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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the area of juvenile delinquency, there is a need for more knowledge of the patterns of personality that lead to criminal and other maladjustive behavior. McCafferty (11) reported for the United States Bureau of Prisons that a multimillion-dollar program cannot properly operate to rehabilitate offenders unless there is some way to determine how the money is spent. With the tremendous growth and systematizing of knowledge in the areas of juvenile delinquency and correction, states have an excellent base for developing useful programs for evaluating their probation, institutional, and parole systems.

Juvenile delinquency has been minimized by some because it affects a relatively small section of our youth (3 or 4 per cent), but in 1962 this included more than a half-million young people who are wards of the juvenile courts and more than 1,750,000 who were arrested by the police. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare (2) estimates, if the present trend continues, three to four million juvenile offenders will come before the courts in the next decade. Furthermore, it costs about $4,000 per year to keep one youngster in a state reformatory, and a conservative estimate puts the
financial outlay for public services to delinquents at $200 million annually.

Sheridan (13) pointed out that while many large urban areas have been able to develop local institutions and other intermediate types of care and services for delinquent children presenting less serious problems, smaller communities in rural areas have had to depend upon the state institutions for care of all their delinquent youngsters. As a result, the young people coming from large urban areas are more likely to be older and more sophisticated in their delinquency pattern than those coming from small communities in rural areas. Protecting the younger, more malleable youngster from the influence of the more hardened delinquent is an institutional problem of no small proportion.

Moreover, juvenile delinquency is not just an American problem. Comparative statistics compiled by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (3) indicate that it is a world problem. Juvenile gangs are found all over the world. In England, for example, "Teddy boys" fomented a series of race riots against West Indians; and in Sweden, motorcycle mobs have been plaguing the cities.

On May 31, 1962, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency presented its first annual report (1) to President Kennedy. The use of $30 million over a three-year period for the prevention and control of delinquency was authorized by the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses
Control Act of 1961 (P. L. 87-274). Under this act grants are offered to support local demonstration projects, and to support training programs for persons who work with youth.

In its first annual report, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency cites the continued rise of delinquency rates since 1948 and the growth of related problems such as school dropouts and youth unemployment. The report calls for more adequate planning, more comprehensive action, and more effective interagency coordination to combat the rise in delinquency. "No effort to prevent delinquency can succeed," it states, "which does not provide young people with genuine opportunities to behave differently, especially through creative, educational, and exciting work programs."

"Mobilization for Youth," a program launched by voluntary agencies in New York City in cooperation with the city government to combat juvenile delinquency on New York's Lower East Side, will be assisted by two federal grants. President Kennedy announced on May 31, 1962, that the program which will cost $12.6 million will receive a three-year grant of $1.9 million under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, and a grant of $1.5 million from the National Institute of Mental Health. The City of New York will contribute $1.4 million the first year and the balance will be contributed by private sources. The program, which is the result of two years of intensive planning, is based upon the belief that obstacles to economic and social betterment among low-income groups are the main causes of delinquency.
Curriculum grants are offered for the development of new course material needed as part of the broad approach to training needs. New theoretical and research findings in the behavioral sciences must constantly be applied, says the President's Committee, to improve practical programs of youth service.

"Delinquency must be solved at the local level," the report of the President's Committee states; "but the federal government has an obligation to offer technical assistance and financial support to cities attempting to solve the problem." Although there are many outstanding youth programs in cities across the nation, they have not been brought together in a comprehensive attack on local youth problems. The report terms New York's Mobilization for Youth the most advanced program so far, but points out that other cities must devise their own programs to meet their own particular needs. The hope is expressed that the Delinquency Act "will prove to be a fore-runner of other federal legislation designed to aid the nation's youth."

In summary, it seems there is a need for more knowledge of the patterns of personality that lead to criminal and other maladjustive behavior. Few studies have been conducted, investigating specific delinquent offenses, which could lead to a basic understanding of juvenile delinquent behavior. With the recent governmental interest in juvenile delinquency this investigation has possibilities of serving as a basis for a broader juvenile delinquency program.
Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice differ significantly in certain characteristics from those who commit such thefts with one or more confederates. The characteristics investigated were: (1) scores made on individual scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and (2) intellectual ability as measured by the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity. Furthermore, the same characteristics were examined to determine if a significant difference existed between each of the groups of juvenile delinquents and a group of juveniles who did not have a record of delinquency and attended Sunday School classes regularly.

Hypotheses

The primary hypothesis tested during the investigation was as follows:

There will be significant differences between mean scores made on each of the individual scales of the MMPI and the CTMM by juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice, delinquents who commit the same offense with one or more confederates, and juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.

In addition to the primary hypothesis the following secondary hypotheses were tested:
1. There will be no significant differences between scores made on each of the individual scales of the MMPI by juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice and those delinquents who commit the same offense with one or more confederates.

2. There will be no significant differences in intellectual ability between juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice and delinquents who commit the same offense with one or more confederates.

3. Juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice will score significantly higher on each of the individual scales of the MMPI than juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.

4. Juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft with one or more confederates will score significantly higher on each of the individual scales of the MMPI than juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.

5. Juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice will measure significantly lower on the CTMM than juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.

6. Juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft with one or more confederates will measure significantly lower on the CTMM than juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.
Significance of the Study

Auto theft is a common offense committed by juvenile delinquents, but little is known about the juveniles who engage in this activity because few studies have been conducted regarding specific offenses. If significant differences in personality patterns could be found between juvenile delinquents who commit specific offenses and non-delinquents, then much could be learned about a child upon his intake at the juvenile detention home. Not only could information be gained as to how this individual might react in a group situation within the detention home, but also a certain amount of information would be useful to the child's probation officer. The probation officer would not only be in a better position to understand the child's case in relation to his offense, but could also be more dynamic in both individual as well as parent-child counseling relationships.

Basic Assumptions and Limitations

It was necessary to propose certain basic assumptions and to establish certain limitations in order to structure the design of the investigation.

1. It was assumed that all subjects who answered the questionnaire were motivated to the same degree.

2. It was assumed that all subjects had the ability to read and understand each question in the test booklets.

3. Generalizations from the data obtained in the study
will necessarily be limited by the small number of subjects utilized in the investigation.

Definition of Terms

**MMPI.** This term referred to the *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory* which is a psychometric instrument designed to provide, in a single test, scores on all the more clinically important phases of personality.

**CTMM.** This term referred to the *California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity*, which was constructed to appraise mental capacity.

The MMPI scales are defined as follows:

1. **Scale ?** - involves the number of items in the inventory that the subject does not answer.

2. **Scale L** - involves sensitivity to the subject's tendency to cover up and deny undesirable personal faults.

3. **Scale F** - points out subjects who are especially motivated to appear inadequate, incompetent or seek escape from pressing responsibilities through illness.


5. **Scale Hs** - considers subjects having many physical complaints with a preponderantly psychological basis.

6. **Scale D** - denotes depressed individuals.

7. **Scale Hy** - involves an elaboration of physical symptoms, which usually take the form of culturally respectable
psychosomatic syndromes as allergy or functional cardiovascular disturbances.

8. **Scale Pd** - indicated by the diagnostic term psychopathic deviate as individuals little affected by remorse and do not appear to be particularly modified by censure or punishment.

9. **Scale MF** - involves a measure of masculinity or femininity of interests.

10. **Scale Pa** - denotes undue interpersonal sensitivity; at its extreme this may be a paranoid feeling about others in which the subject feels mistreated or threatened.

11. **Scale Pt** - indicates subjects who are in some ways excessively meticulous or overly conscientious.

12. **Scale Sc** - considers the degree to which a person thinks and reacts like others about him.

13. **Scale Ma** - involves a measure related to enthusiasm and energy.

14. **Scale Si** - denotes social introversion and extroversion.

Other terms include the following:

1. **Delinquent** - involves those subjects so declared by the courts as being a threat to themselves and/or to the community.

2. **Intake file** - indicates those subjects who are detained at the Juvenile Detention Home.
3. **Individual auto theft offenders** - involves those subjects who have stolen an automobile without an accomplice and have been apprehended by the police.

4. **Group auto theft offenders** - denotes those subjects who have stolen an automobile with one or more confederates and have been apprehended by the police.

Related Research

In recent years many studies have been conducted in the area of juvenile delinquency; however, only a few have direct application to this investigation. Most studies in this area have dealt with juvenile delinquency in general terms, and have not considered personality patterns of offenders who committed specific crimes, such as auto theft.

A number of investigations have provided information concerning the utilization of the MMPI in identification of juvenile delinquents and non-delinquents. Rempel (12) demonstrated the usefulness of applying multivariant statistical techniques to the analysis of MMPI scale scores alone, or in combination with school data, for the purpose of classifying ninth-grade boys as potential delinquents or non-delinquents. The techniques employed proved to be effective to the extent that 62.3 per cent of the non-delinquents and 69.5 per cent of the delinquents were correctly identified by the use of multiphasic data alone; while a combination of multiphasic and school record data made possible the correct
identification of 74.2 per cent of non-delinquent and 67.5 per cent of delinquent-prone boys.

Prediction of delinquency proneness has been attempted both by means of a special scale and by means of MMPI patterns. Hathaway and Monachesi (8) argue very persuasively for an analytical approach to personality evaluation in delinquency, offering evidence that different kinds of personality types lead to common delinquent patterns, depending upon situational conditions.

Wirt and Briggs (15), after studying longitudinal trends in delinquency, concluded that delinquency is primarily a phenomenon of adolescence. Eighty-two per cent of the delinquent offenses used to classify these subjects were committed by juveniles during the ages from fourteen to seventeen. From seventeen to nineteen the rate dropped to 60 per cent and then to 20 per cent for the ages twenty to twenty-three. Although most of these boys did not seem to continue on to become adult criminals, they show a great waste of human resources in other forms of inadequacy and underachievement. While only a significant few of these delinquents would probably profit from traditional psychotherapeutic attention, a great deal can be done through welfare programs, juvenile court procedures, and other preventative programs once these cases have been accurately identified.

During 1947 and 1948 Hathaway and Monachesi (9) conducted their important study on juvenile delinquency by administering
over 4,000 MMPI's to ninth-grade Minnesota school children. Each child was checked against local police and court records to identify those with records of delinquency. The MMPI profiles of the so identified delinquent boys and girls indicated that high Pd and Ma scale scores (alone or in combination), low Mf scores among boys, and low Hy scores among girls were most prevalent. Boys and girls whose profile pattern showed no clinical scales beyond the standard score of 74 were uncommon among delinquents.

Administration of the MMPI to 1958 unselected ninth-grade boys in Minneapolis by Hathaway and Monachesi (10) was followed by checks at two- and four-year intervals with public and private agencies (including the police department). MMPI profiles and later evidence for delinquent behavior by ratings were studied with reference to possible delinquency-proneness reflected in the profiles. In summary, the scale data made tenable the conclusion that although the socially withdrawn, depressed, or feminine personality factors (Inhibitory Scales) in a boy may indicate the presence of some sort of maladjustment, high scores on relevant scales suggest that his involvement in delinquency acts is unlikely. At the other extreme, the data indicate that boys with rebellious, excitable, or schizoid traits (Excitatory Scales 4, 8, 9) are most prone to delinquency. Young people are unquestionably more energetic and responsive to excitement, and they are also probably more rebellious in various ways than is the average middle-aged adult,
so these broad characteristics of youth would be expected to result in a higher average score on scales 4, 8, and 9.

The discriminatory capacity of the MMPI, when applied to delinquent and non-delinquent girls, was demonstrated for the first time in a study published in 1945 by Dora F. Capwell (4). She reported that most of the scales reliably differentiated the two groups. The differences suggested that the delinquents were more maladjusted. When a selected group of fifty-two delinquent girls was matched on IQ with fifty-two non-delinquent, the differentiation was still reliable except on scale 1 (Hs); thus the differences in mean scores on the scales seemed not related to measured intelligence.

The Capwell results were of sufficient importance to warrant attempts to find out whether the instrument would continue to differentiate between delinquent and non-delinquent girls and whether it would also differentiate between delinquent and non-delinquent boys.

In a continued study, Capwell (5) revealed MMPI profiles from four groups of boys and four groups of girls available for analysis. All these profiles were rather rigorously selected for validity according to the R, L, and F scales of the MMPI. There were two samples of delinquent boys, forty-nine in county detention homes or on probation and eighty in the training school. There were also two samples of delinquent girls, the 1946 and the 1947 sample consisting of forty-eight and forty-seven girls respectively. These samples were similar in general selection factors.
Capwell also had four groups of presumptively non-delinquent cases available for contrast to these delinquent samples. These are referred to as presumptively non-delinquent since no check was made to determine for certain that they had not been delinquent or did not at the time have personality characteristics like those of youngsters known to be in trouble. The only known fact about them was that they were not publicly in difficulty with the law. The first two non-delinquent samples were obtained from organized groups of boys and girls and consisted of fifty-six boys and seventy-nine girls tested at the time of the 1946 testing of delinquents. Later, boys and girls from a private school were tested yielding valid profiles from 123 boys and 123 girls. In socio-economic status, all the delinquent groups were somewhat below the 1946 non-delinquent samples and definitely below the two academy samples. In IQ the delinquent samples were also lower and the academy samples highest. In all age samplings the median age was about fifteen or sixteen.

The reliable differences in the Capwell study between the non-delinquent samples on L are not large enough to have much interpretive significance, but they and the less reliable differences on K indicate more defensive answers from both sexes of the academy sample. In this connection, Hathaway and Meehl (7) suspected and confirmed that the K factor was related to socio-economic status. On the clinical scales, Capwell found the boys of the two non-delinquent groups show no significant differences in means. There is a tendency for the
academy boys to have mean scores a little closer to adult normal means (T score 50). The academy girls obtained mean scores on scales 5 and 6 that are reliably different from the 1946 non-delinquents above the 5 per cent level of confidence. These differences on scales 5 and 6 indicate that the academy girls are slightly more masculine (Mf) and a little less sensitive to personal references (Pa).

Since the mean T scores for adult normals as observed in the norm groups for the MMPI are 50, the non-delinquent samples of boys and girls in the Capwell study all show some definite differences from adults. The differences are most marked for scales 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Using common adjectives for the clinical implications of these scales, they indicate the youngsters to be comparatively rebellious (scale 4), personally sensitive (scale 6), obsessive-compulsive (scale 7), apart or detached in effect and concept formation (scale 8), and active with impulsiveness (scale 9). Certainly some of these indications are reasonable enough if one considers the contrasts between the behavior of adolescents and that of mature adults.

The significance of these scores seems to lie in the fact that comparisons of delinquent adolescents with non-delinquent adolescents will show much less difference than would be true if one compared juvenile delinquents with a general sample of adults.
In the Capwell study all four of the delinquent groups show clearly significant differences from average adults norms. If there is an interest in establishing the existence of measurable differences between the average adult and the non-delinquent adolescent or the average adult and the delinquent adolescent, then these differences seem clear on most of the scales; the more marked differences are those between the adult and the adolescent delinquent, with the non-delinquent youngster in the middle.

The findings relative to scale 4 are in distinct support of the assumption that delinquent groups include many persons similar to clinical cases receiving the diagnosis psychopathic personality, asocial and amoral type. The psychopathic deviate patient as seen clinically is most frequently young and delinquent. In evaluating the size of differences it is important that the non-delinquent groups have scores on scales 4, 7, 8, and 9 that are clearly above those of the average adult; and there is good reason to think that many non-delinquent youths are close to at least mild open revolt or delinquent behavior.

Considerable attention has been devoted to the study of psychopathic traits in juvenile delinquency. As Tappan (14) pointed out in his book entitled Crime, Justice, and Correction, the psychopathic personality is considerably more important for crime causation than either psychosis or neurosis. It is particularly prevalent among youthful offenders and
habitual criminals. Contemporary dynamic psychiatrists have given more attention to this disorder in their interpretations of criminality than they have given to any other type of aberration.

Various writers have concluded that it is a condition permitting no uniform definition at all. Some authorities have maintained that psychopathic traits are present in a large segment of the population, that in the usual life history they prove to be innocuous or even advantageous determinants of success, and that the deviant condition is one of degree rather than one of kind.

A substantial body of medical opinion has conceived the psychopathic traits as biological and hereditary; the terms constitutional psychopath and constitutional psychopathic inferiority imply this etiology. Others have maintained as vigorously that the state is environmentally conditioned; these authorities would define the disorder in terms of the pathological home situations of neglect and emotional deprivation from which the psychological reaction patterns are thought to have arisen. Some of the latter prefer the term sociopathic personality.

Psychiatry has delineated a pure type of psychopathic personality that is quite precisely defined and identifiable. This condition may be deemed to include the following characteristics in a more or less marked degree. Note that these are all closely interrelated qualities of character.
1. A lack of conscience, or "superego," and hence an absence of ordinary guilt feelings about one's derelictions.

2. Deficient attachment to or affection for others, a failure to respond to the ordinary motivations founded in respect or regard for one's fellows, and therefore a disposition to ruthlessness and exploitation.

3. Excessive aggression directed outward against the environment rather than inward in repression of selfish drives.

4. An infantile level of response, seeking immediate satisfactions, often in primitive form of behavior, sexual and otherwise.

The psychopathic personality is commonly defined in terms of the id-dominated character, lacking normal superego development. Without mother love and frequently without a father, he does not learn to identify or sympathize with others; instead he exploits them if he can. The psychopath lacks the guilt feelings and anxiety expressed by the normal person as a result of defiance or misconduct in the face of parental disapproval; he is without remorse or neurotic conflict. The psychopath works out his antisocial drives directly without inhibition or guilt.

As one can surely imagine, behavioral features of delinquency are extremely complex manifestations of personality processes, cultural pressures, and momentary situations. This investigation does not endorse the idea that a great many juvenile delinquents are psychopaths, but that much delinquent
behavior is described within the definition of a psychopathic deviate.

The major MMPI contributions to delinquency prediction and diagnosis have been well summarized by Hathaway and Monachesi (8). Gough and Peterson (6) have also published work on the development of a delinquency scale. Not all the items in their final scale came from the MMPI pool, however, and therefore their full finding cannot be duplicated without the use of the California Psychological Inventory. They devised or selected priori items that suited their conception of difficulties in role-taking behavior. They then evaluated each of the potential items against frequencies of response from known criminal, delinquent, and control subjects.

In summary, it seems that little if any research has been conducted in regard to specific offenses by juvenile delinquents. Prediction of delinquency proneness has been attempted both by means of a special scale and by means of MMPI patterns, but not with respect to specific delinquent offenses. This investigation, however, considers the difference in MMPI profiles of non-delinquents and delinquents that have committed auto theft.
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CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA

Delinquent subjects included in this study were selected from referrals of the Dallas County Juvenile Detention Home, Dallas, Texas, during the months from May through November of 1962. The referrals were selected on the basis of age, race, sex, and offense. All referrals were sixteen-year-old, white males, and had committed either individual or group auto theft offenses. The delinquent boys were selected from the intake file of the Dallas County Juvenile Detention Home on the basis of individual and group auto theft offenses. The file was checked each day for new referrals that fell into the classification of the study, until twenty-five individual and twenty-five group auto theft offenders were selected.

The non-delinquent subjects included in the study were selected from sixteen-year-old, white males, who attended Sunday School classes on a regular basis in a large church in Dallas, Texas. Juvenile records of the Dallas County Juvenile Department indicated that these subjects did not have a record of delinquency at the time of this investigation. The church was represented by all levels of socio-economic status, but consisted primarily of the upper-lower and lower-middle socio-economic levels. Members of the church exceeded some 7,000...
in population. The church was located in an old commercial area of the city that had a delinquency rate of 2.38 per cent at the time of this investigation, which was .21 per cent above the delinquency rate for the entire city.

All subjects were administered the MMPI and CTMM to determine some personality traits and mental ability of individual and group auto theft offenders and non-delinquent subjects. The inventory was administered during the months from May through November of 1962, until the appropriate number of subjects were selected. The California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity was administered to groups of five to ten subjects for the purpose of obtaining an IQ for each subject.

The MMPI is a psychometric instrument designed to provide, in a single test, scores on all the more clinically important phases of personality. In devising the instrument, the point of view determining the importance of a trait was that of a clinical or personnel worker who wishes to assay those traits commonly characteristic of psychological abnormality. The instrument itself comprises 566 statements covering a wide range of subject matter, from the physical condition of the individual being tested to his morale and social attitude.

Procedures for Treating Data

The data were treated statistically by using the analysis of variance technique, as illustrated by Edwards (1), to determine
if the IQ scores, or any scale on the MMPI revealed significant differences among the three groups. The F test was used to determine the significance of the differences among groups, and the 5 per cent level of confidence was established as the lower limit for determining significant differences.

If the F test revealed that significant differences existed among the three groups, t tests were made to determine whether the group of juvenile delinquents committing auto theft with confederates, the group of juvenile delinquents committing auto theft without an accomplice, or the non-delinquent group was responsible for the significant differences. The 5 per cent level of confidence was established as the lower limit for determining significant differences.

The formula for the t test, as indicated in Garrett (2), utilized the within-groups standard deviation based on all seventy-five scores and seventy-two degrees of freedom for each scale tested, which furnished a more reliable measure of experimental variation. Pooling of sums to obtain the within-groups mean score is permissible, since the deviations in each group have been taken from their own mean.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The analysis of variance technique was used to determine if significant differences existed among juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft with confederates, juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice, or non-delinquents on the various scales of the MMPI and CTMM. The following tables indicate the values of the F tests and if these values were significant.

Tables I through V indicate that no significant differences existed among groups on the L, Hs, Hy, Mf, and Pt scales of the MMPI.

TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI L SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>172.00</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE II
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI Hs SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>774.72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>776.66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI Hy SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1040.56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1048.66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI MF SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>26.96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1617.04</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1644.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE V

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI FT SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>113.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56.65</td>
<td>2.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1759.36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1872.66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables VI through XIV indicate that a significant difference existed at either the 5 per cent or 1 per cent level of confidence on the F, K, D, Pd, Pa, Sc, Ma, and Si scales of the MMPI, and on IQ of the CTMM.

### TABLE VI

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI F SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>398.82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>199.41</td>
<td>23.686*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>606.16</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1004.98</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence

### TABLE VII

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI K SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>159.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79.69</td>
<td>4.630*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1239.28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1398.66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>.......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence
TABLE VIII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI D SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>337.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>168.65</td>
<td>12.225*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>993.28</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1330.58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence

TABLE IX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI Pd SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>548.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>274.36</td>
<td>16.159*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1222.40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1771.12</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence
TABLE X

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI Pa SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>105.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.92</td>
<td>4.858*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>784.24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>890.08</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence

TABLE XI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI Sc SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>487.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>243.57</td>
<td>9.638*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1819.52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2306.66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence
### TABLE XII

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI Ma SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>274.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>137.37</td>
<td>7.094*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1394.24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1666.98</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence

### TABLE XIII

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE MMPI Si SCALE FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>239.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119.77</td>
<td>4.048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>2130.00</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2369.54</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence*
TABLE XIV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE IQ FROM THE CTMM FOR TWO GROUPS OF DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1306.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>653.17</td>
<td>23.581*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>1994.32</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3300.67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .1 per cent level of confidence

Hypotheses found to be refuted by the F tests were tested further with the use of t tests. Tables XV, XVI, and XVII indicate the results of a t test computation to test the significance of the differences between any two of the group means where the F ratio was found to be significant.

Table XV revealed mean differences significant at the .1 per cent level of confidence on MMPI and CTMM scores of non-delinquents and delinquents who committed auto theft with one or more confederates. Those mean MMPI scale scores which showed a significant difference at the .1 per cent level of confidence between the two groups were F, K, D, Pd, Pa, Sc and Ma. The mean IQ scores also were significantly different at the .1 per cent level of confidence between the two groups. The mean difference on scale score Si showed no significant difference between the two groups.
### TABLE XV

**MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON THE MMPI AND CTMM OF A GROUP OF NON-DELINQUENTS AND A GROUP OF DELINQUENTS WHO COMMITTED AUTO THEFT WITH ONE OR MORE ASSOCIATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>MMPI Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-delinquent</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group delinquent</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence
Table XVI revealed mean differences in scores on the MMPI and CTMM between non-delinquents and delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice. Those MMPI scale scores which showed a mean difference significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence were F, D, Pd, and Pa, as well as the IQ scores. MMPI scale scores Sc and Si were significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence, and scale scores K and Ma revealed no significant differences between the groups.

Table XVII indicated mean differences in scores on the MMPI and CTMM between delinquents who committed auto theft with one or more confederates, and delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice. The MMPI scale score Ma denoted a mean difference significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence, while scale score F revealed a mean difference significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence. MMPI scale scores K, D, Pd, Pa, Sc, Si, and the IQ scores showed no significant differences between the groups.

In summary, no significant differences existed on scales L, Hs, Hy, Mf, and Pt of the MMPI among juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft with confederates, juvenile delinquents who committed the same offense without an accomplice, or juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly. Significant differences among the groups existed at the 5 per cent or 1 per cent level of confidence on the F, K, D, Pd, Pa, Sc, Ma, and Si scales of the MMPI and on IQ of the CTMM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>MMPI Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-delinquent</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary delinquent</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t ratio</td>
<td>4.206*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence

**Significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence
**TABLE XVII**

**MEAN DIFFERENCES IN SCORES ON THE MMPI AND CTMM OF A GROUP OF DELINQUENTS WHO COMMITTED AUTO THEFT WITH ONE OR MORE ASSOCIATES AND A GROUP OF DELINQUENTS WHO COMMITTED AUTO THEFT WITHOUT AN ACCOMPlice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>MMPI Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group delinquent</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary delinquent</td>
<td>7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t ratio</td>
<td>2.641**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence

**Significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence
The results of the tests of differences between any two groups showed that scales F, K, D, Pd, Pa, Sc, and Ma, and the IQ scores differed at the 1 per cent level of confidence between non-delinquents and group delinquents, and the mean difference on scale score Si showed no significant difference between the two groups. Differences in mean scores between non-delinquents and solitary delinquents were significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence on scales F, D, Pd, and Pa as well as the IQ scores. Scales Sc and Si were significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence, and scale scores K and Ma revealed no significant differences between the two groups. The delinquent groups indicated no significant differences on scales K, D, Pd, Pa, Sc, Si and the IQ scores, but scale Ma denoted a mean difference significant at the 1 per cent level of confidence, while scale F revealed a mean difference significant at the 5 per cent level of confidence.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the problem of this study was to determine if juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice differ significantly in certain characteristics from those who commit such thefts with one or more confederates. The characteristics investigated were: (1) scores made on individual scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and (2) intellectual ability as measured by the California Short-Form Test of Mental Maturity. Furthermore, the same characteristics were examined to determine if a significant difference existed between each of the groups of juvenile delinquents and a group of juveniles who did not have a record of delinquency and attended Sunday School classes regularly.

The primary hypothesis tested during the investigation stated that there will be significant differences between mean scores made on each of the individual scales of the MMPI and the CTMM by juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice, delinquents who commit the same offense with one or more confederates, and juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.
In addition to the primary hypothesis the following secondary hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be no significant differences between scores made on each of the individual scales of the MMPI by juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice and those delinquents who commit the same offense with one or more confederates.

2. There will be no significant differences in intellectual ability between juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice and delinquents who commit the same offense with one or more confederates.

3. Juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice will score significantly higher on each of the individual scales of the MMPI than juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.

4. Juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft with one or more confederates will score significantly higher on each of the individual scales of the MMPI than juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.

5. Juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft without an accomplice will measure significantly lower on the CTMM than juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.

6. Juvenile delinquents who commit auto theft with one or more confederates will measure significantly lower on
the CTMM than juveniles who do not have a record of delinquency and attend Sunday School regularly.

In general, the conclusions of this investigation indicate a very similar personality profile between delinquents who committed auto theft with one or more confederates and delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice, as measured by the MMPI. Furthermore, most of the non-delinquent scale scores revealed group means lower than those of either delinquent group.

In conclusion, the following hypotheses were accepted or rejected on the basis of the results for this investigation.

The primary hypothesis was partially accepted since significant differences did occur between mean scores made on F, K, D, Pd, Pa, Sc, Ma, and Si scales of the MMPI and on the CTMM among juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice, delinquents who committed auto theft with one or more confederates, and juveniles who did not have a record of delinquency and attended Sunday School regularly.

Secondary hypothesis one was accepted in part because there were no significant differences, except on scales F and Ma, between scores made on each of the individual scales of the MMPI by juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice and those delinquents who committed the same offense with one or more confederates.

Secondary hypothesis two was accepted because there were no significant differences in intellectual ability between
juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice and delinquents who committed the same offense with one or more confederates.

Secondary hypothesis three was accepted in part because juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice scored significantly higher on each of the individual scales of the MMPI, except scales K and Ma, than juveniles who did not have a record of delinquency and attended Sunday School regularly.

Secondary hypothesis four was accepted in part because juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft with one or more confederates scored significantly higher on each of the individual scales of the MMPI, except scale Si, than juveniles who did not have a record of delinquency and attended Sunday School regularly.

Secondary hypothesis five was accepted because juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice measured significantly lower on the CTMM than juveniles who did not have a record of delinquency and attended Sunday School regularly.

Secondary hypothesis six was also accepted since juvenile delinquents who committed auto theft with one or more confederates measured significantly lower on the CTMM than juveniles who did not have a record of delinquency and attended Sunday School regularly.
Possible reasons for the differences noted among non-delinquents, delinquents who committed auto theft without an accomplice, and delinquents who committed auto theft with one or more confederates are as follows:

1. The high F scores observed in both delinquent groups may be explained by noting that a young subject going through a period of rebellion against his family and his traditional values and mores may respond to some of the F items in a way different from someone either more accepting of family domination or free from such ties and demands. A low F score denotes persons relatively free of stress, or those who are overly defensive and are taking great pains to cover up whatever emotional tension and distress they may be experiencing.

2. Elevated K scores as indicated by the non-delinquent subjects may be explained in terms of high self-acceptance. One of the reasons why a subject answers items considered socially and personally desirable as true about himself is that he is quite satisfied with himself.

3. Elevated D scores, while not greatly marked, as in the case of both delinquent groups, might indicate a social distance and reserve. They might also be described as generally dissatisfied, but particularly self-dissatisfied, and lack confidence in their own ability.

4. Scale Pd, which was the most pronounced score of the three groups, when coupled with the next highest scale score yields a general personality pattern. The most apparent
personality description of this investigation consists of the high point scales Pd and Ma, and each group appears to have a similar profile pattern with differences existing in degree, rather than type. Subjects possessing pronounced Pd and Ma scores, as group delinquents, seem to show manifestations of psychopathic behavior with hypomania energizing or activating the pattern. These people tend to be overactive, impulsive, irresponsible and untrustworthy, shallow and superficial in relationships. Non-delinquents indicated the same personality pattern, but in a much less notable degree, and solitary delinquents revealed a Pd scaled score to a similar degree as group delinquents, but lacked the degree of hypomania to energize or activate the pattern that group delinquents possessed.

5. Elevated Pa scores, as revealed by both delinquent groups, may be explained in terms of being rather sensitive and emotional, with feelings of being mistreated or threatened.

6. High Sc scores, also revealed by both delinquent groups, may be considered in terms of those subjects who have a tendency to distort some aspects of the world, perceiving it differently than others and reacting to it in unusual ways.

7. High Ma scores, as observed by group delinquents, seem to be related to enthusiasm and energy. When this becomes abnormal, the activity may lead to antisocial acts or to irrational manic behavior. Young people are normally characterized by a considerable amount of the factor this scale measures, and
when it exists in excess, they become restless and frequently stir up excitement for excitement's sake alone. The fact that solitary delinquents scored somewhat lower on this scale than group delinquents may be explained by noting that they did not have the need to belong to a group of peers for the purpose of deriving excitement.

8. The slightly elevated Si score by solitary delinquents, while well within acceptable limits, may approach those subjects described as rigid and inflexible in thought and action, overly controlled and inhibited, and lacking confidence in their own abilities.

9. The higher IQ scores of non-delinquents may be explained by considering why delinquent scores are lower. A possible explanation for lower IQ scores among delinquents is that because they are less intelligent, they have difficulty achieving scholastic success as well as other attainments, and resort to a behavior that is rewarding among other delinquents. Another possible explanation for lower IQ scores among delinquents is that they have a tendency to act out instead of dealing symbolically with their environment, and abstract reasoning is a primary factor among IQ tests.
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