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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

During adolescence many boys and girls come in conflict with the mores and laws of society to a degree that classifies them as being juvenile delinquents, and necessitates their being placed in institutions for care, training, and rehabilitation. Studies which shed light on a better understanding of these institutionalized delinquents should benefit society in general.

Feelings of insecurity appear to be common to all men. Insecurity, according to Adler, originates in early childhood, when the child becomes vaguely aware that he cannot cope effectively with all aspects of the surrounding environment. A feeling that he is incapable of independent existence becomes apparent to a child in early childhood, and eventually he becomes conscious of his inability to single-handedly cope with the challenges of life. Thus, every child has a predisposition toward feelings of insecurity (1, pp. 69-71).

If feelings of insecurity are common to mankind, as stated by Adler, then the effect of feelings of insecurity on adolescent delinquency should be considered as well as the relationship between feelings of insecurity and its effect on other personality variables.
Statement of the Problem

This study was an investigation of the relationship between feelings of insecurity of institutionalized delinquent boys and the following personality variables: Ascendancy, Responsibility, Emotional Stability, Sociability, Cautiousness, Original Thinking, Personal Relations, and Vigor.

Hypotheses

Using the two extremes for significant emphasis, it is hypothesized that subjects with high feelings of insecurity will have lower mean scores on other personality variables than subjects with above average feelings of security.

The following testable predictions are hypothesized:

I. There will be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Ascendancy.

II. There will be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Responsibility.

III. There will be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Emotional Stability.

IV. There will be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Sociability.

V. There will be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Cautiousness.
VI. There will be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Original Thinking.

VII. There will be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Personal Relations.

VIII. There will be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Vigorousness.

IX. There will be significantly fewer recidivists in the group with above average feelings of security than in the group with high feelings of insecurity.

X. There will be a significant difference in the ages of subjects with high feelings of insecurity and those with above average feelings of security.

XI. Subjects with high feelings of insecurity will have a significantly lower Ascendancy score than those with above average feelings of security.

XII. Subjects with high feelings of insecurity will have a significantly lower Responsibility score than those with above average feelings of security.

XIII. Subjects with high feelings of insecurity will have a significantly lower Emotional Stability score than those with above average feelings of security.
XIV. Subjects with high feelings of insecurity will have a significantly lower Sociability score than those with above average feelings of security.

XV. Subjects with high feelings of insecurity will have a significantly higher Cautiousness score than those with above average feelings of security.

XVI. Subjects with high feelings of insecurity will have a significantly lower Original Thinking score than those with above average feelings of security.

XVII. Subjects with high feelings of insecurity will have a significantly lower Personal Relations score than those with above average feelings of security.

XVIII. Subjects with high feelings of insecurity will have a significantly lower Vigor score than those with above average feelings of security.

Definition of Terms

Security-Insecurity. This term is used here to indicate the feelings a person has regarding his environment and other persons concerning feelings of being rejected or accepted, and viewing the world as being threatening, or dangerous to him, on the insecure side, or being warm and friendly to him on the secure side, according to performance on the S-I Inventory.
Ascendancy. This term is used here to indicate the degree of self-assertiveness a person has, according to his performance on the Gordon Personal Profile.

Responsibility. This term is used to indicate the degree to which a person can be relied on to stick to the job which is assigned to him, as measured by his performance on the GPP.

Emotional Stability. This term is used to indicate the degree to which a person is free from excessive anxieties, and nervous tension, as measured by his performance on the GPP.

Sociability. This term is used here to indicate the degree to which a person is gregarious, as measured by his performance on the GPP.

Cautiousness. This term is used here to indicate the degree to which a person is careful in making decisions or taking chances, according to his performance on the Gordon Personal Inventory.

Original Thinking. This term is used to indicate the degree to which a person enjoys thought-provoking questions and discussions, according to the GPI.

Personal Relations. This term is used to indicate the degree to which a person is tolerant and understanding of other people, as measured by his performance on the GPI.

Vigor. This term is used to indicate the degree to which a person is energetic, as measured by his performance on the GPI.
Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the responses of the subjects to the personality variables in this study were reliable responses to patterns ingrained in their personalities.

Method

Population

The present study was based on a sample of 151 boys at the State School for Boys at Gatesville, Texas. The subjects were in Hilltop School. Twenty-eight were from the eighth grade, twenty-eight from the ninth grade, fifty-two from the tenth grade, forty-one from the eleventh grade, and two from the twelfth grade.

Classification Procedure

The boys were classified as being above average in feelings of security (secure group), average in feelings of security (average group), or below average in feelings of insecurity (insecure group) by their scores on the Security-Insecurity Inventory (6). The secure group consisted of fifteen boys, and the average group had forty-six. The insecure group consisted of ninety subjects.

A random sampling of classes was used to select the subjects. The classes at Hilltop School were assembled in the auditorium of the school, and the tests administered to all subjects at the same time. To preserve anonymity each
subject was given a number which was used on his inventories rather than the use of his name.

Description of the Test Instruments

The S-I Inventory (7), developed by Maslow, was used to classify the boys as either secure, average, or insecure. The S-I Inventory is a paper and pencil test of seventy-five items, which measure feelings of security-insecurity in the individual. The subject marks an "X" in one of three columns at the right of the sentence headed "Yes," "No," or "?" A sampling of the questions in the S-I Inventory follows:

1. Do you ordinarily like to be with people rather than alone?   Yes  No  ?
2. Do you have social ease?                                    Yes  No  ?
3. Do you lack self-confidence?                                 Yes  No  ?
4. Do you feel that you get enough praise? (7)                  Yes  No  ?

The feelings of security-insecurity which Maslow intended for the S-I Inventory to measure were: feelings of being rejected on the insecure side, with feelings of being accepted on the secure side; feelings of isolation as opposed to feelings of belonging; anxiety as opposed to lack of anxiety; perception of the world as dangerous, and people as essentially evil, as opposed to perception of the world as benevolent and people as essentially good; and continual striving for safety as opposed to a feeling of safety and security (6).
The S-I Inventory is an outgrowth of clinical and theoretical research by Maslow. Validation of the test, as reported in the manual, was mostly from clinical study, resulting in construction of the test. It was not possible to validate the test with external criteria, but Maslow used other checks. Some students who had taken the test were asked to compare the test score with their own opinion of themselves, with eighty-eight per cent judging the test to be extremely or fairly accurate. Further validation came from students who sought psychotherapeutic help or advice, also generally had insecure scores (6).

To check reliability, Maslow used the split-half method, sorting out the questions measuring each of the syndromes, and pairing them. The split-half reliability was .91 (6).

The Gordon Personal Profile (GPP). This instrument was developed by Leonard V. Gordon (4). The GPP was used to measure Ascendancy, Responsibility, Emotional Stability, and Sociability (5). The GPP has eighteen items which measure each of the four personality characteristics, and is divided into eighteen tetrads. A tetrad consists of four statements, each measuring a specific personality trait (4). The subject answers two questions in each tetrad by placing a mark in the proper column opposite the question which is most like him, and one which is least like him. The following tetrad is an example of the questions in the GPP:
a good mixer socially                      .......
lacking self-confidence                     .......
thorough in any work undertaken              .......
tends to be somewhat emotional (5)           .......

Validity is mostly based on the forced-choice technique, which assumes that when two items which generally have the same preference value are presented, a person will tend to pick the item which is most like himself, and the same is true for the item which is least like the person making the choice; he will pick the item which is least like himself when presented two items of general preference value (4, pp. 11-12). One study conducted at Antioch College with the GPP using the peer rating method was significant at the .01 level. At the end of the school year fifty-five men and sixty-three women dormitory students were given the test, and then every member rated every other member of a dormitory section on each of the four personality traits. Product-moment correlations were used (4, pp. 13-14).

For reliability, split-half methods indicated the reliability coefficients to be above .80 in all cases (4, p. 21). Several studies reported in the manual were made to establish reliability, with results indicating support of the claims (4, pp. 23-24).

The Gordon Personal Inventory (GPI). This test was used to measure Cautiousness, Original Thinking, Personal Relations, and Vigor.
The GPI is complementary to the GPP. Construction of the GPI is similar to the GPP. Twenty items measure each of the four traits, with twenty tetrads, which consist of four sentences to each tetrad. The following tetrad is an example of the GPI:

```
M   L
a very original thinker . . . . . . . . .
a somewhat slow and leisurely person . . . .
tends to be somewhat critical of others . . . .
takes decisions only after a great deal of thought (3) . . . . . . . . . . . . .
```

Validity evidence of the GPI is similar to the validity evidence for the GPP, and was obtained by the forced-choice technique (2, p. 10). In addition, the manual reports several studies, indicating support to the claims of validity (2, p. 10). The GPI was used in one naval study of recruits assigned to radio school. The product-moment correlations between final grades and scores on the GPI indicated a relationship at the .01 level of confidence for Original Thinking and Vigor (2, p. 14). In another study using the GPI, product-moment correlation coefficients were obtained between the ninety company commanders' GPI scores and the average of the basic training grades made by their first two companies. Cautiousness correlated at the .01 level (2, p. 13). In another naval study with frogmen, biserial correlations were computed for a pass-fail criterion and the GPI. Personal Relations were significant at the .01 level (2, p. 14).
Reliability for the GPI was established by use of the split-half technique, and the results supported the claims (2, p. 17).

Procedure for Treating the Data

The subjects were classified into secure, average, and insecure groups through their responses on the S-I Inventory, and then the eight personality variables were measured through use of the Gordon Personal Profile and Gordon Personal Inventory.

The hypotheses were tested through use of Fisher's t technique and the degree of relationship through use of product-moment coefficients of correlation.


CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Feelings of Insecurity

Alfred Adler is one of the most outstanding investigators of the concept of feelings of insecurity. Adler sometimes uses the words incomplete, insecurity, and inferiority synonymously. These feelings can always be found as the central motive in the field of forces which drive the individual toward a goal of perfection. Arising from the helplessness and imperfection of childhood, the individual strives toward a security-giving culture. According to Adler, feelings of insecurity are motives behind the behavior of the individual (3, pp. 50-58).

W. Beran Wolfe (1, p. 9) wrote that in order for the human organism to make continued existence tolerable, the human organism strives for a measure of security and totality. Adler states:

All persons feel inadequate in certain situations. They feel overwhelmed by the difficulties of life and are incapable of meeting them single-handed. Hence one of the strongest tendencies in man has been to form groups in order that he may live as a member of a society and not as an idolated individual (3, p. 60).

Horney indicated that sometimes there are disturbances which are obvious to no one but the individual himself, among which are feelings of inadequacy, or immaturity (11, p. 20).
Adler emphasized the principle of change in growth when he wrote: "To live means to develop" (3, p. 31). This development goes on all through the life of a human being as the individual tries to carry out a never ending effort to establish a favorable relationship between the individual and the surrounding world. The striving for victorious adaptation to the external world is an innate factor in all men.

All individuals have an innate social interest, but it must be developed by upbringing and guidance of the individual's creative power. In training, the individual should become aware of this social interest and its relationship to his striving toward perfection. A common characteristic to all failures in life's goal is a feeling of insecurity (3, pp. 89-90). Adler believed all problems are social in nature, with their solution depending upon how well prepared the individual is to make contact with other individuals. Individuals who are failures, such as neurotics, psychotics, criminals, etc., are developed this way because of inadequate preparation in social interest. These individuals are non-cooperative, and more or less run opposite to the rest of the world, being asocial if not anti-social. Adler wrote that he felt children who felt insecure have not developed the inclination for social achievement and cooperation. In this striving to reach the goal of perfection, some individuals set for themselves a goal of perfection which appears
to contradict reason when they leave the tasks of life unsolved in order that they may not suffer certain defeats (3, pp. 33-34). In another publication Adler indicates that the human organism is goal-directed, striving toward a goal with every psychic movement being made to coordinate (2, p. 32).

The fixing of this goal takes place during the formative years of childhood, asserts Adler. When this goal becomes established, the individual's apperception falls into an established line of direction. The person then does not perceive the situations as they actually exist, but sees them in the light of his own prejudices and interests.

A person's goal direction also dominates his feelings, and individuals justify their attitudes by their feelings.

We conclude that the feelings always agree with the individual's viewpoint of his tasks; they strengthen the individual in his bent for activity. We always do that which we would do even without the feelings, and the feelings are simply an accompaniment of our acts (2, pp. 41-42).

Feelings of insecurity have many positive aspects, and should not be looked upon as necessarily being a form of maladjustment, unless the feelings of insecurity are at an extreme. Feelings of inferiority can be a motivating force in the process of socialization. Adler states:

In the end all great accomplishments stem from the blessed struggle with the needs of childhood--be they organ inferiorities, pampering, or oppressing circumstances--as long as the child, at the time of his oppression, has already learned the active adaptation to cooperation (3, p. 54).
Karen Horney states that the wish to dominate, win prestige, or acquire wealth, was not a neurotic trend itself any more than the desire for affection (12, pp. 162-163). The striving for power in the normal person may be due to his realization of superior ability, or some particular cause such as political or professional group. The striving for power in the neurotic comes from anxiety, and feelings of inferiority. Inner insecurity is one of the features of neurotics who express themselves in dependence upon others (12, pp. 36-37).

Feelings of inferiority, inadequacy, and insecurity determine the goal of an individual's existence, wrote Adler, and as the child grows, he tries to rid himself of his feelings of insecurity by means of compensation (4, p. 72). Life for the individual and the group, according to Adler, is a process of compensation (3, p. 27). Social interest is the compensatory factor in man's feelings of inferiority (3, p. 27).

Maslow looked at insecurity as a syndrome rather than a cause. In developing his classification of specific feelings of insecurity, Maslow gained his ideas from others such as Adler, Horney, Dollard, Fromm, Lewin, and Goldstein, mostly through discussion. Maslow also studied persons who were obviously insecure to the extreme. With each person Maslow studied, the vague notion of insecurity-security became more clear and specific. Maslow chose about three dozen people,
and attempted to "understand" them. Another method used by Maslow was to gather information from autobiographies written by some of his students. To make a cultural study, Maslow took a summer-long trip, and studied security and self-esteem among the Northern Blackfoot Indians. During this time, Maslow gathered material for a paper and pencil test on security-insecurity (16, pp. 331-344).

Maslow listed fifteen specific psychodynamics of security-insecurity feelings in his article "The Dynamics of Psychological Security-Insecurity" (16, pp. 331-344). In an insecure person Maslow always found a "continual, never dying longing for security." Maslow found that there was an almost "continual action toward regaining this individually defined security." Some of the responses to failure of these attempts were labeled "discouragement reactions." Love lost or threatened loss might bring about aggression in an insecure person, and this hostility could be defined as "revenge reactions." To prevent further loss of love, an insecure person might use such behavior as reaction formation, or might use one of the various flight or avoidance defense reactions. Sometimes an insecure person uses ameliorative reactions. An insecure person may attack with reactions upon the situations "which bring about the insecurity in an attempt to change them." Although self-esteem and insecurity are separate variables, they tend to correlate with each other, and an attack upon security is responded to also as an attack.
upon self-esteem. The dynamic reaction here can be seen in compensation as analyzed by Alfred Adler. When an insecure person loses love, respect, or is rejected, he will tend to hide it from himself as long as possible. An insecure person looks upon the world in an insecure way, tending to be blind to the facts which run counter to his feeling that he is insecure. Vicious circles are set in motion, so that an insecure person's reactions have an effect on other people in such a way that this tends to perpetuate and reinforce the feelings of insecurity. An insecure person narrows the world in which he lives, thereby limiting his base of security.

The more a person is insecure, the more exaggerated and unreal become his concepts of security. Habits which are originally set up for one function may carry over when a person changes position from insecurity to security, or vice versa. In formulating this concept, Maslow used the example of a secure person who is also stingy. Secure and insecure persons tend to hang on to or "defend" their defenses which have been built up during their lifetime of problem-solving. Freud, according to Maslow, discussed this phenomenon as "resistance."

Maslow sums up his concept of the dynamics of insecurity:

Thus, it would be fair to say, if we were forced to give a short description of the insecure person for the sake of discussion, that he is a person who feels unconsciously rejected and consciously unhappy, unstable and conflicted, who perceives the world and the people in it as dangerous to him, who reacts to these conscious and unconscious feelings by attempting to win back security in various ways, but who by the very reason that he attempts to win it back guarantees its perpetuation or even intensification, unless some "good"
external influence intervenes into the vicious circle to put him on the correct path (16, p. 344).

Isenberg indicated that modern man was ill at ease, and modern man's attempt to hide his inner confusion, doubt, hesitancy, and insecurity, was futile (15, p. 2).

Personality Variables in Delinquents

Hurlock reported that today there was wide acceptance that no "delinquent type" exists, but that a delinquent is an ordinary boy or girl who is the product of interrelationships existing between forces which produce an individual personality (14, p. 341).

One of the outstanding characteristics of an adolescent delinquent is educational retardation, which, according to Cole, could partly be explained by the slight intellectual inferiority which is also characteristic among delinquent adolescents (8, p. 467).

Delinquents, according to Horrocks, tend to direct their social activities toward the gang-type of group, and avoid the adult-sponsored group (13, pp. 144-145). Horrocks indicated that he believed the delinquent to have a larger number of companions and a more active social life than his non-delinquent counterpart. Cole reported that Hathaway and Monachesi found, by use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, that delinquents were irresponsible, defiant, suspicious, destructive, overactive, and extroverted (8, p. 472).
Hurlock indicates that the unsocialized, aggressive delinquent felt deprived, rejected, misunderstood, and insecure. "Temperamentally, he is restlessly energetic, impulsive, extroverted, aggressive, and often sadistic. His attitude is hostile, defiant, resentful, stubborn, unconventional, and non-submissive to authority." The unsocialized delinquent is better accepted by his peers than by society. The socialized delinquent is not very persistent, goal-striving, dependable in action or consistency, and is irresponsible. The emotionally disturbed delinquent feels inadequate in any situation, is easily discouraged and depressed, is sly, seclusive, has few friends, and has a strong urge for crowd companionship (14, pp. 352-353). Cole reports that adolescent delinquents tend to be emotionally immature, with the emotional age being below both the delinquent's mental and chronological age (8, p. 470). Although adolescent delinquents are unpopular with school teachers and authorities, they are "sociable" and can make contacts with others very easily (8, p. 496). According to Cole, the adolescent delinquent's maladjustment is largely due to hostile and anti-social motivation, rather than due to basic social skills (8, p. 469). Horrocks indicates that there is a relationship between acceptance-rejection and dominance-submission (13, pp. 41-45).

Feelings of social insecurity, among delinquents, is related to personal appearance. A study of nicknames reported by Hurlock indicates that nicknames most disliked by adolescents
were those which refer to anomalies of physical development (4, p. 54).

One of the predisposing causes of adolescent delinquency, according to Hurlock, is a low grade of intelligence, although low-grade intelligence is not a direct cause, since many bright adolescents also come in conflict with the law. Most delinquents have not adopted for their own moral values which are widely accepted by society, but have attached themselves to the lower moral values. Although the delinquent may follow anti-social patterns, he gets along well with his age-mates, generally, sometimes showing leadership qualities. He is not socially maladjusted, but is well-adjusted to the group to which he belongs, with the standards of his group being unacceptable to society (14, pp. 345-347).

Related Research

In a study by Harrison Gough using the S-I Inventory and the MMPI, it was found that the weights assigned to the S-I by Maslow for scoring, could be discarded, and the raw score of + and -1 could be assigned to the questions, thereby eliminating the use of weighted scores. Gough also found that there was a high correlation between the psychathenic scale of the MMPI, which resembles most nearly the ordinary personality, and the S-I. Gough found that performance on the S-I was not influenced by intelligence, academic performance, socio-economic status, but that there were certain sex differences in the correlation. Hypochondriacal complaints
were more prominent among girls than among boys in relation to security-insecurity. From a table of \( t \) scores Gough obtained, based upon a population of 260 high school seniors, he suggested that a \( t \) score of seventy and over could be taken as indicative of a critical level of insecurity (10, pp. 257-261).

Bennett and Jordan used the \( S-I \) in a study to determine the relationship and direction of aggressive responses to frustration. The *Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration* study was used and correlated with the \( S-I \). Bennett and Jordan hypothesized "that persons having high scores on security measures will tend to be impunitive; while those having low scores will tend to be extrapunitive." The subjects were 109 college students. Results of the study indicated that the insecure group was more extrapunitive than the secure group, and the secure group was more impunitive than the insecure group, but the hypothesis that insecure individuals are intropunitive was rejected (5, pp. 166-167).

Smith used the \( S-I \) in a study of Sheldon's work on physique and temperament. Smith hypothesized that: "Security feelings are related to mesomorphy, next, to endomorphy, and least, to ectomorphy." Smith correlated the scores on the \( S-I \) with mesomorphy, endomorphy, and ectomorphy, and found that, although the results were not significant, the order of correlation was consistent with the hypotheses (20, pp. 316-317).
In an exploratory study of gamblers, Morris used the S-I, predicting that gamblers would show lower security than non-gamblers, but the results reversed the predictions, indicating that gamblers tended to be more secure than non-gamblers (18, pp. 191-192).

Breese used the S-I and the GPP, among other instruments, in an unpublished doctoral dissertation at Cornell University. Breese's study compared academic underachievers in high school. Breese found that underachievers gave more expression of feelings of insecurity, saw themselves as less responsible, and less ascendant than those who were designated as achievers (7, p. 90).

W. J. Tucker and John J. Painter, in a study at the University of Texas, used the GPP to relate personality and product use. Tucker and Painter concluded that there was clearly indicated a relationship between product use and personality traits, but that the relationship was not particularly strong, and certainly less strong than popular marketing concepts (21, pp. 325-329).

In a study by Gordon and Stapleton, the GPP was administered to juniors and seniors in a small high school, and three months later the GPP was administered again. The purpose of the study was to determine if students would answer the questions in the test differently if they had different motives behind taking the test. The students were given the test for guidance purposes. Later, students who had taken
the test previously, and were applying for jobs, were given the test as an employment test, and students not wanting jobs were given the test again for guidance purposes. The results indicated that the profile pattern did not change substantially in the retest (9, pp. 285-295).

Phelan, Stein, and Weissman used the GPI in an exploratory study of some personality characteristics in relation to taking risks in business. The cautiousness subscores were used, and the subjects were divided into groups. The groups were then paired against each other in all combinations, and played the business game "Management." Results indicated that the cautious groups tended to be more conservative, and the impulsive groups more radical in their bidding, regardless of the feedback information in the game, pertaining to monetary losses (19, p. 401).

Monachesi, in a study using the MMPI, attempted to differentiate certain personality characteristics of institutionalized and non-institutionalized delinquents. Monachesi assumed that delinquent boys committed to an institution would, on the average, have more personality maladjustment than those on probation, or non-delinquents. The results found by Monachesi were that there was no significant difference between institutionalized delinquent boys and delinquent boys on probation, or non-delinquent boys, as measured by the MMPI (17, pp. 167-179).
In his comparative study of delinquents and non-delinquents, Birkness and Johnson found that grade repetition was higher for delinquents than non-delinquents, with non-delinquents excelling scholastically the delinquents by an appreciable margin. Non-delinquents were much superior in creativity than delinquents. In responsibility and resourcefulness, non-delinquents were rated more than twice as high as delinquents. In feelings of insecurity in their social relations thirty-two per cent of the delinquents appeared to feel secure, while eighty-four per cent of the non-delinquents appeared to feel secure, strongly indicating non-delinquents feel more secure in their social relations than do delinquents. Concerning purposefulness, only twenty per cent of the delinquents were rated as being purposeful, while sixty per cent of the non-delinquents were rated as purposeful, indicating almost three times as many non-delinquents were purposeful as delinquents. Forty per cent of the delinquents were rated as being vague, while only eight per cent of the non-delinquents were so rated, indicating that delinquents were more likely to drift without decisiveness and persistence than non-delinquents. In concern for others, almost twice as many non-delinquents rated as considering the welfare of themselves and others, than delinquents. In emotional stability, almost half of the delinquents studied were rated as being emotionally stable, as compared to approximately one-eighth of the non-delinquents who were rated as unstable (6, pp. 561-572).
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CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

It was generally hypothesized that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have lower mean scores on the personality variables used in this study than those with above average feelings of security. Eighteen testable hypotheses were examined.

Of the eighteen testable hypotheses, thirteen were accepted, and five were rejected. Results using the product-moment coefficient indicated that there was a negative correlation between feelings of insecurity and Ascendancy, Emotional Stability, Personal Relations, Sociability, Original Thinking, and Vigor—the higher the feelings of insecurity, the lower will be the scores on these personality variables. There appears to be no correlation between Cautiousness and Responsibility. Using Fisher's $t$ technique, the results indicated that there was a significant difference between the mean scores for the secure and insecure groups on Ascendancy, Responsibility, Emotional Stability, Sociability, Original Thinking, Personal Relations, and Vigor. The secure group made significantly higher scores on these personality variables than did the insecure group. There did not appear to be a significant difference between the two groups on number of Recidivists, Age, and Cautiousness.
Table I indicates the means for the personality variables, age, and recidivism of the groups.

**TABLE I**

MEANS FOR EACH GROUP ON EIGHT PERSONALITY VARIABLES, AGE AND RECIDIVISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Variable</th>
<th>Above Average in Security N 15</th>
<th>Average in Security N 46</th>
<th>Below Average in Security N 90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>18.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td>20.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>24.98</td>
<td>21.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>20.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>19.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Thinking</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>22.87</td>
<td>21.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Relations</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>19.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor</td>
<td>27.87</td>
<td>23.26</td>
<td>20.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Recidivists</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II presents the correlations between adolescent boys with feelings of insecurity and the eight personality variables.

**TABLE II**
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ADOLESCENT BOYS WITH FEELINGS OF INSECURITY AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Variables</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy</td>
<td>-.3223</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>-.1223</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-.2890</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>-.2488</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>-.1861</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Thinking</td>
<td>-.2147</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Relations</td>
<td>-.2441</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor</td>
<td>-.2330</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first hypothesis stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Ascendancy. Table II indicates that there is a significant negative relationship at the .05 level of confidence; therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

The second hypothesis stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Responsibility. Table II indicates there is no significant
relationship between feelings of insecurity and Responsibility; Hypothesis Two is rejected.

The third hypothesis stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Emotional Stability. Table II indicates that there is a significant negative relationship at the .05 level of confidence; therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

The fourth hypothesis stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Sociability. Table II indicates that there is a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Sociability at the .05 level of confidence; therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

The fifth hypothesis stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Cautiousness. Table II indicates that there is no significant relationship between feelings of insecurity and Cautiousness; therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

The sixth hypothesis stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Original Thinking. Table II indicates that there is a significant relationship between feelings of insecurity and Original Thinking at the .05 level of confidence; therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

The seventh hypothesis stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity
and Personal Relations. Table II indicates that there is a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Personal Relations at the .05 level of confidence; therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

The eighth hypothesis stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Vigorousness. Table II indicates that there is a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Vigor; therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

Table III presents data pertinent to Hypotheses Ten through Eighteen. The difference between means on personality variables for the secure and insecure groups is presented in Table III. Fisher's $t$, with significance at the .01 level of confidence, is accepted.

The ninth hypothesis stated that there would be significantly fewer recidivists in the group with above average feelings of security than in the group with high feelings of insecurity. Table III indicates that there was no significant difference in the number of recidivists; therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

The tenth hypothesis stated that there would be a significant difference in the ages of subjects with high feelings of insecurity and those with above average feelings of security. Table III indicates that there is no significant difference in the ages of the group with high feelings of
TABLE III

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS ON PERSONALITY VARIABLES, AGE, AND RECIDIVISM FOR THE SECURE AND INSECURE GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Variables</th>
<th>Means Secure</th>
<th>Means Insecure</th>
<th>Standard Error of Difference</th>
<th>Fisher's t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Recidivists</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascendancy</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>27.47</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cautiousness</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Thinking</td>
<td>26.67</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Relations</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor</td>
<td>27.80</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

insecurity and those with above average feelings of security; therefore, the hypothesis is rejected.

The eleventh hypothesis stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Ascendancy score than those with above average feelings of security. Table III indicates that there was a lower Ascendancy score for
the insecure group, significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis is accepted.

The twelfth hypothesis stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Responsibility score than those with above average feelings of security. Table III indicates that there was a lower Responsibility score for the insecure group, significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis is accepted.

The thirteenth hypothesis stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Emotional Stability score than those with above average feelings of security. Table III indicates that there was a lower Emotional Stability score for the insecure group, significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis is accepted.

The fourteenth hypothesis stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Sociability score than those with above average feelings of security. Table III indicates that there was a lower Sociability score for the insecure group, significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis is accepted.

The fifteenth hypothesis stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly higher Cautiousness score than those with above average feelings of security. Table III indicates that there was no significant difference in the Cautiousness scores of the two groups. The hypothesis is rejected.
The sixteenth hypothesis stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Original Thinking score than those with above average feelings of security. Table III indicates that there was a lower Original Thinking score for the insecure group, significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis is accepted.

The seventeenth hypothesis stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Personal Relations score than those with above average feelings of security. Table III indicates that there was a lower Personal Relations score for the insecure group, significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis is accepted.

The eighteenth hypothesis stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Vigor score than those with above average feelings of security. Table III indicates that there was a lower Vigor score for the insecure group, significant at the .01 level of confidence. The hypothesis is accepted.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of feelings of insecurity and the relationship to other personality variables among institutionalized adolescent boys. The study was limited to the population in Hilltop School, at the State School for Boys at Gatesville, Texas. To measure the level of security, the Security-Insecurity Inventory was used, and the subjects classified as secure, average, or insecure. To measure the other personality variables, The Gordon Personal Profile and The Gordon Personal Inventory were used. Statistical techniques utilized mean, Fisher's $t$, and product-moment correlations. A total of 151 subjects participated in the study. There were fifteen boys in the secure group, forty-six in the average group, and ninety in the insecure group. Of the eighteen testable hypotheses, thirteen were accepted, and five rejected.

Findings

Results of the study indicated that there was a negative relation between Ascendancy, Emotional Stability, Sociability, Original Thinking, Personal Relations, and Vigor. Comparing the difference between the means on personality variables for
the secure and the insecure groups, the conclusions drawn were that the insecure group made significantly lower scores than the secure group on Ascendancy, Responsibility, Emotional Stability, Sociability, Original Thinking, Personal Relations, and Vigor.

Hypothesis I, which stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Ascendancy, was accepted.

Hypothesis II, which stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Responsibility, was rejected.

Hypothesis III, which stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Emotional Stability, was accepted.

Hypothesis IV, which stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Sociability, was accepted.

Hypothesis V, which stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Cautiousness, was rejected.

Hypothesis VI, which stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Original Thinking, was accepted.

Hypothesis VII, which stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Personal Relations, was accepted.
Hypothesis VIII, which stated that there would be a significant negative relationship between feelings of insecurity and Vigorousness, was accepted.

Hypothesis IX, which stated that there would be fewer recidivists in the group with above average feelings of security, was rejected.

Hypothesis X, which stated that there would be a significant difference in the ages of subjects with high feelings of insecurity and those with above average feelings of security, was rejected.

Hypothesis XI, which stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Ascendancy score than those with above average feelings of security, was accepted.

Hypothesis XII, which stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Responsibility score than those with above average feelings of security, was accepted.

Hypothesis XIII, which stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Emotional Stability score than those with above average feelings of security, was accepted.

Hypothesis XIV, which stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Sociability score than those with above average feelings of security, was accepted.
Hypothesis XV, which stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly higher Cautiousness score than those with above average feelings of security, was rejected.

Hypothesis XVI, which stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Original Thinking score than those with above average feelings of security, was accepted.

Hypothesis XVII, which stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Personal Relations score than those with above average feelings of security, was accepted.

Hypothesis XVIII, which stated that subjects with high feelings of insecurity would have a significantly lower Vigor score than those with above average feelings of security, was accepted.

Conclusions

The following conclusions appear to be warranted by the data obtained in this study:

1. As scores on feelings of security-insecurity rise toward the insecure end of the continuum, among institutionalized adolescent boys, scores on Ascendancy, Emotional Stability, Personal Relations, Sociability, Original Thinking, and Vigor will drop to a lower level.
2. Institutionalized adolescent boys who are classified as insecure will tend to score lower on Ascendancy, Responsibility, Emotional Stability, Sociability, Original Thinking, Personal Relations, and Vigor, than those who are classified as secure.

Recommendations

Although the findings in this study do not establish a cause-effect relationship, there are implications for use of this information in counseling situations, especially in the use of supportive therapy.

The following suggestions are recommended for further study:

1. A parallel study of institutionalized adolescent girls can be made using the same tests and procedure.

2. A parallel study of average, non-institutionalized adolescent boys and girls can be made, and the results compared with this and similar studies.

3. Studies using similar personality variables from other personality tests and relating the variables to security-insecurity should be made.

4. Similar studies should be made utilizing the two extreme groupings, above average in feelings of security and below average in feelings of security.
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