



5-1-1972

A Comparison of the Self-Concepts of Institutionalized Delinquents, Non-Institutionalized Delinquents, and Non-Delinquents

Franklin D. DeForest

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

DeForest, Franklin D., "A Comparison of the Self-Concepts of Institutionalized Delinquents, Non-Institutionalized Delinquents, and Non-Delinquents" (1972). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3669.
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3669>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

A COMPARISON OF THE SELF-CONCEPTS OF INSTITUTIONALIZED DELINQUENTS,
NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED DELINQUENTS, AND NON-DELINQUENTS

by

Franklin D. DeForest

Bachelor of Science, University of North Dakota 1970

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

May
1972

T
1972
D362

This thesis submitted by Franklin D. DeForest in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Alice T. Clark
(Chairman)

Paul H. Wrought

Michael J. Patton

William Johnson
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title A COMPARISON OF THE SELF-CONCEPTS OF INSTITUTIONALIZED DELIN-
QUENTS, NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED DELINQUENTS AND NON-DELINQUENTS

Department Psychology

Degree Master of Arts

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature *Franklin D. Johnson*

Date *April 26, 1972*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Alice Clark, my committee chairwoman, whose continued support has helped to make this thesis possible. I would also like to express my appreciation to the other committee members, Dr. Paul Wright and Dr. Michael Gatton, for their assistance and encouragement.

I am particularly grateful to the staff of the North Dakota Industrial School, the Burleigh County Juvenile Court, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps in Bismarck for their time and patience in allowing me to use their facilities to collect data.

A special thank you is extended to the subjects of this thesis, without whom the present study would have been neither possible nor justifiable. It is hoped that this thesis may provide, in some small way, insight into and an understanding of their experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Nature of the Problem	
Current Theories Related to the Etiology of Delinquency	
Definition of Terms	
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
Self-Other Research	
Self-Concept and Delinquency	
Self-Concept and Institutionalization	
Accuracy of the Delinquent's Self-Estimate	
Hypotheses to be Tested	
III. METHOD	31
Subjects	
Test Instrument	
Procedure	
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	38
Presentation of Mean Self-Concept Scores	
Self-Estimate as a Function of Delinquency Status	
Self-Estimate as a Function of Institutional Status	
Implications of the Findings	
V. SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	53
APPENDIX	61
REFERENCES	63

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Mean Self-Concept Scores: Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees, Juvenile Court Probationers and North Dakota Industrial School Inmates	39
II. F Ratios for One-Way Analysis of Variance: Mean Self-Concept Scores	40
III. T Ratios of Mean Self-Concept Scores: Non-Delinquent and Combined Delinquent Groups	42
IV. T Ratios of Mean Self-Concept Scores: Institutionalized and Combined Non-Institutionalized Groups	44
V. T Ratios of Mean Self-Concept Scores: Groups Confined for Six Months and Periods Greater Than Six Months	46
VI. Mean Self-Concept Scores: North Dakota Industrial School, Lefebber (1965) First Offenders and Waters (1969) Incarcerated Delinquents	49
VII. Mean Self-Concept Scores: Neighborhood Youth Corps, Lefebber (1965) Non-Delinquents and Waters (1969) Non-Delinquents	51

ABSTRACT

On the basis of previous theorizing and empirical research, it seems that the self-concept may be a highly relevant factor in the understanding and containment of delinquent behavior. However, as Rubin (1970) has noted, there remains some doubt as to the effectiveness of existing treatment programs in promoting a change in the delinquent's self-concept structure which will be lasting and lead to a more adaptive response to the normal social environment. Therefore the present investigation proposes to show that there exist fundamental differences between the self-concepts of delinquents, both institutionalized and non-institutionalized, and non-delinquents. These differences can then be assumed to be characteristic of the delinquent's self-concept. The study further proposes to show that differences in self-concept which are found to be associated with delinquency are not a function of institutional status, although institutionalization may have some effect on those areas of the self-concept found to be irrelevant to delinquency orientation.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was administered to three groups: Delinquents confined to a state training school; probationers of the juvenile court; and enrollees of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. The results of the 55 tests were converted to standard scores and analyzed using the analysis of variance and t tests. Nineteen scales of the TSCS were examined.

The results appear to indicate that no significant differences exist among the three groups in terms of their self-concepts. Since

the first hypothesis was not supported, it was not possible to provide an adequate test of the second hypothesis. Therefore, on the basis of the present investigation, it would seem that other indices, such as identification with the delinquent subculture, may be better predictors of delinquent behavior than is level of self-evaluation.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Nature of the Problem

Crime, in all its aspects, is costing the United States more than \$20 billion a year (Roncek, 1969). The devastating impact of crime cannot be understood merely in terms of dollars and cents, however. It must also entail a consideration of the disrupted lives of the offenders as well as their victims. Indeed the rapidly accelerating crime rate is America's number one social problem.

Approximately half of all serious crime in the United States is committed by persons under eighteen years of age. Fifteen-year-olds commit more serious crimes than any other age group (Worsnop, 1970). The present correctional system recognizes the logical need to focus attention on the juvenile delinquent to effect preventive rather than curative measures if the subsequent adult crime is to be curtailed. It is frequently observed that today's adult criminal is the final product of yesterday's juvenile delinquent!

However, increased attention to the juvenile delinquent has not resulted in a panacea for juvenile crime. In fact, as the crime rate steadily increases, the mean age of the offenders decreases. This has definite implications for the projection of recidivism rates since there is a clear-cut relationship between age at the time of the arrest and the chances of re-arrest. Over 50 percent of persons released from detention when under 15 years of age are

eventually returned to correctional institutions. The same is true for only about ten percent of those arrested from age 35 on (Worsnop, 1970).

Although the trend in the United States appears to be to keep delinquent youths in their own communities and out of institutions, the four years prior to 1968 witnessed more than 20 percent increase in the institutionalized delinquent population. According to the statistics published by the Children's Bureau (1967, 1970), in June, 1968, approximately 54,000 children in the United States were living in public institutions for delinquent children. Eighty-four percent were in training schools and the remainder were in forestry camps and diagnostic centers. The average length of stay for children in the training schools is ten months. (The average length of stay in the only public institution for delinquents in North Dakota is over 24 months.)

While accomplishments cannot adequately be measured in terms of monetary value, services generally can be. For example, the operating cost for training schools in the United States in 1968 was \$190.8 million. This represents a per capita expenditure of \$4368, an increase of 15 percent over the previous year. (The per capita expenditure for 1968 at the North Dakota Industrial School was \$5145. Since the length of stay at NDIS is well over twice the national average, it follows that nearly three times the money is expended for each youth institutionalized because of delinquency in North Dakota. Nonetheless, approximately one fourth of all students released from the North Dakota Industrial School are subsequently returned to the institution [Dawes and Hase, 1966].)

An understanding of juvenile delinquency requires that consideration be given to the demographic status of the locality being studied. There is an abundance of literature relating to the causes and cures of delinquency in the large industrial communities, but there is a scarcity of research which deals specifically with delinquency in sparsely populated, agrarian areas such as North Dakota. In an examination of the students at the North Dakota Industrial School, Olson (1955) found that 80 percent of the inmates are born in North Dakota. He recommended that causes be sought on a statewide basis.

Current Theories Related to the Etiology of Delinquency

Popular among the current theories dealing with the etiology of delinquency are those which propose that delinquent behavior stems from a state of anomie in which normative standards of conduct are weak or lacking. Kvaraceus and Ulrich (1959) defined juvenile delinquency as norm-violating behavior. They then asked whose norms and what norms were being violated, concluding that in general they are the norms of the middle-class culture as exemplified in the school and legal codes. Cohen (1955), Cloward (1959) and Ohlin (1959) state that the theory of anomie focuses on pressures toward deviant behavior arising from discrepancies between cultural goals and approved modes of access to them. Delinquent behavior is thus conceptualized as the result of the inequities in our society which instills aspirations in all groups but deprives the lower-class youngsters of a means to achieve realistically these goals. In an attempt to combat feelings of frustration and inadequacy, lower-class youngsters seek to achieve cultural goals by illegitimate means. Miller and Kvaraceus (1959)

support this contention by pointing out that approximately 85 percent of recidivists are from the lower socioeconomic level.

Other theorists have tended to place less emphasis on socioeconomic status as a causative factor in delinquency. McCann (1956) mentions that it is uniquely personal goals rather than culturally established goals that the delinquent is pursuing. In an unconscious attempt to establish an identity, the delinquent adopts short-range values and goals which he pursues by means of experimental, trial and error methods. Since he is not in a state of real communication with anyone from whom he can learn harmless ways of realizing his goals, his methods may run counter to those of the surrounding society. The disturbed adolescent with an inadequate self-image withdraws in bafflement from society in search of release of his own potentialities. Society's expectations are too high or too low. Frustration, conflict, anxiety and confusion are the result. The adolescent seeks to escape society more than to revolt against it. In doing so he discovers a subgroup whose values match his own needs. In this subgroup he tries to resolve the irreconcilable conflict between society's expectations and his own inadequate conception of self.

Cohen and Short (1958) go into somewhat greater detail in describing the development and function of the delinquent subculture. They attribute much of delinquency to participation in this subculture. They state that working-class children are unable to meet the standards of the established culture. They experience problems in relation to their status and their own worth. Through communicative interaction children who share this circumstance band together and form their own system of beliefs and values. The value system generated by these embittered youngsters is laden with malice and negativism. It

justifies for them hostility and aggression against the sources of their status frustrations.

Erikson (1956) has also adopted a position in which the search for identity and involvement in the delinquent subculture are vital factors. He states that children today lack the opportunities for creative and meaningful participation that their parents had as children. Mechanical devices, spectator sports and the sedentary aspects of much of modern life have deprived these young people of natural stepping stones to adulthood. As a result, some have turned to delinquent behaviors as an alternative while others have withdrawn to fantasy. Gang membership often helps the vacillating youth to act. It reinforces his sense of identity. His assignments in the gang overcome the feeling of uselessness. As a gang member he can safely assert his masculinity and his defiance of authority. Erikson feels that the solution is simple: Provide adolescents with an opportunity to achieve recognition in useful work.

Like Erikson, Block and Neiderhoffer (1958) play down the role that social status plays in the formation of adolescent gangs. They feel that there is a strong motivation in all normal adolescents to gain adult status. When tattooing, scarring, hazing, etc., behaviors reminiscent of the puberty rites of primitive cultures, fail to adequately pronounce the transition from child to adult, the confused youths turn to gangs for informal and approved mechanisms of symbolic adult status. Also like Erikson, Block and Neiderhoffer feel that the increasing lack of provisions for adolescents in our rapidly changing society is the reason for much of the confusion and conflict which permeates modern youth.

6

Kvaraceus (1963), in seeming contradiction of the position he had taken earlier, states that the disengagement and alienation of youth runs across all classes. It is as serious in the middle-classes as it is in the lower-classes. He feels that youth has become a surplus commodity due to automation, labor laws and compulsory school attendance which keep young persons out of the main stream of social, civic and economic life of the family and community. This isolation from the regular community results in a youth that is stigmatized and down-graded. Kvaraceus also feels that today's major youth problem centers around the need to regain a sense of self-worth and self-respect and that the only answer is for society again to find a responsible role for its youth.

In all of the theories thus far mentioned, three factors have been considered: The physical status of the adolescent; his psychological reaction to this status; and the behavioral manifestation of this reaction. In each case the intervening variable has been a sense of self-worthlessness and ego diffusion, and the behavioral response has been delinquency. The stimulus situation, however, has been somewhat more variable. Therefore the nature of the theories, when considered as a group, are more descriptive than prescriptive. Nevertheless, if it could be shown that delinquent behavior is in fact a function of the differential self-concepts of adolescents, one would then be in a better position to establish a criterion by which to judge the efficacy of various treatment programs.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate further the relationship between self-concept and delinquent behavior. If it can be shown that juvenile delinquency is in fact a function of the level of self-esteem, it may subsequently be possible to use the self-concept

to develop a judgmental criterion for evaluating the effectiveness of the institutionalization of delinquents.

Definition of Terms

Various definitions of the self and self-concept have been put forth. English and English (1958) have simply defined self-concept as the individual as he is known to himself. Rogers' (1951) definition of the self-concept is somewhat more elaborate:

The self-concept or self-structure may be thought of as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities; the percepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence (p. 136).

Rogers goes on to say that the self-concept serves to regulate behavior and may account for uniformities in personality. When events in the environment are perceived as being consistent with the concepts of the self, then the self may be seen as worthy and acceptable. Internal tension and defensive behavior are the result of perceived discrepancies between the external reality and the self-concept.

Hilgard (1949) supports this contention by saying that the ego-defense mechanisms may be viewed as defenses against anxiety, and that, in order to understand a person's defenses, something must be known about his image of himself. Hilgard, however, appears to be somewhat in disagreement with Rogers in regard to the consciousness of the self when he differentiates between the self present in awareness and the inferred self. In terms of the measurement of the self-concept, the self present in awareness is reliant on introspective techniques. It is subject to all the difficulties of these techniques, especially

6

since the self is continually using self-deception to maintain self-respect. Hilgard feels that the better method is to infer the self from the data open to the external observer.

Hall and Lindzey (1970) have proposed that the self has come to have two distinct meanings. First of all there is the "self-as-object," a term which denotes a person's attitudes, feelings, perceptions and evaluations of himself as an object. Second is the "self-as-process." This term implies a group of psychological processes which govern behavior. Sarbin's (1952) conception of the self appears to be an example of the self-as-object. He states that one may have several selves, each of which consists of the person's attitudes toward the various aspects of his existence. He differentiates between the somatic self, the receptor-effector self and the social self. Symonds (1951), on the other hand, appears to be concerned solely with the self-as-process. He defines the self as "bodily and mental processes as they are observed and reacted to by the individual" (p. 4). He goes on to say that the self may have four different aspects. One is the self as perceived as, for instance, a reflection in a mirror. The second aspect of the self deals with a person's feelings about himself as good or bad. Thirdly, the self involves the extent to which a person values himself. Finally, the self may be a system of activities which are a response to these values and by means of which the person defends himself.

Regarding the origin and development of the self, numerous diverse theories have been developed, the most prominent of which may be traced to James, Baldwin, Cooley and Mead. Each of these theorists appears to have built upon the preceding ones, and what emerges is a general theory of the development of the self which is highly dependent

upon the concept of the reflected self. Cooley (1922) made famous the concept of the "looking-glass" self. It proposed that the self is a function of the way one imagines he appears to others, the way he imagines that others judge that appearance and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or shame. Mead (1922) expanded this line of reasoning by developing the notion of the "generalized other." Mead felt that man was not innately capable of imagining how he appeared to others. He rather learns to respond to himself through imitation, as others have responded to him. In this way he takes the role of the other, adopting the attitudes and gestures they have directed toward him. The attitude of the generalized other, then, is the attitude of the whole community or social group. Mead (1934) further says that a person may develop many selves, each developing in relation to the attitudes expressed by a particular social group.

From these theories, several assumptions about the self can be drawn. One is that an individual's conception of himself reflects the responses that other persons have directed toward him. Secondly, variation in background experiences among persons result in differential self-conceptions. Finally, the individual's self-image functions to direct his behavior. It is these three assumptions concerning the self which have served to guide the present study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Self-Other Research

While much of the present theoretical speculation concerning the self and the self-concept can be traced to the work of William James, little empirical investigation was done in this area in the half century following the publication of James' The Principles of Psychology in 1890. However the 1940's witnessed a resurgence of interest, particularly as regards the ways in which one's concept of self serves to direct his behavior and attitudes.

Rogers (1949) notes that in 1949 there occurred what might be called a case of simultaneous discovery in the area. Unaware of each other's work and using different methodologies, several researchers found some support for the contention that the way a person feels about others reflects his feelings toward himself.

In ten counseling cases, Sheerer (1949) found that by using a client-centered approach to therapy an individual's evaluation of himself and his worth as a person could be significantly altered. Analyzing self-referent statements made during the interviews, Sheerer further concluded that there is a definite and substantial correlation between attitudes of acceptance of and respect for one's own self and attitudes of acceptance of and respect for others. Stock (1949) also used clients in therapy in order to investigate this relationship.

She too found that there exists a definite relationship between the way an individual feels about himself and the way he feels about other persons. An individual who holds negative feelings about himself tends to hold negative feelings toward other people in general. She further found that, as his feelings about himself become more positive, feelings about others change in a similar direction. While Seeman's (1949) content analysis of therapy sessions supported the positive correlation between attitudes toward self and others, he did not find that a change in attitude toward one's self was associated with a change in attitudes toward others.

All of the studies thus far mentioned have been conducted on clinical populations and the investigators have inferred the clients' attitudes about themselves and others from spontaneous comments made during the interviews. This condition leaves at least two questions unanswered. One may ask whether these findings would hold true for normal or non-clinical populations. Secondly, one might wonder whether the dynamics of the self can validly be studied, as Hilgard has stated, only by inferring the self from data open to the external observer, or if more introspective approaches can be used. Phillip (1951) studied various groups of people not in therapy. Using an objective, multiple-choice questionnaire, he obtained essentially the same results as those reported previously for clinical populations and concluded that the correlation between self-other attitudes is not a function of clinical status or maladjustment. His results also demonstrate the comparability of the two concepts of the "inferred self" and the "self present to awareness."

Subsequent to Phillips' study, numerous similar investigations were conducted to further validate the relationship. Berger (1952),

for example, using larger and more varied samples, reported results which provided additional evidence for the positive correlation between acceptance of self and others. Diller (1954), Levanway (1955) and others have attempted to study the effects of a third variable, such as stress, success or failure, on the self-other relationship. Their research has generally lent further support by way of secondary findings to the previously investigated and, by now, quite well-established relationship. Wylie (1961) cites 21 such studies carried out in the decade between 1949 and 1958. While she concedes that they generally support the hypothesized association between self-acceptance and acceptance of others, she points out that a few puzzling exceptions and contradictions occur in the reported results, an example of which would be the negative findings of Zelen (1954). Using sociometric techniques to study 83 sixth grade children, he found no relationship to exist between self-acceptance and acceptance of others. As Zelen notes, some degree of insight or understanding of others is implied in the postulated relationship. These qualities may not have yet been developed in his young sample. Wylie further makes note of the possibility that common response sets may cause one to rate others as he has rated himself and thus cause the findings of many of the studies to be artifactual.

Self-Concept and Delinquency

Regardless of the validity of the self-other relationship, the possibility of such an interdependency stimulated a great deal of interest in other areas of personality research. Many of the theorists mentioned in Chapter I, who postulated that delinquency was a defense against feelings of self-worthlessness and ego diffusion, found indirect

support for their theories in the self-concept research. It was now quite feasible to conceive of the aggression, destructiveness and apparent disregard for others inherent in delinquency as being a function of the delinquent's lack of positive regard for his own self.

Among the earliest studies conducted to investigate the relationship between self-concept and delinquent behavior was that of Balester (1956). He used the Q-sort technique, developed by Stephenson, to measure the self-concepts of male adults, male non-delinquents and male delinquents. The delinquent group consisted of two groups of first offenders and two groups of recidivists. Each subject was administered the Q-sort scale three times, at 30-day intervals. When the mean self-concept scores of the two non-delinquent groups were compared with those of the four delinquent groups, 23 of the 24 computed t tests showed the non-delinquents to have a significantly more positive self-concept. The results further showed that the first offenders' mean self-concept was significantly higher than that of the recidivists. Balester concluded that his results demonstrate that differences in overt behavior can be traced to differences in the structure of the individuals' self-concepts.

About the same time that Balester was conducting his study, a series of investigations was begun by a sociologist who proposed that an appropriate self-concept may serve to "insulate" youths from those influences which steer them toward delinquency. These studies, which have subsequently come to be known as the Reckless studies, were conducted almost annually in the latter half of the 1950's. Two of the most frequently cited of these studies are those reported by Reckless, Dinitz and Murray (1956) and Reckless, Dinitz and Kay (1957). The basic format of all the studies is the same. All subjects were equated

for the type of their home neighborhood, which the investigators labelled as a high delinquency area. On the basis of teachers' nominations of the student's likelihood of getting into trouble and on the basis of the student's police record, each subject was rated on a delinquency vulnerability scale. The investigators then administered the California Personality Inventory in order to obtain an estimate of the subject's self-concept. They found that within the sample of nominated delinquents those who had high scores on the delinquency vulnerability scale differed significantly from low scorers in some of their concepts of self and others, friendship patterns and relations with parents. They concluded that an appropriate or inappropriate self-concept is an important component in non-delinquency and delinquency.

Several criticisms have subsequently been leveled against the Reckless studies. Wylie (1961) holds that the researcher's claim that a high self-concept insulates "good" boys from becoming delinquent despite their general neighborhood environment is unwarranted. She notes that a number of important objective differences between the groups, such as the number of broken homes and the parents' attitudes toward the boys, were not controlled. She further contends that one cannot determine to what extent the boys' self-concepts reflect rather than cause the differences in behavior which lay behind their teachers' nominations of them as delinquents. With somewhat the same reasoning, Tangri and Schwartz (1970) feel that the design of the Reckless studies does not permit conclusions concerning the causative nature of the relationship between self-concept and delinquent behavior. They point out that the researchers treated the self-concept as a dependent variable while the statement that the self-concept is an insulator against

delinquency implies that the self-concept is the independent variable. The critics feel that the investigators should have first determined whether the self-concept was positive and then related it to the present delinquency status. Tangri and Schwartz (1967) further criticized the studies because the CPI, used to measure the self-concept, correlated so highly with the teachers' evaluations of delinquency. They felt both the CPI and the teachers use the same middle-class frame of reference. These criticisms will be dealt with later in the discussion.

Regardless of the shortcomings of these early studies, they promoted considerable interest in the possibility that a low self-concept is the direct cause of juvenile delinquency. This was especially true since earlier studies had suggested that one's self-conception could be altered in the therapeutic process.

While previous studies had used a more global measure of the self-concept, Atchison (1958) made use of an early version of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS) which allowed him to investigate various areas and characteristics of the subject's self-concept. The subjects of Atchison's study had not yet demonstrated truly delinquent behavior, but they were boys who exhibited behavior problems in their ninth grade classes. They were selected on the basis of their position on the Haggerty-Olson-Wichman Teacher Rating Schedule. Atchison found that the behavior problem boys had a significantly lower total net positive mean score, measuring overall self-concept, than did controls. He found no differences between the two groups in the consistency and clarity of their self-concepts nor in the frankness with which they responded.

Hamner (1968) mentions the possibility that two groups differ on some variable other than that of delinquency, and it may be that it is this uncontrolled variable that is accounting for the differences in the self-conceptions. Deitche (1959) attempted to deal with this problem by equating his subjects on the basis of age, sex, IQ, ethnic origin and stability of their homes. He, too, used the TSCS as a measure of the subjects' self-concepts, and, like Atchison, he found that the overall self-concept of the non-delinquents was higher than that of the delinquent group. Deitche's results are also consistent with Atchison's in that he found no differences between the groups in terms of the consistency of their self-concepts.

Fitts and Hamner (1969) observe from data collected on the TSCS that the usual demographic variables of age, sex, IQ, race and education do not cause very significant differences in the self-concept across groups. But they go on to say that the socioeconomic variable may contribute to significant differences, especially where the lower classes are concerned. Washburn (1963) indicates that he equated the subjects of his study not only on the basis of age, sex, IQ and race, but also with respect to socioeconomic class, adding that the subjects all lived in the same urban area. Washburn constructed his own self-concept scale which contained items taken from the theories of Freud, Sarbin, Erikson, Horney and Fromm. A cluster analysis of the items yielded three subtests: Conformity; ambition; and adjustment. The delinquents in Washburn's study were confined to a juvenile hall or a public institution. The results of the study indicate that the group of delinquents scored significantly lower than non-delinquents on the subtests measuring conformity and adjustment.

Therefore it would appear that there are quite stable differences in the self-concepts of delinquents and non-delinquents. Several of the criticisms that have been leveled against this line of research, however, have yet to be proven unfounded. Until it is possible to deal with these criticisms, research in the area of self-concept and delinquency, like self-other research, will remain speculative.

Self-Concept and Institutionalization

Rubin's (1970) critique of Glueck's Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency, while directed toward research in a somewhat unrelated area of criminology, may have some relevance here. Rubin cautions that institutionalized delinquents, as were sampled by Washburn, are in part a product of the institution. One must be aware of the fact that an examination of institutionalized delinquents will provide information about institutionalized offenders and not offenders in general. The findings of studies such as Washburn's, which have compared institutionalized delinquents with non-institutionalized non-delinquents, have frequently been challenged on the grounds that the institutionalized subjects are suffering from what has come to be known as "commitment shock." The critics maintain that the juvenile's arrest and incarceration have disrupted his normal activity and have caused him to feel uncertain about plans for the future. The resultant uncertainty makes itself evident in the subsequent loss of self-confidence and self-esteem.

Lefebver (1965) contends that his results refute this argument. The subjects in his study had been equated on the usual demographic variables as had Washburn's subjects. Unlike Washburn, however, Lefebver not only compared institutionalized delinquents with non-delinquents, but he also studied the differences between two groups

within the institution--first offenders and recidivists. Lefebber feels that if commitment shock is in truth a factor, then it should be as evident in the first offender group as it is in the recidivists. The results showed that there are significant differences among the self-descriptions of the three groups, as measured by the TSCS, with the non-delinquents obtaining the highest scores, the delinquent first offenders next in order and the delinquent recidivists obtaining the lowest scores. Lefebber also found that none of the aspects of the self-concept varied as a function of mental maturity, ethnic group membership, age or socioeconomic status. The author notes, however, that the self-concept scores of all the boys fell below the mean of the normative group on which the test was standardized. He attributes this to the fact that a large proportion of the subjects were from the lower socioeconomic classes. With this in mind, any statement as to the effects of socioeconomic status on self-concept, based on the results of this study, must be inconclusive. Lefebber adds that future studies should attempt to compare subjects within their respective socioeconomic class.

While Fitts and Hamner (1969), reviewing research in the area, feel that in design, execution and thoroughness Lefebber's study is unsurpassed in the field of self-concept and delinquency, not all subsequent studies have either imitated his study or followed his recommendations. Seay (1968), for example, did not control for either institutional status nor for the usual demographic variables. Consequently the findings of the study are somewhat inconsistent with earlier findings. Using the total positive score of the TSCS as his measure of the self-concept, Seay compared an institutionalized delinquent group with a high school college-preparatory class and industrial arts class. The results indicate that the mean self-concept score of the industrial

arts class was significantly more positive than either the delinquent or college preparatory group and that the latter two groups did not differ significantly from one another.

While it is doubtful that the variable of institutionalization alone could account for Seay's puzzling results, one must be aware of the caution made by Rubin (1970) concerning the nature of the effects of institutionalization. Rubin feels that delinquents in the institution are a very special group of youngsters. He suggests that if institutionalized delinquents, non-institutionalized delinquents and non-delinquents were compared, it is possible that the non-institutionalized delinquents would be found to be more like the non-delinquents than the institutionalized delinquents. The following two studies seem patterned after the suggestion made by Rubin.

Dorn (1968) compared institutionalized and non-institutionalized delinquents and non-delinquents on the basis of their self-concepts, alienation and anxiety. The non-institutionalized delinquents were boys who were reported to have been in trouble with the school or police. Using the Twenty Statements Test in response to "Who am I?" as his measure, Dorn found that institutionalized delinquents are more likely to be alienated and anxious and more apt to make self-derogating statements than are the non-delinquents. In terms of the extent to which they felt anxious and made self-derogating remarks, the non-institutionalized delinquents fell in between the other two groups. The non-institutionalized delinquents, however, were both the most alienated and socially anchored of all the groups. Dorn attributes this to the fact that non-institutionalized delinquents are forced to live in a group with which they do not identify.

Using the TSCS to compare institutionalized delinquents and non-delinquents with what he called "incipient" delinquents, Waters (1969) obtained results quite similar to those of Dorn. The incipient delinquent group was selected on the basis of a teacher-counselor agreement criterion. Waters found that the delinquent groups had a poorer self-concept than the non-delinquents and that the incarcerated delinquents demonstrated a more solidified self-concept than did the incipient group. He explains this latter finding in terms of Erikson's theory of identity formation. The incarcerated delinquents have solved their identity diffusion problem, he says, while the incipient delinquents with their marginal status have not.

These last studies, while not contradicting the findings of Lefeber, do point up the definite impact that institutionalization can have in some areas of the self-concept. Since the present investigation intends to direct itself to the effects of institutionalization on the self-concept, studies relating to this relationship will be investigated further.

Engles (1956) used the Q-sort technique to study the stability of the self-concept in adolescence. She tested 89 eighth graders and 61 tenth graders in 1954 and again in 1956. She found that the correlation between Q-sort obtained was .53. She regarded her results as evidence that the self-concept is a stable measure. Engles further found that those persons showing a negative self-concept in 1954 were more maladjusted than those having a positive image of themselves when retested in 1956. In one of the Reckless studies, Lively, Dinitz and Reckless (1962) found that the direction of the development of the self was quite stable through the early adolescent years of 12 to 15. They

felt their findings indicated the possibility of working preventively most effectively with 12 year olds.

Although these studies indicate that the self-concept is a relatively stable construct, this does not mean that with special treatment programs the self-concept cannot be modified beyond the age of 12. Earlier in this discussion it was noted that Sheerer and Stock found that an individual's self-concept could be altered in the process of client-centered therapy. A less direct treatment program was that studied by Kelly and Baer (1969), who measured the change that took place in the self-concepts of a group of male delinquents while they participated in the Outward Bound program. Outward Bound offers a 27-day program which exposes young adults to severe physical challenge and pushes individuals to their physical limits in order that they may demonstrate competence to themselves and to others. Of the ten self-concept measures employed, the investigators reported significant improvements for the three concept measures "I am," "I would like to be" and "Boys who don't get into trouble." They felt that these results indicated that Outward Bound is a desirable short-term means of promoting positive change in the self-concepts of male delinquents. Therefore, while it has been shown that the self-concept can be modified by various techniques, the present investigation is interested in determining whether a positive change in self-concept is associated with what has traditionally been the most popular method of treatment in the field of criminology, i.e., institutionalization.

Theorists who have proposed that a negative self-concept is a potent factor in the etiology of delinquency have challenged and supported the use of institutionalization as a method of treatment. Those persons who subscribe to the theory of commitment shock feel that arrest and

confinement disrupt the life of the young offender, creating uncertainties in him and contributing to his already negative self-image. Another point of view, however, can more readily be appreciated when one considers the issue brought up earlier by Wylie concerning the causal nature of the relationship between the self-concept and delinquency.

Although Reckless feels that a negative self-concept leads to delinquent behavior, Wylie maintains that it is equally possible that the delinquent's antisocial behavior, which puts him at odds with a social system to whose standards and values he has subscribed, causes the self-devaluation. Fitts and Hamner (1969) contend that the relationship is most probably cyclical, based on interaction. They feel that a negative self-image produces negative behavior, which in turn causes society to react negatively. This contributes to a more negative self-concept, leading to more negative behavior, etc. Theoretically institutionalization reverses this cycle by enforcing more positive behavior and subsequently creating a more positive self-concept.

Few empirical studies have been conducted which have allowed one to evaluate the psychological effects of institutional confinement. Moran (1953) conducted a descriptive study in an attempt to provide insight into the meaning of the reformatory experience. He examined the inmate's feelings toward himself, the personnel and his peers within the institution. Moran found that in a progressive reformatory with a good program the inmates will not think of themselves as convicts but will more likely think of themselves as students or trainees. While the subject pool consisted of older inmates as well, it was found that the youngest group of inmates, namely those under 18, exhibited the poorest self-concepts.

Since the design of Moran's study did not enable one to draw conclusions concerning the change which took place in self-attitudes during confinement, several longitudinal studies were subsequently conducted. Rose and Weber (1961) measured the change that took place in boys committed to a closed institution and compared this to the change taking place during commitment to an open institution. The boys from the closed institution were from a typical training school in Minnesota and were tested immediately before placement and again after parole. The investigators used three scales to measure feelings of inadequacy. Two of the scales measured how others feel about the subject, and one scale measured how the subject feels about himself in relation to others. They found that the training school boys showed improvement on all the scales, but they felt that the findings could perhaps be accounted for in terms of the selected reference groups available to the boys during their commitment. The boys are less likely to feel inferior to others who are being subjected to the same treatment and who have problems similar to their own. The authors feel that if the reference group were the primary factor operating in the change it would be doubtful that the change would carry over to the normal social environment.

The mention of reference groups by Rose and Weber is reminiscent of the theories of Cooley and Mead discussed earlier. In order to understand the effects of institutionalization, it is perhaps as important to understand the etiology of personality change as it is to measure the change itself. Hall's (1966) research into the importance of peer identification lends some support to the significance of the influence of reference groups. Hall quotes Daniel Glaser as stating that "a person pursues criminal behavior to the extent that he identifies himself with

real or imaginary persons from whose perspective his criminal behavior seems acceptable". Hall notes that the individual comes to identify with other delinquents and differentiate himself from non-delinquents. Therefore he feels that identification with the delinquent subculture would be a better predictor of delinquent behavior than self-evaluation. Using scales devised by himself, Hall investigated the extent to which 130 male non-delinquents and delinquents, institutionalized and non-institutionalized, identified with delinquent peers and the extent to which they devalued themselves. He found that delinquents who exhibited strong degrees of identification tended to have high levels of self-evaluation, and delinquents with weaker degrees of identification tended to have lower levels of self-evaluation. Hall explains his results, which are somewhat inconsistent with previous findings, noting that the marginal delinquent, who has been unable to detach himself completely from conventional society and make the delinquent peer group the primary reference point, exhibits a low level of self-evaluation as a result of his inconsistent and contradictory identities. He further contends that the totally-committed delinquent has a more consistent and integrated self-concept since he has been stripped of all but delinquent roles; and since he identifies totally with those "persons from whose perspective his criminal behavior seems acceptable," he should show a high level of self-regard.

The studies by Dorn and Waters, which were discussed earlier, reported results which are compatible with Hall's position as regards the consistency of the delinquent's self-concept. Also in accord with Hall's contentions was Dorn's finding that institutionalized delinquents are more alienated than either non-delinquents or non-institutionalized delinquents. O'Connor (1970) lent further support when he found that

boys who are highly oriented toward delinquency tend to become more alienated when detained in a custody oriented institution. He considers this to be a severe indictment of the present correctional system, which supposedly is designed to assimilate the youth into society, since most of the institutions are custody-oriented.

Numerous other investigations have been conducted (Pierson, Cattell and Pierce, 1966; Bellizzi, 1966; Hamner, 1969; Robbins, 1969; Eynon and Simpson, 1970; Rubin, 1970) which have attempted to evaluate the change which takes place in the self-concept as a result of institutionalization.

All of the studies have reported finding changes which were, to varying degrees, positive. None of the research, however, allows one to determine to what extent the confinement has helped to integrate the delinquent into society or to what extent the self-concept change is enduring and adaptive in the normal social environment. Since in most of the studies the measurement instruments have been of a univariate variety, it has not been possible to determine whether change has taken place in those specific areas of the self-concept which have come to be associated with delinquency. When one considers the fact that frequently a delinquent may return again and again to the same institution, one cannot help but have some doubt as to the efficacy of such a treatment program. Despite the ever-increasing volume of research in the area, Fitts and Hamner (1969) maintain that literature dealing with the change in self-concept as a result of institutionalization is badly lacking. Therefore the present investigation is intended to shed some light on the nature of the change and to help resolve the question raised by Hall concerning the suitability of the self-concept as a measure of adjustment.

Accuracy of the Delinquent's Self-Estimate

Interpretation of the results of studies such as those of Seay and others may be confounded not only by the variable of institutional status but by several equally potent factors. The findings of Block and Thomas (1955) may be relevant to one of these. They found that the relationship between self-concept and social adjustment is not linear, but rather curvilinear. The purpose of their investigation was to modify the traditional view that a high self-concept is associated with adjustment and a low self-concept with maladjustment. Interestingly enough, their results show that persons describing themselves as very close to their ego-ideal tend to deny and suppress threatening features of themselves and cannot be considered mature and healthy. Thus the authors have uncovered a second dimension which is itself linearly related to the expression of self-satisfaction, i.e., ego control. Since the notion of curvilinearity applies to the level of the self-concept and not to the level of adjustment, one can say that persons who score at the extremes in terms of self-concept may be equally maladjusted. One cannot, however, necessarily make the statement that persons who are extremely well-adjusted should demonstrate a level of self-acceptance similar to that of the extremely maladjusted. Nevertheless this seems to be the implication drawn from Seay's findings. Therefore it might be of value to investigate further the extent to which variables such as ego control distort or diminish the accuracy of self-perceptions in a group of delinquents. Although it might prove difficult to control for such variables experimentally, Greenberg (1968) has developed a refinement of the TSCS which enables one to discriminate, from among those subjects who obtain very high self-regard scores on the TSCS, those who are well-adjusted from those who are maladjusted.

Amos (1963) used the California Achievement Test Battery, the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity and the "Guess Who" test to obtain a measure of the subject's ability and to determine how each subject was perceived by the rest of the group. The "Thinking About Yourself" test was used to see how the child saw himself. While it is difficult to refute or support the findings of one study on the basis of another when different measurement instruments are used, the data collected by Amos indicates that delinquent boys are as accurate as non-delinquent boys when it comes to estimating their academic and social ability, but they may be somewhat less accurate in the estimation of their physical ability. Since much of the activity of delinquent groups is physically oriented, it may be that the distortion that does take place in the delinquent's self-evaluation is a function of the extent to which the area of self-perception is of importance to him.

As was said earlier, consideration of the accuracy of self-evaluations may not have a great deal of practical relevance to experimental control. It would seem, however, essential to have some estimate of the extent to which this variable may be a factor in the obtained level of self-regard. Selection of a measurement instrument sensitive to the subject's defensiveness would appear to be the most efficient means of handling what would otherwise be an unanalyzed, yet influential, variable.

Delinquency and Socioeconomic Status

Although a great deal of theorizing has been concerned with the effect that socioeconomic level has on delinquent behavior and self-concept, not much empirical research has addressed itself to the problem. Consequently there has been considerable debate as to whether delinquency

is a phenomenon of the lower classes. Reiss and Rhodes (1961) reject the previously discussed position of Cohen and Cloward which stated that delinquency was a result of the frustration that lower-class children experience when subjected to the unattainable middle-class goals promoted in most schools. Nevertheless their research shows that the more serious type of delinquent behavior, that which is engaged in by the career-oriented delinquent and which most often results in court action, is primarily restricted to the lower classes. Similar findings had previously been reported by Burgess (1952) and Miller and Kvaraceus (1959), who estimated that approximately 85 percent of the delinquent recidivists are from the lower socioeconomic level.

Other investigators, however, have contended that this relationship is artifactual. Piliavin and Briar (1965) and Forer (1970), for example, recognize the fact that a large majority of the delinquents arrested are from the lower classes. However they attribute this to the fact that police and court officials are allowed to a large extent to use their own discretion in apprehending and prosecuting young offenders and use this latitude in manifesting the prejudice that associates delinquency with poverty, thereby strengthening that prejudice with convictions.

Whatever the relationship between delinquency and socioeconomic status, it is nonetheless true that most inmates in training schools for delinquents and probationers of the juvenile courts are members of the lower classes. Since it is frequently these populations that are involved in all areas of delinquency research, the relationship between socioeconomic status and self-concept is relevant to the research presently being discussed.

Klausner (1953) studied the self-concepts of 17-year-old males using factor analysis. He found that groups of subjects from different socioeconomic classes do have modally different self-concepts. Klausner also suggested that the lower-socioeconomic groupings reply to feelings of insecurity and inferiority with aggression and self-assertion. The findings of Fannin and Clinard (1965) lent some support to Klausner's position. They found that lower-class delinquents conceived of themselves as tough, fearless, powerful and dangerous, while middle-class delinquents saw themselves as being clever, smart, loyal and bad. These differential self-concepts were found to be related to specific types of behavior. Those who viewed themselves as tough, for example, significantly more often committed violent offenses and fought more often and with harsher means.

Hill's (1957) findings indicate that the self-concept increases with age for both upper and lower socioeconomic groups but that the rate of increase is greater for the upper classes. By the age of 17, there is a considerable difference between the self-concept measures of the two groups.

Although Maxwell's (1967) research did not necessarily support the contention that lower-class adolescents feel less adequate than those from the upper classes, he did find that the level of the self-concept was a function of both the educational and the occupational status of the parents. Therefore, on the basis of the research discussed here, it would seem that socioeconomic status is a variable which researchers in the field should make an attempt, as Lefebvre has suggested, to control.

Hypotheses to be Tested

On the basis of previous theorizing and empirical research, it seems that the self-concept may be a highly relevant factor in the understanding and containment of delinquent behavior. However, as Rubin (1970) has noted, there remains some doubt as to the effectiveness of existing treatment programs in promoting a change in the delinquent's self-concept structure which will be lasting and lead to a more adaptive response to the normal social environment. Therefore the present investigation proposes to show that there exist fundamental differences between the self-concepts of delinquents, both institutionalized and non-institutionalized, and non-delinquents. These differences can then be assumed to be characteristic of the delinquent's self-concept. The study further proposes to show that differences in the self-concept which are found to be associated with delinquency are not a function of institutional status, although institutionalization may have some effect on those areas of the self-concept found to be irrelevant to delinquency orientation.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

The sample of institutionalized delinquents was selected from the population of the North Dakota Industrial School, a typical training school for delinquents serving the entire state of North Dakota. While NDIS is a coeducational institution, only males were selected to participate in the study since they, more than the girls, had exhibited what might properly be called delinquent behavior. Their commitment offenses generally were violations in the areas of burglary, car theft, larceny and vandalism, offenses which are typically associated with a lack of regard for others on an impersonal level. The female inmates, on the other hand, demonstrated behavior which reflected more personal overtones or disrupted family patterns, such as incorrigibility, running away and sexual promiscuity.

Twenty-seven boys were selected on the basis of the amount of time they had spent in the institution. The age range for the boys was 14 to 18 years, with the mean age being 15.9 years. This had been the first commitment for all the boys, and all had been in the institution for at least six months; none longer than 18 months. It was felt that six months should allow sufficient time for the boys to have overcome any "commitment shock" and to have experienced a self-concept change, if such a change is to take place at all, as a result of the treatment program or selected reference group. Although Rubin (1970) showed that

the percentage of boys who undergo positive self-concept change during institutionalization is highest among the boys released early, it was felt that, since the average length of stay at this particular institution is well over 18 months, the selection of 18 months as the criterion for participation in the study would not significantly weight the sample in favor of those boys who are most resistant to personality change. While nearly one-fifth of the boys were of American Indian descent, this factor was disregarded since it had previously been shown by Deitch (1959) that variations in ethnic background did not produce significant differences in the self-concept. Almost all of these subjects had been on probation through the juvenile court prior to their commitment.

The non-institutional sample of delinquents were probationers of the Juvenile Court of Burleigh County. They were equated with the institutional sample on the basis of sex, age and referral offense. The age range for these boys was 14 to 17 years, with a mean age of 16.1 years. The size of the resultant sample was rather restricted, consisting of 13 boys. The length of time for which each boy had been on probation was not considered relevant, since no attempt was being made to evaluate the probation program itself. The investigation was instead only interested in the extent to which institutionalization was more effective relative to non-institutionalization.

The non-delinquent, or control, group consisted of 15 trainees enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. They were equated with the delinquent groups in terms of age and sex. The age range for these boys was 14 to 17 years, with a mean age of 15.9 years. In addition to enrollment in the NYC program, the selection criterion for participation in the study was an absence of previous involvement with the juvenile court.

NYC is a program which offers occupational training, remedial education and counseling to high school students from low-income families. Consequently this group was selected as the control sample since it had been found that a large percentage of those in the delinquent groups came from families who were on welfare, and nearly all the parents of those in the delinquent samples were in the lowest occupational stratum.

Several investigators, including Howard (1967) and Weisman (1969), have found that participation in NYC tends to have a diminishing effect on the incidence of delinquent behavior displayed by enrollees. This has been attributed to the counseling received as a part of the program. It was not felt, however, that this was an uncontrolled variable, because all groups of subjects, including the probationers, were receiving counseling. Since the aim of the present study was to evaluate the effect of institutionalization itself and not the specific treatment services rendered within the institution, it was felt that the fact that all subjects received similar individual and group counseling introduced increased control into the study.

Test Instrument

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Fitts, 1965) was chosen as the measurement device for the present study since it is easily self-administered and provides a multi-dimensional analysis of the subject's self-concept. The TSCS can be used with subjects age 12 or higher and having at least a sixth grade reading ability. Completion of the Scale requires 10 to 20 minutes. The test is composed of 100 self-descriptive items to which the subjects respond by selecting one of five response options ranging from completely true to completely false. From these 100 items several subscales have been derived.

The first of these is the Self Criticism Scale, which consists of 10 statements selected from the L-Scale of the MMPI. This sub-scale is designed to give an indication of the amount of defensiveness the subject displays on the test. A high score on the Self Criticism Scale indicates that the subject is willing to admit to mildly derogatory statements which are most often true of nearly everyone. A score below 20 (T score 28) on this scale is reason to suspect that the subject has reacted defensively and perhaps caused his scores to become distorted in the positive direction. The validity of the results should be questioned. The 90 items not included in the Self Criticism Scale are made up of 45 negative and 45 positive statements. This division has been made in an attempt to reduce the effects of a positive or negative response set. These 90 items constitute the remaining sub-scales of the test.

The Positive Scores have been parcelled out into nine sources of variation. The first of these is the Total P Score. This score indicates the subject's overall level of self-esteem. High scorers tend to like themselves, have confidence in themselves, have personal self-worth and behave in accordance with these self-perceptions. Persons who score low have doubts about their own worth, lack self-confidence and are anxious and depressed. Three of the remaining eight sources of Positive Score variation reflect an internal frame of reference. The first of these is Identity and deals with the way the individual perceives himself, what he is. The second is Self Satisfaction, which reflects how the subject feels about or accepts himself. Third is Behavior, describing the way an individual perceives the way he acts and the things he does. The five remaining sources of variance involve an external frame of reference and are labelled according to the area of self-perception

concerned. They are the Physical Self, the Moral-Ethical Self, the Personal Self, the Family Self and the Social Self.

Among the remaining sources of variance which can be analyzed by the scale is the Variability of responses. This measures the amount of inconsistency the subject demonstrates from one area of self perception to another. Conflict indicates the extent to which the subject's responses to positive items conflict with his responses to the negative items in the same area of self-perception. The Distribution of Response describes how certain the subject is of his self-image.

The five Empirical Scales have been so labelled because they have been shown empirically to differentiate among various groups frequently encountered in a clinical setting. They include the Psychosis Scale, the Personality Disorder Scale and the Neurosis Scale. The Personality Integration Scale describes persons who have attained a better than average level of adjustment. The Defensive Positive Scale is a measure of defensiveness more subtle than the Self Criticism Score. It allows one to differentiate psychiatric patients from normals despite a high Total P Score.

The final source of variance with which this study has concerned itself is the Number of Deviant Signs. This scale is based on the hypothesis that persons who deviate sharply from the norm on minor behaviors are likely to deviate on major aspects of behavior. Therefore the NDS is merely a count of the number of deviant features of the other scores and is the Scale's best index of psychological disturbance. It is possible to analyze other sources of self-concept variance with the TSCS, but for the purposes of the present study these 19 scales will be considered. A brief summary of the scales is given in the appendix.

Fitts (1971) reviews a good deal of recent research which has attempted to establish the reliability and validity of the TSCS. Test-retest reliabilities reported by Fitts range from .60 to .92 on the various sub-scales. These values are consistent with data obtained by Nunnally (1968) and others when a split-half technique was used.

The concurrent validity of the TSCS has been demonstrated in studies which have found significant correlations between TSCS scores and the scores of other self-concept measures or external physical abilities of the subjects. Factor analytic studies of the TSCS attempting to study its construct validity have uncovered factors related to observable behaviors which are highly consistent with the traditional sub-scales of the test. While response biases stemming from the social desirability of the response are a threat to the validity and reliability of any self-concept measurement device, the TSCS provides two indices, the Self Criticism Score and the Defensive Positive Score, which enable one to determine to what extent response bias is operating. Nevertheless, as Cronbach (1960) notes, it is necessary to consider the scores as reflecting the subject's self-concept as he is willing to make it known to others.

Procedure

The incarcerated delinquents were tested in small groups in classrooms at the institution. The test was given with the examiner present. Since the subjects frequently expressed concern over the possibility of being detained at the school as a result of their test scores, numerous attempts were made to assure them that the test was not being given for the benefit of the school and that their test results would not be revealed to school officials.

51

The test was administered individually to the probationers by their probation officer.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps guidance counselor gave the test to the non-delinquent sample. In each case the subjects were assured anonymity and asked only to provide information regarding their age and sex on the answer sheet. Administration of the test is standardized and the only instructions given to the subjects were those which are printed on the test booklet.

The 55 tests were scored by computer and the raw scores converted into standard scores. The validity of the individual tests was examined. The results were analyzed using the analysis of variance and the t test.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Presentation of Mean Self-Concept Scores

The 55 tests were computer-scored and the results reported in T score form. None of the subjects displayed defensiveness on the test to such an extent that would warrant suspicion regarding the validity of the results. The means for the three groups are presented in Table I. In general, high scores are indicative of a more positive or solidified self-concept. In those instances in which the opposite is true, the T scores have been converted and placed in parentheses, enabling a consistent comparison across scales.

It may readily be seen that in very few instances does the mean of any group exceed the mean of 50 obtained for the standardization sample. Such an occurrence is evident in only seven of the 57 reported means. Therefore it would appear that the self-concepts of all three groups are generally below average and, in some cases, considerably so.

Self-Estimate as a Function of Delinquency Status

In order to test the significance of the differences between the obtained means, F ratios were computed for each scale. These ratios are given in Table II. Only one of the 19 F tests yielded a significant F ratio, and this at the .05 level of significance. The results of the Duncan's Multiple Range Test on this F ratio indicate that non-delinquents demonstrate a significantly more integrated personality in terms of their self-concepts than do institutionalized delinquents.

TABLE I

MEAN SELF-CONCEPT SCORES: NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ENROLLEES, JUVENILE COURT PROBATIONERS AND NORTH DAKOTA INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL INMATES.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>JC</u>	<u>NDIS</u>
Self Criticism	49.7	49.3	52.4
Total Conflict	52.5 (47.5)	50.3 (49.7)	58.8 (41.2)
Total Positive	39.7	43.3	38.0
Identity	36.1	39.3	35.8
Self-Satisfaction	46.9	48.9	44.5
Behavior	36.5	42.0	34.9
Physical Self	44.0	45.6	41.3
Moral-Ethical Self	38.6	39.6	35.9
Personal Self	45.1	52.0	43.5
Family Self	39.3	39.2	35.7
Social Self	38.2	46.5	41.3
Total Variability	45.7 (54.3)	41.5 (58.5)	48.9 (51.1)
Defensive Positive	48.7	51.3	46.5
Psychosis	62.7 (37.3)	57.7 (42.3)	57.8 (42.2)
Personality Disorder	61.4 (38.6)	59.3 (40.7)	64.2 (35.8)
Neurosis	57.5 (42.5)	51.9 (48.1)	59.9 (40.1)
Personality Integration	50.2	47.9	42.0
Number of Deviant Signs	64.6 (35.4)	59.5 (40.5)	66.1 (33.9)
Distribution Score	40.1	40.5	41.9

TABLE II

F RATIOS FOR ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE:
MEAN SELF-CONCEPT SCORES.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Mean Squares</u>		<u>F Ratio*</u>
	<u>Treatments</u>	<u>Within Groups</u>	
Self Criticism	57.38	66.47	.86
Total Conflict	388.69	115.00	3.38
Total Positive	120.16	93.53	1.28
Identity	55.38	133.45	.41
Self-Satisfaction	90.38	107.21	.84
Behavior	222.16	74.03	3.00
Physical Self	87.56	74.53	1.17
Moral-Ethical Self	73.16	105.06	.67
Personal Self	319.44	128.52	2.49
Family Self	86.41	154.94	.56
Social Self	241.98	81.59	2.97
Total Variability	245.47	89.41	2.75
Defensive Positive	99.53	87.20	1.14
Psychosis	132.72	98.14	1.35
Personality Disorder	113.25	108.95	1.04
Neurosis	281.41	85.51	3.29
Personality Integration	373.28	91.19	4.09**
Number of Deviant Signs	192.10	84.30	2.28
Distribution Score	18.25	81.09	.23

*df = 2/52

**p .05

It is interesting to note that the non-delinquent control group very nearly approximates the standardization sample as regards the mean (50.3) and the standard deviation (10.1) obtained for this group on the PI scale. Consequently, one may consider the institutionalized delinquents as being low in personality integration. This fact is of interest when one considers the lack of significant differences found among the means of the remaining 18 scales. Data from those identified as criminal offenders has amply supported Fitts' (1971) hypothesis concerning persons who obtain low scores on the PI scale. He proposed that such persons would differ from the general population in terms of their self-esteem and that they would demonstrate more defensiveness, conflict, confusion and variability in their self-perceptions. He further predicted that high PI persons would report more positive self-concepts in all areas of self-perception.

Since the results of the present investigation do not support such a hypothesis, it would seem quite probable that the differences between the two groups on the PI scale are due to chance variation among the groups. This conclusion is given some indirect support by the fact that the probability of obtaining at least one significant difference on the basis of chance alone is slightly greater than 60 percent when 19 comparisons are conducted.

In order to more properly isolate the differences due solely to delinquency status, the institutionalization variable was disregarded and the two delinquent groups combined. t tests were then conducted upon the means of this combined group and the non-delinquent sample. The results are reported in Table III. Again the only significant difference was found to be in the area of personality integration. The possibility that this represents a true difference between populations

TABLE III

T RATIOS OF MEAN SELF-CONCEPT SCORES:
NON-DELINQUENT AND COMBINED DELINQUENT GROUPS.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>Standard Deviation</u>		<u>T Ratio*</u>
	<u>NYC</u>	<u>JC/NDIS</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>JC/NDIS</u>	
Self Criticism	49.80	51.48	10.01	7.10	.58
Total Conflict	52.53	56.08	12.65	10.27	.97
Total Positive	39.73	39.78	10.12	9.44	.07
Identity	36.13	37.00	12.22	10.95	.23
Self-Satisfaction	46.93	45.95	9.45	10.50	.32
Behavior	36.53	37.73	9.01	9.99	.41
Physical Self	44.00	42.73	7.30	9.01	1.73
Moral-Ethical Self	38.67	37.18	11.29	9.58	.44
Personal Self	45.20	46.30	12.59	11.10	.29
Family Self	39.40	37.40	10.76	11.73	.58
Social Self	38.27	43.05	9.39	8.88	1.66
Total Variability	45.73	46.55	7.84	10.26	.31
Defensive Positive	48.73	48.13	11.44	8.32	.18
Psychosis	62.73	57.80	7.85	10.22	1.85
Personality Disorder	61.47	62.63	10.78	10.17	.35
Neurosis	57.60	57.58	10.51	8.89	.01
Personality Integration	50.27	43.93	10.11	9.38	2.05**
Number of Deviant Signs	64.67	63.98	9.53	9.22	.23
Distribution Score	40.13	41.48	7.68	9.15	.53

*df = 53

**p .05

has already been discussed, and it would seem that delinquents and non-delinquents do not necessarily demonstrate fundamental differences in the ways in which they perceive themselves. Consequently, the first hypothesis of the present study has not been supported.

Self-Estimate as a Function of Institutional Status

The second hypothesis proposed that no differences exist between institutionalized delinquents and non-institutionalized delinquents in those areas of self-perception found to be associated with delinquency. Since the testing of this hypothesis is dependent upon the existence of differences between delinquents and non-delinquents, and since no such differences were in fact found to be present in the samples used, support for the hypothesis cannot be provided.

It would nonetheless be of interest to examine the sorts of differences which do exist between those persons who are institutionalized and those who are not. The results of the F tests have already given some insight into the fact that no significant differences exist between institutionalized delinquents and non-institutionalized delinquents in those areas of self-perception that have been examined.

The advantageous increase in precision associated with increased group size and fewer number of groups warrants the combining of the non-institutionalized delinquent and non-delinquent groups, thereby isolating the institutional factor. t tests computed on the resulting means yielded three significant t ratios. These results are reported in Table IV. This finding would seem to indicate that institutional subjects experience greater conflict and variability in the self-perceptions and demonstrate a more poorly integrated personality. While the three scales in question are independent in that they do not contain overlapping items, it is interesting to note that all three

TABLE IV

T RATIOS OF MEAN SELF-CONCEPT SCORES:
 INSTITUTIONALIZED AND COMBINED NON-INSTITUTIONALIZED GROUPS.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>Standard Deviation</u>		<u>T Ratio*</u>
	<u>NYC/JC</u>	<u>NDIS</u>	<u>NYC/JC</u>	<u>NDIS</u>	
Self Criticism	49.61	52.48	8.37	7.44	1.32
Total Conflict	51.50	58.85	11.90	8.72	2.57**
Total Positive	41.39	38.84	9.41	9.49	.96
Identity	37.61	35.89	11.55	11.01	.55
Self-Satisfaction	47.86	44.52	8.71	11.35	1.20
Behavior	39.07	34.93	8.77	8.40	1.76
Physical Self	44.75	41.37	6.99	9.67	1.45
Moral-Ethical Self	39.14	35.96	9.61	10.33	1.16
Personal Self	48.36	44.67	11.31	12.20	1.14
Family Self	39.32	36.52	10.74	12.08	.89
Social Self	42.11	41.37	9.96	8.48	.29
Total Variability	43.79	48.96	8.47	10.12	2.02**
Defensive Positive	49.93	46.59	9.77	8.41	1.33
Psychosis	60.43	57.81	8.14	11.25	.97
Personality Disorder	60.46	64.22	9.56	10.78	1.34
Neurosis	54.96	59.93	9.62	8.77	1.96
Personality Integration	49.18	42.00	10.12	8.41	2.81**
Number of Deviant Signs	62.29	66.11	8.77	9.46	1.53
Distribution Score	40.28	41.93	8.54	9.03	.24

*df = 53
 **p .05

scales measure the consistency and solidarity of the self-conception. Consequently the results seem to be in contrast to the findings of Dorn (1968) and Waters (1969). They found that incarcerated delinquents exhibited a more solidified self-concept as a result of living among those with whom they identify and thereby solving their identity diffusion problem.

Interesting as these findings may be, they are somewhat confounded by the fact that not all those persons in the non-institutionalized sample have a marginal status. Only the non-institutionalized delinquents are forced to live in a group with which they do not identify, and it is ironically this group which displays the least amount of variability and conflict in their reported self-concepts.

The most appropriate means of investigating the effects of institutionalization would involve a longitudinal study. A method roughly approximating this procedure would involve comparing those subjects who have been in the institution for a greater or lesser period of time. In this instance, t ratios were computed to determine the significance between those delinquents who have been confined to the institution for six months and those confined for longer periods of time. These t ratios are given in Table V. None of the differences between the means approach significance. The data thus indicate that there is no significant self-concept change that results merely from the state of incarceration.

Implications of the Findings

These obtained results are in marked contrast to the results of previous investigations. There are several methodological explanations as to why such an outcome might occur. Some of these have already been mentioned. Hamner (1968) reiterates the possibility that the non-delinquent

TABLE V

T RATIOS OF MEAN SELF-CONCEPT SCORES:

GROUPS CONFINED FOR SIX MONTHS AND PERIODS GREATER THAN SIX MONTHS.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Mean</u>		<u>Standard Deviation</u>		<u>T Ratio*</u>
	<u>6 mos.</u>	<u>6 mos.+</u>	<u>6 mos.</u>	<u>6 mos.+</u>	
Self Criticism	51.86	53.15	7.28	7.55	.44
Total Conflict	60.86	56.69	8.11	8.84	1.23
Total Positive	38.14	38.00	10.20	8.83	.04
Identity	36.64	35.07	12.35	9.29	.36
Self-Satisfaction	44.29	44.77	12.56	9.88	.11
Behavior	35.14	34.69	7.91	8.89	.13
Physical Self	41.00	41.77	10.48	8.71	.20
Moral-Ethical Self	35.07	36.92	10.28	10.31	.45
Personal Self	43.36	43.77	11.26	11.27	.09
Family Self	38.00	34.92	11.72	12.26	.64
Total Variability	48.50	49.46	10.58	9.58	.24
Defensive Positive	48.57	44.46	9.59	6.25	1.26
Psychosis	57.21	58.46	11.38	11.08	.28
Personality Disorder	64.14	64.31	8.90	12.50	.04
Neurosis	60.21	59.62	9.14	8.35	.17
Personality Integration	40.57	43.54	6.83	9.60	.90
Number of Deviant Signs	68.00	64.08	7.08	11.13	1.06
Distribution Score	42.07	41.77	8.91	8.82	.09

*df = 25

sample may consist of "uncaught" delinquents. In the case of the present study, this is a very real possibility.

A not so subtle reasoning for the Neighborhood Youth Corps program is the need to curb and prevent delinquency in the lower economic stratum. The program seeks to provide opportunities for meaningful and productive endeavors for young men and women who, by virtue of their social status, appear earmarked for a life of non-productivity, self-abasement and possibly delinquency.

Lively, Dinitz and Reckless (1962) found that the direction of socialization was quite stable through adolescence, and they concluded that the most effective preventive work could be done with 12 year olds. Since the youngest subjects in the NYC sample were 14 years old, it is conceivable that, if these youngsters were to develop a delinquent orientation at all, they would probably have been exhibiting some tendencies toward delinquency by the time they entered the program. These tendencies may or may not have yet been manifested in the form of delinquent behavior.

Therefore it is quite possible that some of the NYC subjects tested were adopting a pattern of behavior which, while orienting itself in the direction of delinquency, had not caused these persons to come to the attention of the juvenile authorities. Similarly, the delinquent behaviors may already have been present, but simply had not yet resulted in the juvenile's arraignment. Since the criterion for inclusion in the non-delinquent sample was the absence of involvement with juvenile authorities, this may not have entirely eliminated delinquents and potential delinquents.

A second explanation for the unexpected nature of the results might be understood when considering the character of the groups tested.

48

A survey conducted by the Child Welfare League of America (1960) reported that a number of the youths at the North Dakota Industrial School could not be defined as true delinquents. In many cases the delinquent behavior was simply a superficial manifestation of the lack of adult supervision and guidance. Frequently a young person whose primary problem was one of dependency rather than delinquency was committed to the school and his release was postponed due to a lack of a proper foster home placement being available.

While dependency and delinquency may both lead to an equally negative and confused self-image, dependency is the lot of a great many children who never display delinquent behavior. Therefore it is not conceivable to think that since the institutionalized sample displayed self-concepts that were quite similar to one another that they were all equally delinquent. It is in fact possible that this group was not truly delinquent at all. If such were the case, the results would not necessarily be inconsistent with previous findings since a comparison would be inappropriate.

A comparison of the raw scores of the institutionalized delinquent sample with those of delinquent groups studied in previous investigations is presented in Table VI. Lefeber (1965) and Waters (1969) found significant mean differences to exist between the self-concepts of non-delinquents and institutionalized delinquents and concluded that incarcerated delinquents have a significantly poorer self-concept than do non-delinquents.

Examination of Table VI, however, makes readily apparent the fact that the institutionalized sample in the present study demonstrates a self-concept which is in many respects poorer than that of their counterparts in the research of Lefeber and Waters. Therefore it would

TABLE VI

MEAN SELF-CONCEPT SCORES: NORTH DAKOTA INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL,
LEFEBER (1965) FIRST OFFENDERS AND WATERS (1969) INCARCERATED DELINQUENTS.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>NDIS</u>	<u>Lefebur*</u> <u>First Offenders</u>	<u>Waters</u> <u>Incarcerated</u> <u>Delinquents</u>
Self Criticism	37.19	35	37.0
Total Conflict	38.33	37	31.4
Total Positive	305.81	314	309.6
Identity	111.48	115	116.8
Self-Satisfaction	96.15	95	93.8
Behavior	98.26	103	98.9
Physical Self	65.04	70	67.3
Moral-Ethical Self	59.30	59	57.4
Personal Self	60.30	59	61.1
Family Self	59.41	60	59.8
Social Self	61.85	65	63.9
Total Variability	49.19	53	52.8
Defensive Positive	48.81	51	**
Psychosis	53.04	52	**
Personality Disorder	58.56	59	**
Neurosis	72.52	78	**
Personality Integration	7.44	8	**
Number of Deviant Signs	26.59	**	**
Distribution Score	102.11	111	93.8

*From Fitts and Hamner (1969).

**Not available from data.

seem that, even if some of the subjects in this sample were not truly delinquent, this has not produced mean self-concept scores that are spuriously high for delinquent groups, at least not to the extent that it would preclude being able to distinguish them from non-delinquents displaying a reasonably positive self-concept.

It has been noted that in almost every instance the mean self-concept score for all groups was below the mean of the standardization sample. This might cause one to wonder whether the scores of the non-delinquent sample are consistent with those reported by investigators who have found non-delinquents to have a more positive self-concept than delinquents. A comparison of the NYC sample with the non-delinquent samples of Lefeber and Waters is presented in Table VII.

The scores for the NYC group are consistently indicative of a poorer self-concept than are those of the non-delinquents in Lefeber's and Waters' studies. Therefore one might conclude that the reason for the lack of significant differences in the present investigation is the unexpectedly low self-concepts of the NYC subjects.

Some of the reasons why the NYC group might display self-concepts quite comparable to those of delinquents have already been discussed. The possibility is there that some of the NYC enrollees are "uncaught" delinquents. If this were the case, increased control would perhaps lead to the finding of more significant differences between groups. There is no reason, however, why this condition should be presumed to exist. On the contrary, it is quite possible that the controls already present in the study have led to the eradication of artifactual differences.

Hill (1957) found that in the adolescent years socioeconomic level becomes an important variable in the development of the self-concept.

TABLE VII

MEAN SELF-CONCEPT SCORES: NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS,
LEFEBER (1965) NON-DELINQUENTS AND WATERS (1969) NON-DELINQUENTS.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>NYC</u>	<u>Lefebber</u> <u>Non-Delinquents</u>	<u>Waters</u> <u>Non-Delinquents</u>
Self Criticism	35.47	35.57	37.1
Total Conflict	33.73	*	33.8
Total Positive	311.33	331.91	341.1
Identity	111.80	120.09	124.3
Self-Satisfaction	100.07	105.88	100.0
Behavior	99.47	107.95	113.1
Physical Self	67.07	72.47	73.3
Moral-Ethical Self	61.67	64.22	67.8
Personal Self	61.33	66.52	64.6
Family Self	62.13	65.50	68.7
Social Self	59.13	65.21	66.7
Total Variability	43.93	45.91	56.0
Defensive Positive	52.93	55.95	*
Psychosis	54.33	51.48	*
Personality Disorder	62.27	65.72	*
Neurosis	75.60	84.86	*
Personality Integration	10.53	9.09	*
Number of Deviant Signs	24.40	*	*
Distribution Score	97.73	*	125.2

*Not available from data.

Somewhere between the tenth and twelfth grades youths from the lower socioeconomic group show increasingly poor self-concepts in relation to their upper-class peers. Lefebber (1965) found that the mean self-concept scores for his groups were below those of the normative group. He attributed this to the fact that the groups were heavily weighted with boys from the lower socioeconomic group. He further recommended that future studies deal with comparing the self-concepts of matched groups from the lower, middle and upper socioeconomic levels.

The present study has attempted to follow Lefebber's suggestion. It appears that in so doing, differences between the groups that were primarily a function of differential class status have diminished.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Recent theorizing concerning the etiology of juvenile delinquency has yielded two plausible explanations. The first of these proposes that juvenile delinquency stems from the organized isolation of adolescents from any meaningful involvement in today's adult society. While this creates in the adolescent a feeling of uselessness, it also leaves him with fundamental and disturbing questions about his own identity. With the natural stepping-stones to adulthood not being available to him, he asserts his identity through ritualistic gang behaviors which are analogous to the puberty rites of primitive tribes. The second theory posits that juvenile delinquency is primarily a phenomenon of the lower-classes which results when a middle-class value system is imposed upon persons who lack legitimate means to achieve the subsequent goals. This theory of anomie could perhaps better be subsumed under the more general theory which proposes that delinquent behavior is a defense against ego-diffusion. At any rate, the intervening variable in both theories is assumed to be a feeling of worthlessness and self-deprecation.

While this established a tenuous theoretical relationship between self-concept and delinquent behavior, it remained for self-concept theorists to solidify the link. Several independent studies conducted simultaneously provided the impetus for much future research which has attempted to empirically validate the relationship. The results of

these studies showed that there exists a definite and substantial relationship between the way an individual feels about himself and the way he feels about and respects other persons. These studies further found that as a person's evaluation of himself becomes more objectively positive his feelings about others change in a similar direction, implying a causal relationship.

With this groundwork laid, it was possible to conceive of the aggression, destructiveness and apparent disregard for others which is inherent in delinquency as being a function of the delinquent's lack of positive regard for his own self. Several researchers have subsequently demonstrated that this is in fact the case by finding a high positive correlation between the extent to which a person devalues himself and the extent to which he exhibits delinquent behavior. Walter Reckless, who has been a pioneer in this area of research, asserts that his investigations show that the relationship between self-concept and delinquency is not only correlational, but causative; that is, that a high self-concept can serve as an insulator against delinquency. While others have accepted the causative nature of the relationship, they feel it is the delinquent's antisocial behavior that causes the self-devaluation, putting him at odds with a social system to whose standards and values he has subscribed. Still others feel the relationship is interacting and cyclical, with the negative self-concept leading to negative behavior, producing negative responses from society, in turn leading to a more negative self-concept, etc.

Whatever the nature of the relationship, there is mounting evidence that the delinquent can be differentiated from the non-delinquent on the basis of self-concept. Still there are some investigators who feel that this relationship is artifactual and have attempted to prove

this point by refining designs and instruments used to evaluate self-conceptions. They state that a major difficulty in present designs is in the definition and sampling of delinquent and non-delinquent populations. There is always the possibility that the two groups differ on some variable other than that of delinquent behavior and that some uncontrolled variable may account for the difference in self-concepts. An example of this may be that the lower socioeconomic classes are disproportionately over-represented in delinquent populations when official statistics and institutional populations are used, and many studies have not sufficiently controlled for the effects of this variable on self-concept. Even more serious is the possibility that the non-delinquent sample may be the "uncaught" delinquent.

In attempts to refine measuring instruments so as to make them more amenable to delinquency research, the problem of defining self-concept emerges. While some investigators have taken a highly simplistic approach, others have developed complex, multi-factor schemes which have enabled them to draw conclusions regarding different types of delinquents on the basis of differential self-concepts and to determine precisely those components of the self-concept which distinguish delinquents from non-delinquents. Similarly many researchers have questioned the use of self-ideal discrepancies as a direct measure of self-concept. While the question as to whether one is measuring self-concept or self-satisfaction is perhaps primarily one of semantics, the indiscriminant use of the two has produced problems (such as regarding the comparability of results) beyond those problems inherent in the use of discrepancy measures. Nevertheless, both procedures have demonstrated significant differences among populations, thus pointing to the fact that there is some fairly broad phenomenon accounting for the differences.

Since the self-concept has been shown to be both a cause and an effect of behavior, workers in the field have used this as both an indictment of and a reasoning for institutionalization of delinquents. While some investigators have found that institutionalization has promoted negative feelings about the self by further alienating the delinquent from society, others have found that a more positive self-concept resulted from the institutional demand of more positive behavior. Generally the contradictory findings have been attributed to differences among institutions. At any rate, many institutions have begun using the self-concept as a direct diagnostic and prognostic measure.

The present investigation proposed to show that delinquents could be differentiated from non-delinquents on the basis of their self-concepts, and that, in those areas of self-perception shown to distinguish delinquents from non-delinquents, institutionalized delinquents and non-institutionalized delinquents would demonstrate no differences.

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale was administered to 27 inmates of a state institution for delinquents, 13 probationers of the juvenile court and 15 non-delinquent enrollees of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. The groups were equated in terms of age, sex, socioeconomic status and type of offense.

The results appear to indicate that no stable differences exist in the self-concepts of delinquents and non-delinquents. Therefore the first hypothesis was rejected. Since no distinguishing self-concept characteristics were uncovered, the second hypothesis could be neither supported nor refuted. No differences in self-concept were found to exist, however, between institutionalized delinquents and their non-institutionalized counterparts in those areas of self-perception examined.

Several possible explanations for these rather unexpected findings have been offered. As regards the absence of significant differences between the delinquents and non-delinquents, one very plausible reason could be the fact that the terms "delinquent" and "non-delinquent" may not be properly descriptive of the samples used in the present study. There is a very real possibility that the institutional sample and the probationers were not truly delinquent or that the NYC enrollees were not in fact non-delinquents.

One possible way of circumventing this problem might be to use self-declared delinquency and non-delinquency as the criterion. This method also has its shortcomings, however, in that it introduces increased subjectivity into the design. Not only would idiosyncratic definitions of delinquency present a problem in such a case, but the willingness of a subject to define himself as a delinquent would undoubtedly be a function of the clarity and solidarity of his self-concept.

An examination of other than first-offenders might provide one with a more clearly defined sample of delinquents. By so doing, however, one would be obtaining measures of self-concepts that were in part a product of various treatment programs and not necessarily the underlying cause of the original delinquent behavior.

As far as determining the effects of institutionalization is concerned, it has already been suggested that a more appropriate design would incorporate a longitudinal comparison. The usual problems inherent in longitudinal studies, such as carry-over effects and time considerations, would have to be dealt with. Nevertheless, this approach would undoubtedly yield more potent and easily interpreted findings.

Perhaps the next step in the resolution of the question concerning the relative importance of socioeconomic level and delinquency in the formation of the self-concept is to compare delinquents and non-delinquents from the upper-classes. This would not, however, necessarily explain lower-class delinquency, since there are very likely at least two distinctly different phenomena operating in the delinquency of the lower and upper-classes.

There may well be some merit in self-concept research in the attempt to understand and contain the spread of delinquency. Justification for its present position among priorities, however, is questionable. Lefebvre's (1965) sample consisted of 847 subjects and the differences he found between them he declared to be significant. Statistical significance is nevertheless not always indicative of practical importance. With such a large sample size quite insignificant differences might be declared statistically "significant".

It is not surprising that research in the area of self-concept and delinquency has progressed so rapidly in recent years when one considers the extent to which the problem of delinquency permeates our society. This line of research presents itself as holding promise for the uncovering of a quick and easy means of ameliorating and controlling delinquency. It would seem, however, that the causative role that the self-concept plays in the development of delinquency has perhaps been over-played and has led to a too simplistic conception of etiology for a phenomenon which has proven to be complex and virtually uncontrollable.

On the basis of the present data, no criterion can be established by which to evaluate the advisability or justifiability of delinquent institutionalization, and only opinionated comments can be made. To the extent to which the self-concept is a factor in the dynamics of delinquent

behavior, confinement at NDIS appears to have no positive effect. The importance of the self-concept as a determining variable, however, has already been relegated. Therefore, while recidivism rates remain the most popular method of evaluation, there appears to be an urgent need for a means of appraising the effectiveness of a treatment program which does not involve the trial and error approach. The benefits derived from using recidivism rates as a judgmental criterion have been frequently overshadowed by the havoc it has played with human resources and potential.

APPENDIX

SCORES ON THE TSCS*

SC--The Self Criticism Score. A measure of defensiveness in reporting the self concept.

Conflict Scores--Measures of "conflict", or contradiction, between responses to positive and negative statements in the same content area.

Total Conflict--A non-directional measure, or summation of conflict, regardless of its direction, across all content areas.

P Scores--The Positive Scores. Measures of self-esteem or how positive the self concept is. There are reported as a Total P Score and as two sets of subscores for rows and for columns.

Row 1--Basic Identity

Row 2--Self-Satisfaction

Row 3--Behavior

Column A--Physical Self

Column B--Moral-Ethical Self

Column C--Personal Self

Column D--Family Self

Column E--Social Self

Total V Scores--Variability Scores. Measures of the range of variation of the P Scores within each row and column.

Distribution Scores

D Score--A summary measure of how certain or uncertain the individual is in his self-description.

Empirical Scales--Five special scores derived from special groupings of items which differentiate between certain groups:

DP--The Defensive Positive Score. A measure of defensiveness in reporting the self concept.

Psy--The Psychotic Score. A measure of similarity to the kind of self concept reported by psychotic patients.

PD--The Personality Disorder Score.

N--The Neurotic Score.

PI--The Personality Integration Score. A measure of personality strength or health.

NDS--Number of Deviant Signs. The sum of all deviant features in all other scores.

*From Fitts and Hamner, 1969

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Amos, W. E. A study of self concept: delinquent boys' accuracy in selecting self-evaluations. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1963, 67, 45-87.
- Atchison, C. A. A comparative study of the self-concept of behavior problem and non-behavior problem high school boys. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1958.
- Balester, R. J. The self-concept and juvenile delinquency. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956.
- Bellizzi, N. Self-concept of delinquents before and after treatment. Criminologica, 1966, 4, 27-31
- Berger, E. M. The relationship between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 778-782.
- Block, H. A. and Neiderhoffer, A. The Gang: A Study in Adolescent Behavior. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958.
- Block, J. and Thomas, H. Is satisfaction with self a measure of adjustment? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 254-259.
- Burgess, E. W. The economic factor in juvenile delinquency. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1952, 43, 29-38.
- Child Welfare League of America. Report of Survey of North Dakota State Training School, June, 1960. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1960.
- Cloward, R. A. Illegitimate means, anomie, and deviant behavior. American Sociological Review, 1959, 24, 164-176.
- Cohen, A. K. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. Chicago: Free Press, 1955.
- Cohen, A. K. and Short, F. Research in delinquent subculture. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14, 20-37.
- Cooley, C. H. Human Nature and Social Order. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.
- Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. 2d. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1960.

- Dawes, K. J. and Hase, H. D. The institutionalized delinquent five years later. North Dakota State Industrial School Monograph, Mandan, North Dakota, 1966, No. 1.
- Deitche, J. H. The performance of delinquent and non-delinquent boys on the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1959.
- Diller, L. Conscious and unconscious self-attitudes after success and failure. Journal of Personality, 1954, 23, 1-12.
- Dorn, D. S. Self-concept, alienation, and anxiety in a contraculture and subculture: A research report. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1968, 59, 531-535.
- Engles, M. The stability of the self-concept in adolescence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1956.
- English, H. B. and English, A. C. A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytic Terms. New York: Longmans, Green, 1958.
- Erikson, E. The problem of identity. Journal of the American Psychiatric Association, 1956, 4, 56-121.
- Eynon, T. G. and Simpson, J. E. The boy's perception of himself in a state training school for delinquents. In P. G. Garabedian and D. C. Gibbons (Ed.), Becoming Delinquent. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.
- Fannin, L. F. and Clinard, M. B. Differences in the conception of self as a male among lower and middle class delinquents. Social Problems, 1965, 13, 205-214.
- Fitts, W. H. Manual for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. Nashville: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
- Fitts, W. H. and Hamner, W. T. The self concept and delinquency. Nashville Mental Health Center Monograph, Nashville, Tennessee, 1969, No. 1.
- Fitts, W. H., et al. The self concept and self-actualization. Nashville Mental Health Center Monograph, Nashville, Tennessee, 1971, No. 3.
- Forer, L. G. No One Will Listen: How Our Legal System Brutalizes the Youthful Poor. New York: John Day, 1970.
- Greenberg, G. U. A refinement of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to clarify interpretation of extremely favorable self reports. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1968.
- Hall, P. M. Identification with the delinquent subculture and level of self-evaluation. Sociometry, 1966, 29, 146-160.

- Hall, C. W. and Lindzey, G. Theories of Personality. 2d. ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- Hamner, W. T. The self concept of delinquents. Nashville Mental Health Center Research Bulletin No. 3, Nashville: 1968, (mimeograph).
- Hamner, W. T. The learning of social controls in juvenile antisocial personalities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1969.
- Hilgard, E. R. Human motive and the concept of self. American Psychologist, 1949, 4, 374-382.
- Hill, T. J. Attitudes toward self: An experimental study. Journal of Educational Sociology, 1957, 30, 395-397.
- Howard, J. Neighborhood Youth Corps--An alternative to delinquency. Juvenile Court Judges Journal, 1967, 18, 87-91
- Kelly, F. J. and Baer, D. J. Jesness Inventory and self-concept measures for delinquents before and after participation in "Outward Bound". Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 719-724.
- Klausner, S. Z. Social class and self concept. Journal of Social Psychology, 1953, 38, 201-205.
- Kvaraceus, W. C. Alienated youth here and abroad. Phi Delta Kappa, 1963, 45, 87-90.
- Kvaraceus, W. C. and Ulrich, W. E. Delinquent Behavior: Principles and Practices. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1959.
- Lefebber, J. A. The delinquent's self-concept. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1965.
- Levanway, R. W. The effect of stress on expressed attitudes toward self and others. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 225-226.
- Lively, E. L., Dinitz, S., and Reckless, W. C. Self concept as a predictor of juvenile delinquency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1962, 32, 159-168.
- Maxwell, J. W. The relationship of family adjustment to the self concept of lower class adolescents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1967.
- Mead, G. H. A behavioristic account of the significant symbol. Journal of Philosophy, 1922, 19, 159-163.
- Mead, G. H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

- Miller, W. B. and Kvaraceus, W. C. Delinquent Behavior: Culture and the Individual. Washington, D. C.: National Educational Association, 1959.
- Moran, M. R. Inmate concept of self in a reformatory society. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1953.
- O'Connor, G. G. The impact of initial detentions upon male delinquents. Social Problems, 1970, 18, 194-199.
- Ohlin, L. W. and Cloward, R. A. New Perspectives on Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1959.
- Olson, L. B. A study of juvenile delinquents in the State Training School, Mandan, North Dakota. Unpublished masters thesis, University of North Dakota, 1955.
- Phillips, E. L. Attitudes toward self and others: A brief questionnaire report. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 5, 79-81.
- Pierson, G. R., Cattell, R. B., and Pierce, J. A demonstration of the HSPQ of the nature of the personality changes produced by institutionalization of delinquents. Journal of Social Psychology, 1966, 70, 229-239.
- Piliavin, I. and Briar, S. Police encounters with juveniles. American Journal of Sociology, 1964, 70, 206-214.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S. and Kay, B. The self component in potential delinquency and potential non-delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 566-570.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S. and Murray, E. Self concept as an insulator against delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, 744-746.
- Reiss, A. J. and Rhodes, A. L. The distribution of juvenile delinquency in the social class structure. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 720-732.
- Robbins, W. C. Self concept, personality adjustment and measurable intelligence of delinquent boys. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1969.
- Rogers, C. G. A coordinated research in psychotherapy: A non-objective introduction. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 149-153.
- Rogers, C. G. Client-Centered Therapy: Its Current Practice, Implications, and Theory. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

- 67
- Roncek, J. S. Crime: The American way of life. International Journal of Legal Research, 1969, 4, 119-126.
- Rose, A. M. and Weber, G. H. Changes in attitudes among delinquent boys committed to open and closed institutions. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1961, 52, 166-177.
- Rubin, J. Changes in self concept during institutional confinement. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1970.
- Rubin, S. Crime and Juvenile Delinquency. Dobbs Ferry, New York: Oceana Publications, 1970.
- Sarbin, T. R. A preface to psychological analysis of the self. Psychological Review, 1952, 59, 11-22.
- Seay, T. A. A comparison of the self-concept of juvenile delinquents, industrial arts students and college preparatory students. Unpublished masters thesis, Austin Peay State University, 1968.
- Seeman, J. A study of the process of nondirective therapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 157-168.
- Sheerer, E. T. An analysis of the relationship between acceptance of and respect for self and acceptance of and respect for others in ten counseling cases. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 169-175.
- Stock, D. An investigation into the interrelations between the self concept and feelings directed toward other persons and groups. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 176-180.
- Symonds, P. M. The Ego and the Self. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1951.
- Tangri, S. S. and Schwartz, M. Delinquency research and the self-concept variable. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1967, 58, 182-190.
- Tangri, S. S. and Schwartz, M. Self-concept research. In M. E. Wolfgang, L. Savitz, and N. Johnston (Ed.), The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. 2d. ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Children's Bureau. Statistics on Public Institutions for Delinquent Children, 1966. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.
- U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Children's Bureau. Statistics on Public Institutions for Delinquent Children, 1968. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.

Washburn, W. C. Patterns of self concepts related to problems of neurosis and delinquency in adolescents. Exceptional Children, 1963, 29, 341-347.

Waters, D. B. Differential self concept of incarcerated delinquent, incipient delinquent, and non-delinquent adolescent males. Unpublished masters thesis, Emory University, 1969.

Weisman, M. The Neighborhood Youth Corps. Juvenile Court Judges Journal, 1969, 19, 134-138.

Worsnop, R. L. Juvenile offenders. Editorial Research Reports, 1970, 1, 101-118.

Wylie, R. C. The Self Concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Zelen, S. L. The relationship of peer acceptance, acceptance of others and self acceptance. Proceedings of the Iowa Academy of Science, 1954, 61, 446-449.