

PERSONALITY FACTORS AND PSYCHO-SOCIAL CONDITIONS RELATED
TO TROUBLEMAKING BEHAVIOR IN NORMAL
INSTITUTIONALIZED CHILDREN

APPROVED:

Sidney Hamilton
Major Professor

Earl W. Kocker
Minor Professor

Swane Kingery
Dean of the School of Education

Robert B. Toulous
Dean of the Graduate School

PERSONALITY FACTORS AND PSYCHO-SOCIAL CONDITIONS RELATED
TO TROUBLEMAKING BEHAVIOR IN NORMAL
INSTITUTIONALIZED CHILDREN

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Coy F. Hollis, B. A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Related Literature	
Statement of the Problem	
Hypotheses	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations	
II. METHODOLOGY	13
Subjects	
Description of Measuring Instruments	
Procedure	
Statistical Treatment	
III. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	21
IV. DISCUSSION	28
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	36
Summary	
Conclusions	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	40

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Troublemakers and Non-Troublemakers According to Test Form	19
II. Means and Standard Deviations on the Elementary Form of the <u>California Test of Personality</u> for Non-Troublemakers and Troublemakers	22
III. Means and Standard Deviations on the Secondary Form of the <u>California Test of Personality</u> for Non-Troublemakers and Troublemakers	24
IV. Frequencies of Troublemakers and Non-Troublemakers According to Present Age Tested by Chi Square	25
V. Frequencies of Troublemakers and Non-Troublemakers According to "Age When Placed" Tested by Chi Square	25
VI. Frequencies of Troublemakers and Non-Troublemakers According to Length of Residence Tested by Chi Square	26
VII. Frequencies of Troublemakers and Non-Troublemakers According to Family Relations Tested by Chi Square	26
VIII. Frequencies of Troublemakers and Non-Troublemakers According to Siblings At Home Tested by Chi Square	27
IX. Frequencies of Troublemakers and Non-Troublemakers According to Peer Relations Tested by Chi Square	27

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Anyone who works with institutionalized children will have many encounters with deviant behavior. This does not mean necessarily that institutionalized children are more deviant in behavior than children living at home. However, because of massed living conditions, the relationship of worker to child instead of parent to child, and the need for control and order, deviant behavior in an institution is more noticeable. In order to give stability to living conditions and to encourage development of acceptable behavior patterns, deviant behavior must be understood in relationship to its source, method of expression, and its consequences.

Deviant behavior may result from many factors in a child's life. The source may lie embedded in the personality of the child as a result of occurrences during the developmental stage or it may be a learned pattern of reaction to frustration (12).

Donnelly (3) in describing the psycho-dynamics of the psychopath gave two types: those with antisocial reaction and those with dyssocial reaction. The difference was primarily a problem of superego formation on the one hand and superego management on the other. Those called "dyssocial"

had identified with and developed a superego consistent with that of their parents and not with society at large. Any aberrant features were reflections of the particular social concepts and practices of the parents. Those classified "antisocial reaction" were almost void of culturally acceptable superego values. They had little or no effect or feelings of guilt, could not form lasting relationships, and were convinced of their own knowledge and expertise. While all who behave in a deviant way are not psychopaths, it is believed that there is some degree of universality in the etiology of deviant behavior.

There are likewise many forms that reveal deviant behavior. For some children deviant behavior is deeply ingrained in their personality and has become a way of life. It may or may not be very noticeable or disturbing, but they appear to be "out of step" with the rest of society. Expressions such as, "He couldn't do anything right if he tried" or "He always puts the wrong foot forward" or "If there's trouble he's in it," typically describe such persons. The continuum may run from this extreme to the persons who display infrequent outbursts of antisocial behavior.

Related Literature

Bower (1) in describing deviant behavior said that it differs from normal to a marked extent and over a period of time. Everyone will experience difficulty on occasion and

be required to find solutions to problems. The "normal" person can usually effect some solution without acting in a deviant manner.

The emotionally handicapped act in some deviant fashion not as a matter of choice but of necessity because they have less behavioral freedom. Their actions come as an interaction of personality and environmental factors. The deviations may be seen in several significant ways: inability to learn from past experience, inability to build or maintain interpersonal relationships, inappropriate types of behavior under normal conditions, undue depression, a tendency to develop illness, and behavior which has an automatic, repetitive pattern.

Edmiston and Baird (4) studied 1,058 children from eight orphanages to determine their adjustment as compared to a regular public school group. Some children went to school at the home and some went to public school. The home group attending public school were superior in self-reliance, feelings of personal worth, and freedom from nervous tendencies but were inferior in personal freedom and feelings of belonging to the home group attending their own school. The indication is that public school made them feel more capable, independent and worthy, but they did not fit into the setting and were cramped by it. The regular public school group compared favorably on self-reliance with the public school home group, the social skills of the entire home group, and both school and community relations. The study also showed that

outside contact was desirable and that adjustment decreased as residence lengthened.

Karson (6), using the Children's Personality Questionnaire or High School Personality Questionnaire, depending on the age of the testee, studied 189 boys from eight to twelve years of age who had been referred to a child guidance clinic to determine if there were any measurable personality differences between those classified as "personality problems" and "conduct problems." Those in the group classified as "personality problems" were sissyish, socially-oriented, sensitive, and had no record of acting out. Those in the "conduct problems" group were more dominant, impulsive, excitable, aggressive, and intelligent.

In most published literature it has been found that boys are more deviant in behavior than girls. The reverse of this may be true for institutionalized children. Kyllonen (8) said, "Among those children who, in the adolescent years, require such drastic measures as institutionalization, the girls are, as a group, more disturbed than the boys."

Lauterbach, Vogel, and Hart (10) made a study of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory protocols of behaviorally disturbed adolescent boys and their parents and found a lower correlation than that obtained for normal families. They also found the behaviorally disturbed sons showed more psychopathology than their parents. The parents

of disturbed sons identified less with each other than parents of normal sons. A positive high correlation was found between age and tendencies toward externalization which suggested that conflicts tend to be internalized by the younger sons but acted out by the older adolescents. The father-son identification and the mother-son identification were found to be equal.

Lapouse and Monk (9) conducted a study of behavior deviations in order to investigate several questions: Are there differences in the occurrence of behavior deviations between boys and girls? Does the prevalence of deviations change as children grow older? Are there variations according to socioeconomic class and race? Do deviations occur differentially in only children and children having brothers and sisters? Are certain subgroups more likely than others to deviate from the prevailing patterns of behavior characteristic of the general population of children? The children were rated by their parents in the areas of body control, behavior control, habits, and miscellaneous behavior.

The findings showed that boys are more often deviant than girls. The greater number of deviations occurred in the younger group--those between nine and twelve years of age. Negro children received more extreme scores than white children, while there was no appreciable difference in socioeconomic levels. No significant difference was found between

only children and children with siblings. The subgroups most likely to deviate, in order of descending vulnerability, were younger school-age children, Negro children, and boys.

Deviant behavior in men's residence halls was successfully predicted by Clark (2), using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). The study was done to explore the usefulness of the MMPI in predicting disciplinary type behavior in residence halls. MMPI profiles of men from the ten most troubled sections and the ten least troubled sections were compared for significance. It was found that more men in the troubled sections had higher scores on the psychopathic deviant, schizophrenic and hypomania scales (scales 4, 6 and 9) which Hathaway and Manochesi have called the exciter scales. The men in the least troubled sections of the residence halls had higher scores on the depression, masculinity-femininity and social introversion scales (scales 2, 5 and 0) which are called the suppressor scales. This study indicated the possible use of personality scales in studying deviant behavior.

Children who live in a residential child-care home live in what has been called a "total institution." This refers to a social structure where the inmates' existence centers regressively around intramural regulations established by a staff who have administrative power over them. In such a setting the residents will usually have positive feelings for

other residents and negative feelings for the institution as a whole. Fine and Offer (5) studied periodic outbursts of antisocial behavior in such a setting. They found that it was possible to predict the outburst of antisocial behavior by use of a rating scale.

They also found that the popularity of a person with the group was not positively related to misbehavior. There was a trend for an unpopular person to become more acceptable to the group as his behavior deviated more from the accepted norm. Those who were rejected from the group might gain acceptance if they acted out against the institution. Those already accepted by the group tended to act out less. Another interesting finding was that during periods of antisocial outbursts the children identified more with other children, and during periods of good behavior they tended to move more toward the adults. Those adults involved in the study became more acceptable to the children, who sensed their interest and desire to help.

Pierson and Kelly (11) took a different view of anxiety and its relationship to deviant behavior than some others. Using the High School Personality Questionnaire, they found that there was a very significant negative relationship between anxiety and delinquency. They found a negative correlation of .78 (N = 850) and concluded that the delinquent might not be "anxiety driven" but might lack anxiety as a

control. They also found a high positive correlation of .55 (N = 850) between delinquency potential and extroversion, and that the delinquent was more likely to show marked deviation on any number of scales rather than a definite pattern on any select scales. The key to predicting delinquency was the degree of deviation.

Zax, Izzo, Louis, and Trost (13) stressed the importance of early identification of the emotionally disturbed child. In his study with school children, using teacher ratings, grade-point averages, achievement, days absent, referrals to the school nurse, peer perception, and self-perception in order to locate the emotionally disturbed child, he found that negative peer perception impaired achievement.

It has long been acknowledged that the attitude of the parent is a factor in the behavior of the child. Their actions are often an extended expression of the attitudes of the parents. Kupferman and Ulmer (7) found the attitude of the parents toward a vocational rehabilitation program with delinquents determined its success or failure.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the present study was to discover the relationship of personality factors and certain psycho-social conditions related to the troublemaking behavior of normal institutionalized children.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were examined.

1. Non-troublemakers will have a significantly higher mean score on The California Test of Personality than troublemakers.
2. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers in the middle age range, 13 to 15, than non-troublemakers.
3. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers placed in an institution earlier than non-troublemakers.
4. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers in residence a shorter period of time than non-troublemakers.
5. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers rejected by their parents than non-troublemakers.
6. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers with siblings at home than non-troublemakers.
7. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers rejected by their peers than non-troublemakers.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were used in this study:

Troublemaker--a child who has a history of delinquency or acts out under stress and causes or encourages others to

act out although not directly involving himself, or a combination of these.

Non-troublemaker--a child who has no history of delinquency, does not act out under stress and does not cause or encourage others to act out.

Deviant Behavior--a child who acts out in a noticeable and destructive manner against the institution, adults in charge, or other children by stealing, fighting, destruction of property, deliberate disobedience of rules, or running away.

Normal Institutional Child--a child who has a normal measurable intelligence.

Limitations

The present study investigated only the children with emotional problems that acted out. There were a number of children who turned their hostility inward but were not recognized as troublemakers.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bower, Eli M., "The Emotionally Handicapped Child and the School," Exceptional Children, XXVI (September, 1959), 6-11.
2. Clark, D. L., "Exploring Behavior in Men's Residence Halls Using the MMPI," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (November, 1964), 249-251.
3. Donnelly, John, "Aspects of the Psychodynamics of the Psychopath," American Journal of Psychiatry, CXX (June, 1964), 1149-1154.
4. Edmiston, R. W. and Francis Baird, "The Adjustment of Orphanage Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XL (December, 1949), 482-488.
5. Fine, P. and D. Offer, "Periodic Outbursts of Antisocial Behavior," Archives of General Psychiatry, XIII (September, 1965), 240-251.
6. Karson, S., "Primary Factor Correlates of Boys with Personality and Conduct Problems," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXI (January, 1965), 16-18.
7. Kupferman, Saul C. and Raymond A. Ulmer, "An Experimental Total Push Program for Emotionally Disturbed Adolescents," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII (May, 1964), 894-898.
8. Kyllonen, Ronald R., "Behavior: Disturbed or Disturbing," National Education Association Journal, LIII (September, 1964), 50-52.
9. Lapouse, Rena and Mary A. Monk, "Behavior Deviations in a Representative Sample of Children: Variations by Sex, Age, Race, Social Class and Family Size," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXIV (April, 1964), 436-446.
10. Lauterbach, C. Q., N. Vogel, and J. Hart, "Comparison of the MMPI's of Male Problem Adolescents and Their Parents," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XVIII (October, 1962), 485-487.

11. Pierson, George R. and Robert F. Kelly, "Anxiety, Extroversion and Personality Idiosyncrasy in Delinquency," Journal of Psychology, LVI (October, 1963), 441-445.
12. Redl, Fritz and David Wineman, Children Who Hate, New York, Free Press, 1965.
13. Zax, Melvin, Emory T. Izzo, D. Louis, and Mary Ann Trost, "Identifying Emotional Disturbance in the School Setting," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXIV (April, 1964), 447-454.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The subjects were 76 children from a residential child care institution located in Dallas, Texas. The institution has a church affiliation but accepts children from any faith. The population consisted of 84 per cent white children, 15 per cent Latin Americans, and less than 1 per cent Negro children. Forty-five per cent of the subjects were boys and 55 per cent were girls. The children were kept by the home only during school-age years, and the ages ranged accordingly from six to nineteen. They were generally from lower socio-economic, culturally deprived families and only a small minority were from families with adequate financial support, the majority coming from homes which had collapsed both financially and emotionally.

Description of Measuring Instruments

Behavior is complex and is affected by many variables. Because of this complexity, three areas were studied in an attempt to find the sources of deviant behavior. These were

- (1) Personal adjustment,
- (2) Social adjustment, and

(3) Certain psycho-social conditions.

The first two areas were measured by the California Test of Personality, hereafter referred to as the CTP. In the area of personal adjustment six factors were measured. These factors were

- (1) Self-reliance,
- (2) Sense of Personal Worth,
- (3) Sense of Personal Freedom,
- (4) Feeling of Belonging,
- (5) Withdrawing Tendencies, and
- (6) Nervous Symptoms.

In the area of social adjustment, six factors were evaluated

- (1) Social Standards,
- (2) Social Skills,
- (3) Antisocial Tendencies,
- (4) Family Relations,
- (5) School Relations, and
- (6) Community Relations.

The reliability of the various sub-scales runs from .73 to .98. The reliability of the Total Adjustment for the three divisions used were (a) Elementary .94, (b) Intermediate .96, (c) Secondary .93. Some of the weaknesses and strengths of the test are pointed out by Sims (4). Sims does not think that six sub-scores under each of the two

components, social and personal adjustment, are needed for diagnosis but feels that for the total scores there is a fair degree of reliability. Sims further observes that the test is mechanically satisfactory and as personality inventories go is among the better ones available.

An instrument is considered valid if it measures that which it was intended to measure. If the instrument measures several factors, there may be several validities. Ellis (2) found that the CTP was more effective than the interview method in securing data if it was ego-involving and self-revelatory in nature. Cronbach (1) points out that many test forms permit responses not related to the design of the test because of "response sets." These in turn reduce the yes-no form, thus admitting unrelated responses which tend to increase validity.

Taylor and Combs (5) give evidence of the validity of the CTP in the area of self-acceptance and adjustment. It has long been held that well-adjusted persons can accept more self-damaging statements than the poorly adjusted. In a test using a list of damaging-to-self statements, the upper 50 per cent (better adjusted, according to the CTP) checked a larger number of self-damaging statements than the less well adjusted.

In a study done to determine the effectiveness of different techniques in personality evaluation by Jackson (3), the paper-and-pencil method was found to be superior. The

CTP is such a paper-and-pencil technique. An analysis of the five methods of evaluation studied showed the following values for the different methods in determining total adjustment: (a) CTP - 1.29, (b) Interview - 1.21, (c) Experience rating - .80, (d) Teacher rating - .64, and (e) Parent rating - 1.00. In spite of some criticisms, the test may be considered to be a reliable and valid instrument.

The third area, psycho-social conditions, was determined on the basis of the following six classifications:

1. Present age--This was divided into three groups to parallel their grade placement in school:
 - (a) Ages 6-12 representing elementary grades,
 - (b) Ages 13-15 representing junior high school, and
 - (c) Ages 16-19 representing high school.
2. Age when placed in the institution--The age division here was the same as used in present age.
3. Length of time in the institution--The division for this time is as follows:
 - (a) Under six months--This represents a period of adjustment to a new environment and the fact of separation from home.
 - (b) Between six months and two years--This represents the period when a person acquires the habits and patterns of living associated with institutional life.

- (c) Over two years--This represents the period when the child becomes resigned to the necessity of having to live in an institution and should have acquired some proficiency in maintaining himself in this setting. These divisions were based upon observation and not experimentation.

4. Reason for placement--This category was divided into two parts:

- (a) Dependent and neglected--Those who must live in an institution in order to have the necessities of life, and who have also been rejected by family members as evidenced by lack of a continuing relationship such as visits, letters, phone calls and gifts.
- (b) Dependent, not neglected--Those who must live in an institution in order to have the necessities of life but have not been rejected by family members as evidenced by a continued relationship such as visits, letters, phone calls and gifts.

5. Siblings still at home, which consisted of two groups:

- (a) Yes--Where the child had been selected as the one who would have to leave home while other siblings were permitted to stay.
- (b) No--Where the child was an only child or where all siblings had been placed in an institution.

6. Peer relations--This category was divided into three groups based on the judgment of the houseparents:

- (a) Leader--The one who initiates activity or takes the lead in activity initiated by others.
- (b) Follower--One who does not initiate activity and is influenced by others.
- (c) Isolates--Those who are excluded from group activity by their peers or their own choice.

Procedure

The children lived in a dormitory with a resident family in charge. It was believed that these houseparents were the best judges of behavior and knew more about the children than any other group on the campus. They were asked to align their children on a continuum of behavior beginning with the worst and going to the best. The criteria for the groups were those given in Chapter I.

After the continuum was established, a group of children was chosen in equal numbers from each end, thus gathering the extremes of behavior for study. Eight or ten children, four or five in each group, were chosen from each building, depending upon the size, so that each building would contribute its proportionate share of the total population. Thus the total number of children was 76, with 38 in each group. After the groups were formed, the information about psycho-social conditions was collected from the houseparents and case history records.

Those in each group were administered the California Test of Personality along with all other children. The subjects knew only that it was part of a larger testing program for the entire campus. The groups were mixed with each other and several other children in order to prevent them from thinking that they were a select group. The test has forms for ages ranging from kindergarten to college. In this study the "elementary" for grades 4 through 8, and "secondary" for grades 9 through 12 were used. The number of subjects and the test forms are presented in Table I.

TABLE I
TROUBLEMAKERS AND NON-TROUBLEMAKERS
ACCORDING TO TEST FORM

Classification	Elementary	Secondary
Troublemakers	26	12
Non-Troublemakers	25	13

Statistical Treatment

The hypothesis related to the CTP was tested by Fisher's t. Fisher's t was also computed for each subdivision and the total score. The hypotheses related to the psycho-social conditions were tested by Chi square. The .05 level of statistical significance was established for Fisher's t and Chi square.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Cronbach, Lee J., "Response Sets and Test Validity," Educational and Psychological Measurements, XI (Winter, 1964), 475-493.
2. Ellis, Albert, "Questionnaire Versus Interview Methods in the Study of Human Love Relationships," American Sociological Review, XII (February, 1947), 541-543.
3. Jackson, Joseph, "The Relative Effectiveness of Paper-Pencil Test, Interview and Ratings as Techniques for Personality Evaluation," Journal of Social Psychology, XXIII (February, 1946), 35-54.
4. Sims, Verner M., "Review: California Test of Personality," The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, edited by Oscar K. Buros, Highland Park, The Gryphon Press, 1959.
5. Taylor, Charles and Arthur W. Combs, "Self-Acceptance and Adjustment," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIV (April, 1952), 89-91.

CHAPTER III

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The variables of the California Test of Personality were tested by Fisher's t in order to determine if there were significant differences between them. The variables tested were as follows:

- (1) Self-Reliance,
- (2) Sense of Personal Worth,
- (3) Sense of Personal Freedom,
- (4) Feeling of Belonging,
- (5) Withdrawing Tendencies (freedom from),
- (6) Nervous Symptoms (freedom from),
- (7) Total Personal Adjustment,
- (8) Social Standards,
- (9) Social Skills,
- (10) Antisocial Tendencies,
- (11) Family Relations,
- (12) School Relations,
- (13) Community Relations,
- (14) Total Social Adjustment, and
- (15) Total Adjustment (personal and social).

The comparable age groups between the troublemakers and the non-troublemakers were tested against each other. Table II shows the data for the elementary group.

TABLE II

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE ELEMENTARY FORM OF
 THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY FOR
NON-TROUBLEMAKERS AND TROUBLEMAKERS

Variable Number	Non-Troublemakers		Troublemakers		Fisher's $\frac{t}{\bar{t}}$	P
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation		
1	7.72	1.887	6.46	1.474	2.607	.05
2	7.60	2.280	7.23	2.154	.583	NS
3	7.68	2.328	6.61	2.816	1.439	NS
4	9.28	2.010	7.50	2.620	2.661	.05
5	6.44	3.201	5.50	2.649	1.122	NS
6	7.48	2.729	6.31	3.086	1.407	NS
7	46.20	10.755	39.69	10.156	2.178	.05
8	9.88	1.862	8.65	2.759	1.817	NS
9	8.24	1.903	7.00	2.057	2.188	.05
10	8.16	2.221	6.96	2.889	1.623	NS
11	8.28	3.040	8.42	2.976	-.166	NS
12	8.52	2.300	7.19	2.386	1.982	NS
13	9.60	1.470	7.73	2.228	3.452	.01
14	52.68	9.199	45.96	11.973	2.197	.05
15	98.88	18.700	85.65	19.674	2.410	.05

The data in Table II indicate that the scores for seven variables exceeded the level of significance for Fisher's t for the elementary group. The results show that the elementary troublemakers are weak in personal adjustment and social adjustment. This implies that an integral part of adjustment is the balance between the two areas. All those tested who were troublemakers showed a consistency in the pattern of being weak in both types of adjustment. No one scored noticeably higher in one area nor low in the other. This indicates that poor adjustment is inclusive of the total personality.

The Total Personal Adjustment, Total Social Adjustment, and Total Adjustment scales were all significant at the .05 level for the elementary group. Within the Personal Adjustment scale, two sub-divisions, Self-Reliance and Feeling of Belonging scales, were significant at the .05 level. The other scales were in the predicted direction but were not significant. Within the Social Adjustment scale, two sub-divisions were significant, Social Skills at .05 and School Relations at .01. None of the other sub-scales were significant.

The data in Table III indicate that none of the variables exceeded the .05 level of significance for the secondary group.

TABLE III

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON THE SECONDARY FORM OF
 THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY FOR
 NON-TROUBLEMAKERS AND TROUBLEMAKERS

Variable Number	Non-Troublemakers		Troublemakers		Fisher's t	P
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation		
1	9.08	2.556	8.08	2.060	1.021	NS
2	10.08	2.018	9.83	2.672	.248	NS
3	8.23	2.722	6.83	2.192	1.349	NS
4	11.08	2.165	10.83	1.675	.300	NS
5	7.08	2.973	6.75	2.087	.303	NS
6	8.54	1.824	8.17	2.154	.448	NS
7	54.08	10.816	50.50	9.124	.854	NS
8	13.92	.917	12.75	2.586	1.472	NS
9	9.00	2.184	10.08	1.935	-1.255	NS
10	9.31	2.866	7.58	3.707	1.253	NS
11	8.92	2.814	9.00	4.243	-.052	NS
12	8.85	2.597	7.92	2.178	.026	NS
13	11.54	3.003	10.33	2.718	1.006	NS
14	60.54	9.779	57.67	11.448	.648	NS
15	115.62	19.121	108.17	19.655	.921	NS

The hypotheses related to the psycho-social conditions were tested by Chi square. Table IV indicates there was no significant difference in the distribution of ages for troublemakers and non-troublemakers. The second hypothesis, that there would be a significant relationship of the present age to troublemaking behavior, was therefore rejected.

TABLE IV

FREQUENCIES OF TROUBLEMAKERS AND NON-TROUBLEMAKERS ACCORDING TO PRESENT AGE TESTED BY CHI SQUARE*

Classification	Ages 6-12	Ages 13-15	Ages 16-19
Troublemakers	13	20	5
Non-Troublemakers	10	20	8

*Chi square = 1.084, Not Significant.

The data in Table V indicate that there was no significant difference in the distribution of "age when placed" of troublemakers and non-troublemakers. The third hypothesis was therefore rejected..

TABLE V

FREQUENCIES OF TROUBLEMAKERS AND NON-TROUBLEMAKERS ACCORDING TO "AGE WHEN PLACED" TESTED BY CHI SQUARE*

Classification	Ages 6-12	Ages 13-15	Ages 16-19
Troublemakers	27	11	0
Non-Troublemakers	26	8	4

*Chi square = 4.49, Not Significant.

The data in Table VI indicate that there was no significant difference in the distribution of length of residence of troublemakers and non-troublemakers. The fourth hypothesis was therefore rejected.

TABLE VI

FREQUENCIES OF TROUBLEMAKERS AND NON-TROUBLEMAKERS ACCORDING TO LENGTH OF RESIDENCE TESTED BY CHI SQUARE*

Classification	Under 6 Months	6 Months to 2 Years	Over 2 Years
Troublemakers	3	14	21
Non-Troublemakers	2	11	25

*Chi square = .908, Not Significant.

The data in Table VII indicate that there was a significant difference in the distribution in family relations of troublemakers and the non-troublemakers. The non-troublemakers received a higher rate of acceptance than the troublemakers. The fifth hypothesis was therefore accepted.

TABLE VII

FREQUENCIES OF TROUBLEMAKERS AND NON-TROUBLEMAKERS ACCORDING TO FAMILY RELATIONS TESTED BY CHI SQUARE*

Classification	Accepted	Rejected
Troublemakers	5	33
Non-Troublemakers	28	9

*Chi square = 29.737, (P .001).

The data in Table VIII indicate that there was a significant difference in the distribution of siblings at home of troublemakers and non-troublemakers. A higher number of troublemakers had siblings at home. The sixth hypothesis was therefore accepted.

TABLE VIII

FREQUENCIES OF TROUBLEMAKERS AND NON-TROUBLEMAKERS ACCORDING TO SIBLINGS AT HOME TESTED BY CHI SQUARE*

Classification	Yes	No
Troublemakers	17	21
Non-Troublemakers	1	37

*Chi square = 18.636 (P .001).

The data in Table IX indicate that there was a significant difference in the distribution in peer relations between troublemakers and non-troublemakers. The non-troublemakers scored higher in the peer ratings. The seventh hypothesis was therefore accepted.

TABLE IX

FREQUENCIES OF TROUBLEMAKERS AND NON-TROUBLEMAKERS ACCORDING TO PEER RELATIONS TESTED BY CHI SQUARE*

Classification	Leader	Follower	Isolate
Troublemakers	12	14	12
Non-Troublemakers	16	19	1

*Chi square = 10.590 (P .01).

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis One stated that there would be a significant difference in mean scores of the CTP with the troublemakers being lower. The subjects were divided into two groups, Elementary, grades 4 through 8, and Secondary, grades 9 through 12. Table II showed that in the Elementary group the hypothesis was confirmed. The non-troublemakers scored higher on Personal Adjustment, Social Adjustment and Total Adjustment, each being significant at the .05 level.

Within the Personal Adjustment scales, two were significant at the .05 level, Self-reliance and Feeling of Belonging. The other scales though not reaching significance were in the hypothesized direction, and some were close to significance. The fact that only two of the individual scales were above significance and that the total score was above significance was indicative of how close the other scores were to significance.

From the Personal Adjustment section of the test, it was seen that troublemakers and non-troublemakers differ most widely on Self-reliance and Feeling of Belonging. The child who was self-reliant was able to do things independently of others and direct his own activity as situations vary. He

was characteristically a stable person emotionally and had a sense of responsibility for his behavior. Conversations with many of the subjects listed as troublemakers confirmed this attitude of lack of responsibility for their own behavior. They were dependent upon the institution to make them do what was right. They were not able to rely upon themselves. From the scores on this scale it may be concluded that troublemakers had a significantly lower feeling of self-reliance than did non-troublemakers.

The second scale to distinguish between troublemakers and non-troublemakers was Feeling of Belonging. This feeling was contingent upon several factors. A person felt that he belonged if he had the love of a family, the good wishes of friends, and enjoyed a cordial relationship with people in general. He had a sense of being important and valued by other people. From the score on this scale it was evident that a person who felt that he was a part of and belonged to something or some group was less likely to cause trouble. The troublemaker felt more that he was an outsider, lacking the support and care of family and friends than did the non-troublemaker.

The other scales, Sense of Personal Worth, Sense of Personal Freedom, Withdrawing Tendencies, and Nervous Symptoms, were in the hypothesized direction but did not reach significance. Therefore, while possibly being indicators

of differences in troublemakers and non-troublemakers, they were not conclusive. However, the total score indicated that non-troublemakers had a higher personal adjustment than did troublemakers in the elementary age range.

For this same age group in the Social Adjustment scales, two were significant, Social Skills and Community Relations. The person who was socially skillful was diplomatic in dealing with other people. He was able to subordinate his egoistic tendencies in favor of the interest of others. He showed a liking for people and was willing to be helpful. The scores on this scale indicated that the troublemaker was lacking in this area. Conversely, he was seen as inconsiderate of other people, self-centered, and lacking in diplomacy. The presence of these traits alone would be sufficient to cause others to brand him as a troublemaker. A person lacking in social skills had little chance of being accepted in society.

Troublemakers and non-troublemakers were also distinguished by the Community Relations scale. The person who was making a good adjustment in his community was one who was able to mingle happily with those around him. He was tolerant of his fellows and concerned with their general welfare. He was respectful of the laws governing the community.

The difference in the scores of the two groups on this scale was significant at the .01 level, indicating that this was the area of widest discrepancy between them. The troublemaker was the child who was having the most difficulty adjusting to the community in which he lived. If a child was not able to accept the environment and conditions under which he lived, it was likely that he would rebel against it. This scale score difference suggested that non-troublemakers were able to make a satisfactory adjustment to the institutional community, while the troublemakers were not able to adjust.

Three of the other scales, Social Standards, Antisocial Tendencies, and School Relations, were in the hypothesized direction but did not reach significance. In the entire test, only one scale, Family Relations, was in the opposite direction from that hypothesized.

The total score for Social Adjustment was significant at the .05 level, as was the Total Adjustment score. It was therefore concluded that the total Personal Adjustment, total Social Adjustment, and Total Adjustment scores were significant indicators between troublemakers and non-troublemakers for the elementary age group.

Table IV gives the results for the Secondary Form. All of the scores, except Social Skills and Family Relations were in the hypothesized direction, but none reached the .05

level of significance. There are two probable reasons for this lack of distinction in the older group. Either the troublemakers in this group had, as a result of age, made improvement so that there was not as much difference in behavior as in younger children, or the test was not sensitive enough to detect it. It was therefore concluded that the CTP was not able to distinguish between troublemakers and non-troublemakers in the secondary age range, or else the subjects in the secondary group answered less frankly than those in the elementary group.

The second area of investigation was certain psychosocial conditions which were felt to be an influence on behavior. Hypothesis Two stated that the distribution of the present ages of troublemakers and non-troublemakers would be different, with the troublemakers being primarily in the middle age range. Table IV shows that the troublemakers do show a tendency to be younger than non-troublemakers, but a different age classification is needed to determine if there is a certain age group more likely to cause trouble than another. A dichotomy rather than a trichotomy might have given more conclusive results.

Hypothesis Three indicated that the age when a child is placed in an institution is related to the causes of troublemaking, with troublemakers being placed at an earlier age. The data in Table V, although not significant, showed that no

troublemakers were placed in the upper age group while four non-troublemakers were in this group. In this case the tendency is toward troublemakers being placed earlier. Here also, a different age grouping could be used with possibly significant results.

Hypothesis Four stated that length of residence in an institution is a significant factor, with troublemakers being in residence a shorter period of time. The shorter time period was hypothesized for troublemakers because it was felt that deviant behavior was primarily a matter of becoming adjusted to institutional life. While adjustment poses a major problem, it was not related to length of residence in this sample.

Hypothesis Five stated that in regard to parent relationship, troublemakers would be more neglected and non-troublemakers would be more supported, as evidenced by personal contacts, letters, phone calls, and gifts. The data in Table VII showed that this was the most distinguishing factor of the entire study, being significant at the .001 level. This suggested that the most important factor in a child's life as far as behavior was concerned was his relationship or lack of relationship with his parents. There is no mediating influence upon the behavior of a child as strong as that of a parent who cares for and supports the child emotionally.

An apparent discrepancy was noted between the data in Table VII and the score on family relations in the CTP which needs interpretation. As indicated in Table VII, family relationship as actually measured was the most distinguishing factor in the study between troublemakers and non-troublemakers, with the former being rejected and the latter being accepted. On the family relationship scale on the CTP, the troublemakers scored higher than did the non-troublemakers. Although the score on family relations did not reach statistical significance, it was the only scale in the test on which troublemakers were higher than non-troublemakers.

The conclusion reached was that the troublemakers may have felt rejected but wanted to be accepted. Therefore when answering questions about family life, they engaged in fantasy and answered as they would have liked things to be and not as they were, thus creating for themselves a desirable family relationship. The answer was an indication of what they wanted not what they actually had. These data should encourage an institution to strengthen the bonds of family life; and, if this is impossible, to find substitute families for the children.

Hypothesis Six stated that more troublemakers would still have siblings at home than non-troublemakers. The data in Table VIII showed that this was true and was significant at

the .001 level. In this case, the child for some reason, which most likely was not understood by himself, had been selected to live in an institution while his brothers and sisters remained at home or at least with some family. It is not difficult, in such cases, to understand how a child could react through aggression against his new environment. He would not only feel neglected by his parents but also less desirable than other family members.

Hypothesis Seven stated that troublemakers would be lower in peer relations than non-troublemakers. They would be those who are on the outside of the group, isolated from comradeship. Table IX indicated that this was true. Children who acted out in this relationship could have been either trying to impress the group and therefore become acceptable to them.

From these data a picture of the troublemaker emerges. He is unsure of himself and doubts his own ability. He has no strong personal attachments, feeling rejected by parents and peers. He is an outsider and does not belong to anyone or anything. In his attempts to form friendships he lacks the necessary social skills to be very successful. There is evinced a general disregard for persons and laws. He finds it very difficult to adjust to community life and social interaction.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between certain personality factors and certain psychosocial conditions related to troublemaking behavior in normal institutionalized children.

Seven hypotheses were tested in order to determine the differences between troublemakers and non-troublemakers.

These hypotheses were as follows:

1. Non-troublemakers will have a significantly higher mean score on The California Test of Personality than troublemakers.
2. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers in the middle age range, 13 through 15, than non-troublemakers.
3. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers placed in an institution earlier than non-troublemakers.
4. There will be significantly larger numbers of troublemakers in residence a shorter period of time than non-troublemakers.
5. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers rejected by their parents than non-troublemakers.

6. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers with siblings at home than non-troublemakers.

7. There will be a significantly larger number of troublemakers rejected by their peers than non-troublemakers.

Seventy-six subjects were used in the present study. These were divided into two groups of 38 each. One group was classified as troublemakers and the other as non-troublemakers. The subjects were residents in a child-care institution located in Dallas, Texas. The houseparents were asked to rate their children on a continuum of behavior from worst to best. From this rating a proportionate group was selected from each end of the continuum, thus getting the extremes of behavior in each group. They were then tested with The California Test of Personality on the appropriate form. The Elementary form was used for 51 subjects, and the Secondary form was used for 25 subjects, depending upon their grade in school. All subjects were rated on the six psycho-social conditions stated in Hypotheses Two through Seven.

Hypothesis One was tested by Fisher's t . It was found that in the elementary group, non-troublemakers scored higher than troublemakers on all total scores. Four sub-scales were significant:

- (1) Self-Reliance,
- (2) Feeling of Belonging,

- (3) Social Skills, and
- (4) Community Relations.

In the secondary group there were no significant scores on sub-scales or total scores. In the psycho-social conditions there were three significant conditions:

- (1) Family Relations,
- (2) Siblings At Home, and
- (3) Peer Relations.

In the area of psycho-social conditions, the subjects were treated as a single group.

Conclusions

The data obtained through the use of the California Test of Personality in this study indicated that the Elementary form would distinguish between troublemakers and non-troublemakers on self-reliance, feeling of belonging, social skills, and community relations. The Secondary form did not reveal any significant difference between the two groups. The test as a whole would therefore have a limited use.

Of the six psycho-social conditions, the last three were very significant. The most significant of the three was family relations. This suggests that a greater effort should be made in strengthening this relationship. The second condition--siblings at home--was a further indication of unsatisfactory family conditions, the child seeing himself as the one punished by being put away from the family. Inability

to establish wholesome peer relations is indicative of the fact that the child is having difficulty fitting into his society. These three categories were the most significant indicators between troublemakers and non-troublemakers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Redl, Fritz and David Wineman, Children Who Hate, New York, Free Press, 1965.

Articles

Bower, Eli M., "The Emotionally Handicapped Child and the School," Exceptional Children, XXVI (September, 1959), 6-11.

Clark, D. L., "Exploring Behavior in Men's Residence Halls Using the MMPI," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (November, 1964), 249-251.

Cronbach, Lee J., "Response Sets and Test Validity," Educational and Psychological Measurements, XI (Winter, 1964), 475-493.

Donnelly, John, "Aspects of the Psychodynamics of the Psychopath," American Journal of Psychiatry, CXX (June, 1964), 1149-1154.

Edmiston, R. W. and Francis Baird, "The Adjustment of Orphanage Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, XL (December, 1949), 482-488.

Ellis, Albert, "Questionnaire Versus Interview Methods in the Study of Human Love Relationships," American Sociological Review, XII (February, 1947), 541-543.

Fine, P. and D. Offer, "Periodic Outbursts of Antisocial Behavior," Archives of General Psychiatry, XIII (September, 1965), 240-251.

Jackson, Joseph, "The Relative Effectiveness of Paper-Pencil Test, Interview and Ratings as Techniques for Personality Evaluation," Journal of Social Psychology, XXIII (February, 1946), 35-54.

Karson, S., "Primary Factor Correlates of Boys with Personality and Conduct Problems," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXI (January, 1965), 16-18.

- Kupferman, Saul C. and Raymond A. Ulmer, "An Experimental Total Push Program for Emotionally Disturbed Adolescents," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLIII (May, 1964), 894-898.
- Kyllonen, Ronald R., "Behavior: Disturbed or Disturbing," National Education Association Journal, LIII (September, 1964), 50-52.
- Lapouse, Rena and Mary A. Monk, "Behavior Deviations in a Representative Sample of Children: Variations by Sex, Age, Race, Social Class and Family Size," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXIV (April, 1964), 436-446.
- Lauterbach, C. Q., N. Vogel, and J. Hart, "Comparison of the MMPI's of Male Problem Adolescents and Their Parents," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XVIII (October, 1962), 485-487.
- Pierson, George R. and Robert F. Kelly, "Anxiety, Extroversion and Personality Idiosyncrasy in Delinquency," Journal of Psychology, LVI (October, 1963), 441-445.
- Taylor, Charles and Arthur W. Combs, "Self-Acceptance and Adjustment," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XIV (April, 1952), 89-91.
- Zax, Melvin, Emory T. Izzo, D. Louis, and Mary Ann Trost, "Identifying Emotional Disturbance in the School Setting," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXIV (April, 1964), 447-454.

Publications of Learned Organizations

- Sims, Verner M. "Review: California Test of Personality," The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook, edited by Oscar K. Buros, Highland Park, The Gryphon Press, 1959.