 - Psychopath, which is the opposite of the predicted relationship. A reason for this was suggested in the over-representation of Negro subjects in the I-2 classification, even though many of them were classified Neurotic according to the results of the Quay system. Negroes are also over-represented in the Psychopath classification, but to a lesser degree than in the I-2 classification. Negroes were not significantly higher than whites on P scores, as had been predicted.

Age was found inversely related to P scores, but the predicted interaction effect of age and race

was not present. Additional results of interest included positive correlations between P and N scores, and negative correlations between I-2 and I-4 subtype scores; it was also noted that those subjects scoring above the mean on the P and N scores were classified predominantly I-2, just as were those subjects who were classified Psychopath and Neurotic.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

The construction of delinquent typologies represents progress toward improved understanding of the problem of delinquency, and development of treatment strategies applicable to large populations. With reliable and meaningful methods of differential diagnosis, training of correctional workers would be simplified by teaching treatment specialties rather than a full range of correctional techniques.

The Quay and Jesness classificatory systems under investigation in this study are tentative first steps toward the attainment of objective methods of categorizing delinquents. It has been suggested that these systems yield descriptively similar classifications, implying a "conceptual overlap" between two pairs of types, the Psychopath and I-2, and the Neurotic and I-4. The results of the present investigation lend some support to such overlap for white subjects, but are largely contradictory for Negro subjects, with the main problem being the low level of Neurotic - I-4 agreement. This brings the meanings

of these categories, especially for Negro subjects, into question.

Quay and Jesness have both listed the characteristics of those included in the four classifications being studied. Possibly because they have a sound theoretical base, the Jesness I-levels are well differentiated from each other at a descriptive level. Based on the description of Quay and Peterson (1964) the Psychopath and Neurotic differences are more subtle. Both are impulsive and aggressive individuals, with the chief difference apparently being the "tension, guilt and remorse" of the Neurotic.

However, the labels themselves, as well as the use to which the Quay scales have been put by Quay and others (Quay and Hunt, 1965; Bryan and Kapche, 1967), imply a traditional, clinical interpretation of the two categories. It is notable that the scales are in the tradition of and very similar to the classification system of Hewitt and Jenkins (1947) which was frankly phychiatrically oriented. It is clear that the scales are intended to identify individual pathology, with neurotics and psychopaths falling at opposite ends of continua of anxiety and social responsivity.

If psychopathic and neurotic delinquents are as different from each other as has been implied, and if the Quay scales adequately reflect these conditions, one would expect to find scores on the P and N scales unrelated, or even negatively related. It has already been noted that Quay reported positive P and N correlations ranging from .17 to .59. But he did not report correlations for the separate races.

In administering the Personal Opinion Study to 60 Negro delinquents, Hezel (1968) found that P and N scores correlated .56. In Table 19 it was seen that for the present study, P and N scores correlated .36 for Negroes (significant at .01 level) and .21 for whites (not significant). These results suggest that, at least for Negroes, the two scales are not as independent as would be necessary to measure personality characteristics as theoretically diverse as psychopathy and neuroticism.

It may be argued that the high P - N correlation was produced by subjects scoring above the mean on both scales, and therefore not classifiable according to Quay. Thus the tendency of both Psychopath and Neurotic subjects to be classified I-2 may be unrelated to the correlation of these factors. In Table 21 the I-level distributions for all subjects

above both means were reported. The relationships with I-level are quite similar to those of subjects classified Psychopath and Neurotic. In Table 21, 14 of 18 Negroes (77.8%) above both means were seen as classified I-2, while only 6 of 13 whites (49.2%) were so classified.

In Table 20, it was seen that the I-2 and I-4 subtype scores correlated zero or negatively for both races, with the exception of Neurotic Acting Out and Asocial Aggressive. These classifications, then, appear relatively independent of each other.

One may conclude that Negro subjects, whether scoring high on the P scale, N scale, or on both, tend to be classified I-2. One possibility is that both P and N scores as well as scores on I-2 subtypes are being affected by a common factor, and to a much stronger degree among Negro subjects. Hezel (1968), dealing with Negro subjects only, found that P and N scores each correlated negatively at an .001 level of confidence with level of ego development, using Loevinger's (1966) theory and method of measurement, which is highly similar to the Warren-Jesness theory.

All of these results raise serious questions about the meaning not only of the P scores and the N scores, but about the I-levels as well. Though many

of these findings reflect statistically significant differences between groups, they represent trends rather than absolute dichotomies. Thus, some white subjects classified Neurotic by Quay are also classified I-2. For this reason, it is impossible to cite any one factor as responsible for the results. But there is one factor which seems to run through most of the findings, and which may represent the single most parsimonious explanation. This may be described as social immaturity.

It was pointed out in Chapter II that at least one theorist (Ferdinand, 1966) differentiated the unsocialized aggressive child and the psychopathic child, though they are both described as impulsive. This differentiation was apparently made on the basis of the greater social adequacy (maturity?) of the psychopath. It has also been noted that most descriptions of the psychopath attribute to this individual a higher level of competency than is characteristic of the I-2 delinquent. For the present results, it is suggested that P and N scores, as well as I-2 designations, reflect social immaturity rather than, or in addition to, those qualities suggested by the labels given these factors. This "immaturity" appears to be a socially determined set of attitudes

or response tendencies, related to minority group membership.

This conclusion is supported by several of the results of the present study.

One of the most significant was the negative correlation of age with both P and N scores for Negroes, which was not true of whites. Thus the younger Negro subjects were higher on both scales, while the age of white subjects showed essentially no relationship to them. If youth alone were related to inflated P and N scores by reason of such age-appropriate tendencies as response sets of acquiescence or social desirability, both racial groups should have shown negative correlations between age and these scores.

The fact that no age relationship was found with I-levels for either racial group is considered a function of the separate norms for age groups. Thus, even when compared with white subjects of their own age group, Negroes are more often classified I-2. And, as described in I-level theory, I-2 reflects a higher degree of immaturity, though this is described as "interpersonal."

It had been hypothesized that an "alienation" concept might explain differences in results along

racial lines. There was some support for this in the higher scores by Negroes on the Jesness Inventory scales of Social Maladjustment and Alienation, but Negroes were higher on all personality scales, significantly so on Value Orientation, Immaturity, and Repression in addition to the two on which the hypothesis was based. With the exception of Repression and possibly the Immaturity scales, those on which Negroes are significantly higher are distinctly "social" in implication, as opposed to individual personality measures. That is, Social Maladjustment, Value Orientation, and Alienation all reflect attitudes which might be considered socially pathological and associated with lower socioeconomic class, rather than individual psychopathology.

The additional finding of significantly higher S scores on the Quay scales among Negroes is also of relevance here. As noted earlier, Quay and Peterson (1964) describe this factor as reflecting "attitudes, values and behaviors commonly thought to occur among members of culturally and economically disadvantaged delinquent gangs in whom personality maladjustment per se is not clearly evident (p. 1)." When comparing the total white and Negro groups, this is the only Quay factor on which there is a signifi-

cant difference between the means, with Negroes being higher.

Implications

The most obvious implication of the results of the present research is that the impact of age and race differences must be considered in making use of the two instruments studied, whether as diagnostic tools or in further research. Since the purpose was comparison of the methods in terms of degree of agreement and relationship with age and race factors, and not an evaluation, neither of them can be said to be superior to the other in classifying delinquents. Obviously, the test of this lies in their use to specify treatment, and evaluation of the outcome. This has been attempted within the California Youth Authority system with Warren's I-level method of classification, with reported encouraging results. A measure of the value of the Jesness classifications using the Inventory alone awaits further reports of the Preston Typology Study.

Another implication involves the effect of minority group membership on responses to questionnaires which measure attitudes. It may be that the results reflect social or group characteristics which

have more relevance for environmental - social planning and manipulation than for treatment based on individual personality characteristics or pathology.

REFERENCES

Abrahamsen, D. Crime and the human mind. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.

Aichorn, A. Wayward youth. New York: Viking Press, 1935.

Bender, L. Psychopathic conduct disorders in children. In R. M. Linder (Ed.), A handbook of correctional psychology. New York: Philosophical Library, 1947.

Bryan, J., and Kapche, R. Psychopathy and verbal conditioning. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72, 71-73.

Cleckley, H. The mask of sanity. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1955.

Cloward, R. A., and Ohlin, L. E. Delinquency and opportunity: a theory of delinquent gangs. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1960.

Cohen, A. Delinquent boys. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1955.

Dean, A. Alienation: its meaning and measurement. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 753-758.

Ferdinand, T. Typologies of delinquency. New York: Random House, 1966.

Friedlander, K. The psychoanalytic approach to juvenile delinquency. New York: International Press, 1947.

Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. Unravelling juvenile delinquency. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Hewitt, L. S., and Jenkins, R. L. Fundamental patterns of maladjustment: the dynamics of their origin. Springfield, Illinois: State of Illinois, 1946.

Hezel, J. Some personality correlates of delinquents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Saint Louis University, 1968.

Hunt, D. E., and Hardt, R. H. Developmental stage, delinquency and differential treatment. Journal of Research, Crime and Delinquency. 1965, 2, 302-310.

Jenkins, R., and Glickman, S. Patterns of personality organization among delinquents. Nervous Child, 1947, 6, 329-339.

Jesness, C. Manual: the Jesness inventory. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1966.

Jesness, C. The Preston typology study. Sacramento, California: Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, 1968.

Jesness, C. Personal communication, 1969. (Carl Jesness, Ph. D., Youth Center Research Project, NRCC - 3001 Ramona Avenue, Sacramento, California 95826).

Kessler, J. Psychopathology of childhood. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Kissling, E. Comments on "the psychopathic offender - issues in treatment." Correctional Psychologist, 1968, 3, 2-3.

Lefcourt, H., and Ladwig, G. The American Negro: a problem in expectancies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 377-380.

Loevinger, J. The meaning and measurement of ego development. American Psychologist, 1966, 21, 195-206.

Miller, R. C. Personality patterns among delinquent behavioral types. Washington, C. D.: Catholic University of America Press, 1958.

Miller, W. B. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14, 5-19.

Peterson, D. R., Quay, H. C., and Cameron, G. R. Personality and background factors in juvenile delinquency as inferred from questionnaire responses. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23, 395-399.

Peterson, D., Quay, H. C., and Tiffany, L. Personality factors related to juvenile delinquency. Child Development, 1961, 32, 355-372.

Quay, H. C. Personality dimensions in delinquent males as inferred from the factor analysis of case history data. Child Development, 1964, 35, 479-484.

Quay, H. C. Personality dimensions in delinquent males as inferred from the factor analysis of behavior ratings. Journal of Research, Crime and Delinquency, 1964a, 1, 33-37.

Quay, H. C. Personality and delinquency. In H. C. Quay (Ed.), Juvenile delinquency: theory and research. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1965.

Quay, H. C. The prediction of the institutional adjustment of delinquent boys: preliminary results. Mimeo, 1967.

Quay, H. C. Personal communication, 1969. (Herbert C. Quay, Ph. D., Division of Educational Psychology, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122).

Quay, H. C., and Hunt, W. A. Psychopathy, neuroticism and verbal conditioning: a replication and extension. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 283.

Quay, H. C., and Peterson, D. R. The questionnaire measurement of personality dimensions associated with juvenile delinquency. Mimeo, 1964.

Redl, F., and Wineman, D. The aggressive child. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

Rubenfeld, S. Typological approaches and delinquency: an overview. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Public Health Service, National Clearinghouse for Mental Health Information, 1967.

Sanford, R. N. A psychoanalytic study of three criminal types. Journal of Criminal Psychopathology, 1943, 5, 57-68.

Seeman, M. On the meaning of alienation. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 783-791.

Shaw, C., and McKay, H. Juvenile delinquency and urban areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Sullivan, C., Grant, M. Q., and Grant, J. D. The development of interpersonal maturity: application to delinquency. Psychiatry, 1957, 20, 373-385.

Warren, M. Q. Classification of offenders as an aid to efficient management and effective treatment. Paper prepared for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Criminal Justice, Task Force on Corrections, 1966.

Warren, M. Q., and Associates. Interpersonal maturity level classification (juvenile): diagnosis and treatment of low, middle and high maturity delinquents. Community Treatment Publication, California Youth Authority, 1966.

Warren, M. Q., and Palmer, T. Community treatment project, research report No. 6, California Youth Authority, 1965.

Weinberg, S. K. Society and personality disorders. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

APPENDIX A

JESNESS INVENTORY PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

Social Maladjustment (Sm): Social Maladjustment refers here to a set of attitudes associated with inadequate or disturbed socialization, as defined by the extent to which an individual shares the attitudes of persons who demonstrate inability to meet environmental demands in socially approved ways.

Value Orientation Scale (Vo). Value Orientation refers to a tendency to share attitudes and opinions characteristic of persons in the lower socioeconomic classes.

Immaturity Scale (Im). Immaturity reflects the tendency to display attitudes and perceptions of self and others which are usual for persons of a younger age than the subject.

Autism Scale (Au). Autism measures a tendency, in thinking and perceiving, to distort reality according to one's personal desires or needs.

Alienation Scale (Al). Alienation refers to the presence of distrust and estrangement in a person's attitudes toward others, especially toward those representing authority.

Manifest Aggression Scale (Ma). Manifest Aggression reflects an awareness of unpleasant feelings, especially of anger and frustration, a tendency to react readily with emotion, and perceived discomfort concerning the presence and control of these feelings.

Withdrawal Scale (Wd). Withdrawal involves a perceived lack of satisfaction with self and others and a tendency toward isolation from others.

Social Anxiety Scale (Sa). Social Anxiety refers to perceived emotional discomfort associated with interpersonal relationships.

Repression Scale (Rep). Repression reflects the exclusion from conscious awareness of feelings and emotions which the individual normally would be expected to experience, or his failure to label these emotions.

Denial Scale (Den). Denial indicates a reluctance to acknowledge unpleasant events or aspects of reality often encountered in daily living.

APPENDIX B

I-LEVEL AND SUBTYPE DESCRIPTIONS

Maturity Level 2 (I-2)

The two subtypes, Unsocialized Aggressive (Aa) and Unsocialized Passive (Ap), in the second maturity level are much alike in their characteristics. The I-2 perceives the world in an egocentric manner, being concerned primarily with his own needs. His own behavior is impulsive, and he shows limited awareness of its effect on others. He blames others for denying him, but does not understand why they do this or what they expect of him.

His perception of reality is often distorted; but in spite of present difficulties and conflicts, he is optimistic about the future and frequently makes unrealistic plans. On the other hand, he feels he is a "receiver of life's impact"; unfortunate things just happen to him.

His response to the world of adults is in terms of resentment and complaints about not having his needs fulfilled. In an attempt to achieve gratification, the I-2 attaches himself to anyone who shows him kindness or gives him something. This boy lacks ability to handle frustration or control incoming stimuli. The I-2's stance is that the world should take care of him. He defines other people in terms of whether they give or withhold things from him. Beyond this, he has little conception of interpersonal differences and cannot accurately explain, understand, or predict behavior and reactions of others. As a result some react suddenly, sometimes violently, seldom expressing remorse about their behavior. Under stress the I-2 may attempt to withdraw from the situation. An appearance of complete docility often hides feelings of resentment and of being misunderstood.

The I-2 suffers poor peer relationships and is often the object of scapegoating. He has few social skills, and his attempts at relating often appear insincere and clumsy.

Delinquency seems to stem from poor impulse control or inability to cope with external pressures, including those exerted by his peers.

The most important differentiating characteristic between the Ap and the Aa is the nature of response to frustration or demands: the Aa more typically reacts in a hostile or aggressive manner; the Ap complains or passively withdraws.

Maturity Level 3 (I-3)

The I-3 attempts to manipulate his environment to get what he wants. In contrast with the I-2, he is aware that his own behavior has something to do with whether or not he gets what he wants. His efforts to attain his ends may be in the form of conformance to the perceived power structure or "conning" and manipulation. The I-3 seeks structure in terms of rules and formulas for behaving in the immediate social content. He tends to deny the existence of personal problems, instead describing his difficulties as external and resulting from a conflict between himself and his environment. Although the I-3 may have learned to play a few stereotyped roles, he cannot empathize fully with others. He has difficulty perceiving personality and behavioral differences among others, and his conceptions are usually limited to the roles these people fulfill (mother, teacher, mechanic) or in terms of stereotyped, socially desirable descriptions (hard-working, nice, friendly, etc.).

Immature Conformist (Cfm). The Cfm perceives himself as less adequate than others. He may, however, describe himself as "average" and "normal." The Cfm feels that he is expected to conform to the standards of controlling or "giving" figures and assumes their "power" to be overwhelming if he does not meet these expectations. His response is to the immediate power structure, and he may behave somewhat unpredictably in the eyes of his delinquent peers. For this reason, he may not be a close member of the group. Although the Cfm is somewhat pessi-

mistic and anticipates rejection by adults, he has not given up trying to form satisfying relationships.

Cultural conformist (Cfc). The Cfc considers his life to be comfortable, effective, and satisfactory and usually rejects the idea of making changes in himself. He rarely admits to problems; but when he does, he attributes them to the external world (school, probation department, etc.).

The Cfc is alienated toward adults and prefers to rely on peers for social approval and for satisfaction of his needs. He gravitates toward delinquency-oriented peers since his experience make this group most predictable to him. He presents himself as an adequate person who is in control of himself and his emotions. He perceives others to be guided by the same concern with external structure that directs his actions, and has little awareness that people possess diverse personalities, motivations, and responses. Anxiety tends to be related to situations which generate uncertainty.

Delinquency seems to be an attempt to gain or maintain peer acceptance, an attempt to prove masculinity, or to gratify material needs.

Manipulator (Mp). The Mp maintains much the same self-satisfied attitude toward his way of life as does the Cfc and is equally reluctant to make an actual commitment to change.

As the name implies, the Mp's formula involves manipulation to control others and satisfy his own needs. Use of this formula is rigid and apparently self-reinforcing. Since the Mp only seems to assimilate that part of incoming information congruent with his frame of reference, he does not appear to learn much from experience. He ordinarily receives his reward from the means (manipulation) utilized to attain something rather than the end itself.

Anti-social behavior is accepted as part of his life; a way of outsmarting others and dealing out what they deserve. Since he considers the motivations in others to be the same as his own; that is, "to get others before they get you," he

feels that people are unwilling to meet his dependency needs and will try to "use" him.

Although initially capable of making a positive impression on others, the Mp usually alienates both adults and peers. His delinquency is generally an attempt to gain or maintain control, obtain gratification of impulses, or an expression of hostility.

Maturity Level 4 (I-4)

The I-4 has internalized a set of standards by which he judges his and other's behavior. He may experience guilt about his failure to live up to these standards. Sometimes it is not guilt over self-worth but conflict over values that creates problems. With some I-4's who manage to avoid internal conflict, the difficulty arises from admiration and identification with delinquent models. At the I-4 level, the boy begins to show some ability to look for and understand reasons for behavior and shows some awareness of the effects of his behavior on others and their behavior on him.

Acting-Out Neurotic (Na). The Na is characterized by the presence of guilt based on the internalization of a negative, "bad," self-image. As a result, anxiety is not situationally determined but is constantly with him. The Na attempts to "overcome" immediate problems without necessarily trying to uncover or unravel long-standing conflicts. He does, however, want to improve himself and his life, particularly to hurt himself less or to stop hurting others.

Anxious Neurotic (Nx). The Nx is also characterized by internalization of the "bad me" self-image. Anxiety, a constant factor in this boy's life, is typically related to perceptions of self as inadequate and to chronic internal conflicts. In contrast to the Na, the Nx places value upon introspection of self and investigation of the past causes of his problems.

Situational Emotional (Se). The Se evidences no long-term psychoneurosis or psychopathy, but does experience distress or conflict over some current problem. This conflict, which has precipitated the Se's involvement in delinquent activities, could have

involved personal and family problems or environmental situations.

Cultural identifier (Ci). The Ci, non-neurotic in nature, has internalized the value system of a deviant subculture. He perceives inequities and injustices along socio-economic and racial lines; and as a result, has antipathy for the core (middle-class) culture. He suffers little from anxiety and defines any problems he may have as conflicts between himself and society or his environment.

BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR

Eugene John Kissling was born on January 11, 1936 at St. Louis, Missouri. He graduated from DeAndreis High School in 1954, and attended Saint Louis University from 1954 to 1955. He entered the United States Army that year, and was discharged in 1957.

After completing military service he returned to Saint Louis University and received a Bachelor of Science degree in 1960, with a major subject area of psychology. He entered Saint Louis University Graduate School on a part-time basis in 1961, receiving the Master of Science degree in psychology in 1965. Since that time he has been pursuing the degree of Doctor of Philosophy with a major subject area of Clinical Psychology.

The author was employed as a teacher at Pattonville High School in St. Louis County, Missouri from 1960 to 1961, and as a Probation and Parole Officer at the St. Louis Circuit Court for Criminal Causes from 1961 to 1966. In that year he was appointed Clinical Psychologist at the St. Louis Juvenile Court, a position he currently holds.

END

7 titles/inserts