

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Kevin I. Minor for the Master of Science

in Psychology presented on December 10, 1983

Title: INSTITUTIONALIZED AND NONINSTITUTIONALIZED JUVENILES'
PERCEPTIONS OF "SELF" AND "OTHER" STATUS GROUPS

Abstract approved:

Sharon K. Kerr

The present study assessed the social- and self-perceptions of 71 institutionalized delinquents and 210 noninstitutionalized high school students. Subjects were administered a semantic differential scale questionnaire consisting of twelve scales to measure social-perceptions of the following status groups: rock stars, parents, police officers, medical doctors, teachers, criminals, social workers, problem teenagers, businessmen, juvenile court judges, priests and ministers, and correctional officers. A scale entitled "I am" was used to measure subjects' self-perceptions.

The data were analyzed utilizing Confinement Status (institutionalized versus noninstitutionalized) and Gender as control variables. The social control theory of Hirschi was tested by determining the social status group(s) with which the institutionalized and noninstitutionalized subjects identified themselves

most closely.

Only a minimal degree of empirical support was obtained for Hirschi's social control theory. Results also revealed no significant difference between institutionalized and noninstitutionalized groups in self-perceptions. Both groups displayed self-perceptions that were positive relative to their social-perceptions. However, noninstitutionalized subjects generally displayed more positive social-perceptions of status groups with a high degree of freedom-restricting potential than did institutionalized subjects. Specifically, the Confinement Status factor was significant for the parents, police officers, criminals, social workers, problem teenagers, juvenile court judges, and correctional officers status groups. More specifically, the evaluation of Confinement Status effects at specific Gender levels revealed significant differences for the police officers, criminals, social workers, juvenile court judges, and priests and ministers status groups. Some interesting gender differences surfaced in the analysis of social-perceptions. Specifically, the Gender factor was shown to be significant for the medical doctors, teachers, social workers, and correctional officers status groups. More specifically, the evaluation of Gender effects at specific levels of Confinement Status revealed significant differences for the police officers, criminals, social workers, businessmen, juvenile court judges, and priests and ministers status groups.

INSTITUTIONALIZED AND NONINSTITUTIONALIZED
JUVENILES' PERCEPTIONS OF "SELF"
AND "OTHER" STATUS GROUPS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Department of Psychology
EMPORIA STATE UNIVERSITY

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
Kevin I. Minor
December, 1983

Thesis
1983
M

Stephen F. Gaus

Approved for the Major Department

Harold E. Dunt 2/16/84

Approved for the Graduate Council

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Sharon Karr for directing the study. Her consistent patience, encouragements, and insights were insurmountable. I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Stephen Davis and Dr. William Thompson for serving on my committee. Dr. Davis provided invaluable guidance during the data analysis phase of the study, and Dr. Thompson made valuable contributions from a scholarly sociological perspective.

Special thanks goes to Dr. Dae Chang for his direction during the initial stages of the study. I would like to thank Mr. Norbert Gottschling, Mr. Donald Noblett, Mr. Phillip Knapp, and Miss. Kay Nickel for their help in data collection. In addition, I would like to thank Miss. JoAnn Buchanan, Miss. Karen Gustason, Miss. Kimberly Resa, and Mr. Mike Navarro for their sustained efforts in the data scoring phase of the study.

A number of other individuals made valuable contributions to the study. While it is not possible to mention them all here, their help is deeply appreciated.

Fianlly, I would like to thank my parents, Moses and Muriel, without whom my learning and academic career would have been impossible. It is to them that I dedicate this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Self-Perception Variable	3
Social-Perception Variable	10
2. METHOD	15
Subjects	15
Questionnaire	16
Procedure	18
3. RESULTS	20
4. DISCUSSION	25
Self-Perception Variable	25
Social-Perception Variable	26
Limitations and Implications	29
REFERENCE NOTES	35
REFERENCES	37
APPENDIX: TABLES	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Semantic Differential Scale	44
2. Summary of One-Way Analysis of Variance Performed on the Institutionalized-Female Data	45
3. Summary of Two-Way Weighted-Means Analysis of Variance for Specific Status Groups and I am Questionnaire	48
4. Summary of Group Means with Sex of Subjects Controlled	52

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Recently investigators have shown renewed interest in studying the covert (cognitive) behavioral variables associated with juvenile delinquency. For example, Jurkovic (1980) found that a delinquent's level of moral judgement can be mediated by a variety of covert factors, such as attitudinal variables. Likewise, Luger and Cadman (1982) demonstrated the contributing role of cognitive variables in the completion of treatment and nonrecidivism among delinquents. Specifically, such research has often focused on the social-perception variable, (i.e., the delinquent's cognitive perception of certain social status groups) and on the self-perception variable, (i.e., the delinquent's cognitive perception of himself/herself). The present study will focus on social- and self-perception as these issues relate to delinquent behavior.

Loeber (1982) reported that once high levels of observable anti-social behavior have been established, juveniles tend to maintain such levels rather than reverting to lower levels. Several investigations, (e.g., Anolick, 1980; Kelly, 1977; Maher & Stein, 1968) have addressed the question of whether or not this overt antisocial behavior is reflected in the more covert social-perceptions of delinquents. Investigations of this nature have typically focused on delinquents' perceptions of such social status groups as judges and police officers (Maher & Stein, 1968), school teachers (Kelly, 1977),

and family members (Anolick, 1980).

Recent investigations, (e.g., Chassin, Eason, & Young, 1981; Chassin, Presson, Young, & Light, 1981; Jensen, 1972; Lund & Salary, 1980) have also attempted to assess the delinquent's perception of himself/herself. Investigations of this nature have sought to determine if delinquents perceive themselves as delinquents (Chassin, Eason, & Young, 1981), if the self-perceptions of juvenile offenders differ significantly from the self-perceptions of nonoffenders (Lund & Salary, 1980), and if there is an association between self-reported delinquency and self-conceptions among high school students (Jensen, 1972).

Chang (1977) postulates that the social- and self-perceptions of offenders may be important variables to consider when trying to account for unsuccessful rehabilitative efforts and high-offender recidivism rates. To the extent that the behavior of juvenile offenders is mirrored by their social- and self-perceptions and to the extent that these perceptions are influential in causing delinquents to scorn rehabilitative efforts and to justify subsequent involvement in illegal behavior, the study of such perceptions may hold important implications for current treatment methods. Additional light may be shed on the delinquency recidivism problem.

It is important to note that the present study is not concerned with making a traditional research distinction between delinquents and nondelinquents. Some members of the noninstitutionalized group may well have engaged in delinquent forms of behavior that were not punished for a variety of reasons. Some members of this group may have been processed in the juvenile justice system

at an earlier time. Some may even have been undergoing processing at the time of data collection. The sole distinction made by the present study is between juveniles who were institutionalized for delinquent behavior at the time of data collection and juveniles who, instead of being institutionalized for delinquency, were attending public high school at the time of data collection.

Self-Perception Variable

It would seem that the way a juvenile perceives himself/herself can strongly influence the kinds of behavior in which he/she chooses to engage. In addition, the self-perception variable could be an important guiding force in dictating how a delinquent juvenile reacts when other people attempt to influence his/her behavior.

This would appear to be true because the self-perception variable is closely related to the theoretical concept of attribution (Heider, 1958). According to this concept, humans tend to organize their environmental perceptions in ways that seem reasonable to them so as to better understand the causes of the events they experience. Although this process is particularly relevant in reference to the actions of other people, humans also attribute their own behavior to various causes (Valins, 1978). Quicker (1973) theorizes that the way a delinquent attributes his/her behavior will largely determine what he/she will do about the illegal behavior. If blame is attributed to personal inadequacies, the delinquent may attempt to change himself/herself so as to fit society's conventional mold. On the other hand, if blame is attributed to the general inadequacies of society, the delinquent may continue to engage in deviant behavior despite treatment efforts.

The theoretical conceptualization of Quicker (1973) is highlighted by the empirical findings of Eyo (1981). According to Eyo's work, the relationship between high social desirability (as measured by the Children's Social Desirability Scale, CSDS) and high self-criticism (as measured by the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, TSCS) was generally weaker for delinquents than for nondelinquents. According to Eyo (1981), for delinquents the need to be defensive of the "self" appeared to overwhelm the motive for social approval. The desire to attribute delinquent behavior to personal inadequacies and to then change that behavior to a conventional form of behavior, more deserving of social approval, may be overridden by the desire to protect the "self" via acting in a defensive manner and attributing delinquent behavior to societal inadequacies.

Relatively consistent with the work of Eyo (1981) are the results of a study by Lund and Salary (1980). These researchers compared the patterns of TSCS scores for a group of juvenile offenders and nonoffenders. The same nonsignificant results were obtained for the self-perception subscale, although offenders showed more general contradiction in their self-perceptions.

Clinard and Meier (1975) have examined the dynamics involved in the continuance of general deviant behavior from a sociological perspective. These authors argue that one cannot understand the dynamics without understanding the relationship between deviance and self-perception. Clinard and Meier (1975) hypothesize that the individual is actively involved in the creation of his/her own self-perception. This perception is said to be built in an interactive social context where experiences with other people are med-

lated. Consequently, the individual may choose to reject the judgments of others which are discrepant with his/her own self-perception.

Tangri and Schwartz (1967) have espoused a similar position, but instead of concentrating on general deviance these authors chose to focus on the delinquent as a specific type of deviant. Like Clinard and Meier (1975), Tangri and Schwartz (1967) hypothesize that negative evaluations by certain persons in a deviant's life do not mean the deviant will internalize these evaluations into his/her self-perception. However, Tangri and Schwartz (1967) added an important element by noting that the deviant may look elsewhere for a positive self-reflection when given negative evaluations by certain persons or groups. Selected peer group members may provide such a positive self-reflection. If this occurs, the initial self-perception may be reinforced, and those who attempted to apply the negative evaluations may be condemned by the deviant (Sykes & Matza, 1957).

An empirical study by Fiedler and Bass (1959) appears to add support to the theoretical position of Tangri and Schwartz (1967). Fiedler and Bass (1959) found that the institutionalized delinquents in their study exhibited higher self-concepts than members of non-delinquent control groups and unconfined delinquents of the same age. These researchers theorized that the institutionalized delinquents were in an environment where their delinquent behavior was highly valued and reinforced by peers. The increase in favorable self-perception followed the increase in acceptance the delinquents found in the institutional setting. However, the findings of a study by Jensen (1972) are somewhat contradictory to those reported

by Fiedler and Bass (1959). Jensen (1972) examined the association between self-reported delinquency and self-conceptions among junior and senior high school students. He found that self-esteem and self-reported delinquency were persistently negatively related, as were delinquent self-evaluations and self-esteem. According to Jensen (1972), there was a consistent tendency for those who had been officially labeled as delinquent to think of themselves and to feel thought of by others as delinquent more often than those who had not been so labeled.

From a similar sociological perspective, Sykes and Matza (1957) have outlined a set of cognitive and verbal factors that represent what are essentially justifications for delinquent behavior. These so-called "techniques of neutralization" allow the juvenile to remain committed to dominant social norms by letting him/her qualify actions in such a way that these actions are perceived by the juvenile as acceptable. In effect, the delinquent's perception of himself/herself as a nondelinquent is retained while the delinquent behavior continues unabated. This state of affairs constitutes a perfect example of the sociological concept of "primary deviance (Clinard & Meier, 1975; p. 42). Moreover, the techniques function to protect the delinquent's self-perception while at the same time worsening his/her perception of the persons who judge his/her behavior as wrong. Similarly, Schur (1973; p. 125) concluded, "It is relatively easy for some youngsters to develop social-psychological mechanisms to insulate themselves from imputations of bad character".

Several empirical studies add support to this theoretical position. Maher and Stein (1968) found that the delinquent sub-

jects in their study did not tend to identify themselves as delinquent. Similarly, two studies by Chassin and her associates (Chassin, Eason, & Young, 1981; Chassin, Presson, Young, & Light, 1981) examined the extent to which institutionalized delinquents identified with their delinquent labels. The results of both studies indicated that a significant number of delinquents did not identify with their labels. Chassin, Presson, Young, and Light (1981) theorize that delinquents may label themselves with their own definitions of society's role labels and that these definitions may distort the stereotypic content of a conventional social role label.

Similar findings and observations have been made with adult offenders. Yochelson and Samenow (1976; p. 486) made the following statement based on their clinical work with adult offenders: "The apprehended criminal believes that, although he broke the law, he is inherently not criminal. He thinks that he is a good person who should not be punished." Likewise, via the use of a semantic differential technique, Chang and his associates (Chang, 1977; Chang & Iacovetta, 1981; Chang & Winter, 1974; Chang & Zastrow, 1976) found that adult inmates had relatively positive self-perceptions when these perceptions were compared with the inmates' social-perceptions of other status groups. A significant number of adult inmates viewed their behavior as being no more illegitimate than the behavior of other people who society had not condemned.

When dealing with the self-perception variable, it is important to keep in mind that what is evaluated as "negative" by one person or group may be evaluated as "positive" by a different person or group. "Positive" and "negative", as applied to the self-

perception variable, are relatively subjective terms. Although certain persons, (e.g., treatment personnel in an institution or teachers in a public school) may assign negative value to a delinquent's behavior and self-perception, the delinquent may assign positive values to them. In such a case it is possible that the delinquent would be unwilling to accord the negative evaluation a legitimate status. Hepburn (1977), in his investigation of the impact of police intervention on delinquents' self-perceptions, concluded, "The label must be consistent with the actor's perception of his behavior before it will be accorded legitimacy".

Moreover, the negative evaluation may be accorded only partial or temporary legitimacy. Chassin, Presson, Young, and Light (1981) found that the self-perceptions of delinquents within institutional settings were less positive than their global self-perceptions independent of institutional control. Within institutional settings, juveniles saw their delinquent behavior as improved in some ways. However, they saw their feelings or internal states as being negatively altered by the institutional experience. According to these researchers, any positive behavioral change might have been attributed to the external control of the institution rather than to internal improvement. This could help explain the rejection (and loss) of behavioral gains upon release, since such a rejection may help diminish some of the negative elements of self-perception created by the institutional experience. In this case the effects of delinquent behavior could actually be self-enhancing (Bynner, O'Malley, & Bachman, 1981; Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 1978).

In summary, the self-perception variable seems to be closely related to the concept of attribution. Research seems to support

the hypothesis that delinquents often possess defensive attitudes regarding their self-perception and, consequently, often attribute their negatively evaluated behavior more to the inadequacies of society than to their own personal inadequacies. Furthermore, delinquents may choose to reject the behavioral evaluations of others when these evaluations are inconsistent with their self-perceptions. Instead they may look elsewhere for a positive self-reflection. If a positive self-reflection is provided elsewhere, (e.g., by certain peer group members) the initial self-perception may be reinforced. Consequently, those who attempted to apply the negative evaluations may be condemned by the delinquent. Delinquents may use a variety of covert techniques to neutralize the commission of a delinquent act, thus protecting their perceptions of themselves as nondelinquents. Additionally, delinquents may distort the stereotypic content of conventional social role labels by assigning their own definitions to society's role labels. What is defined as negative behavior and negative self-perception by conventional standards may be defined in a more positive light by delinquent standards. Consequently, the delinquent may be reluctant to recognize as legitimate negative evaluations of himself/herself. Positive behavioral change, as measured by conventional standards, may be more externally than internally induced and, hence, may only be temporary. Such a rejection of treatment and subsequent return to delinquent behavior may function to enhance the delinquent's self-perception.

The purpose of this study is to determine if significant differences exist between the self-perceptions of groups of institutionalized delinquents and noninstitutionalized high school students.

A further purpose of this study is to clarify some of the contradictions that have appeared in the past literature regarding the self-perception variable.

Social-Perception Variable

Chang (1977) has theorized that social-perceptions have considerable influence on the attitude formations which eventually influence behavior patterns. The way an offender perceives those groups responsible for his/her apprehension and rehabilitation would seem to be a vital issue in the analyses of treatment methods and recidivism. If an adjudicated delinquent perceives those groups responsible for his/her custody and treatment in an unfavorable light, the efforts exerted by these groups may be scorned and, hence, of minimal value.

However, perception of those groups directly involved in the juvenile justice system does not represent the only area of relevant study. Several diverse social groups, (e.g., public school teachers and parents) exert influence on the life of a juvenile, and these groups are not always involved directly in the juvenile justice system. The delinquent's social-perception of these groups is important because it is with these groups that he/she must deal upon release from court or institutional custody.

Several studies have examined delinquents' perceptions of the groups described above. Maher and Stein (1968) examined delinquents' perceptions of the law and larger community. Using a picture repertory test and a sentence completion technique, these researchers reported some findings of interest. Delinquents typically perceived the judge in an unfavorable manner. The judge was perceived as possessing a lack of personal interest in delinquents and an impersonal

attitude toward them. Delinquents' perceptions of police officers were more favorable. Police officers were typically perceived as being less impersonal and as possessing a higher degree of personal interest in delinquents. Social workers were also perceived as possessing a high degree of personal interest, and the perceptions of this status group were generally favorable. Maher and Stein (1968) found that the helping profession role was not usually identified with the legal role. Perceptions of the former role were generally favorable while perceptions of the latter role were more negative. A significant number of delinquents displayed hostile perceptions of the institution in which they were confined. The institution was generally perceived as a place of punishment rather than as a place of help. Although the delinquents did not tend to perceive themselves as delinquents, they did tend to perceive their fellow inmates as delinquents who deserved institutionalization. The delinquents did not tend to display negative perceptions of public school teachers; teachers were generally perceived with approval. Disapproval of the home environment was also rare in this study.

Although Maher and Stein (1968) did not compare the perceptions of delinquents with the similar perceptions of noninstitutionalized adolescents, the findings of two studies contradict their reports that delinquents perceive the school and home environments with approval. Anolick (1980) found that delinquents displayed significantly more negative family perceptions than groups of high school students and college freshmen. Kelly (1977) found that official delinquents, when compared with nondelinquents and self-report delinquents, were more likely to exhibit negative percept-

ions of teachers and classmates. This pattern was unaffected when sex, social class, and race were introduced as control variables.

The results of several studies by Chang and his associates (Chang, 1977; Chang & Iacovetta, 1981; Chang & Winter, 1974; Chang & Zastrow, 1976) are consistent with the Maher and Stein (1968) finding that delinquents did not tend to perceive themselves as delinquents but did tend to perceive their fellow inmates as delinquents. Chang and his associates demonstrated that adult male prison inmates displayed similar negative perceptions of their peer inmates. In addition, a significant number of adult inmates displayed relatively favorable self-perceptions. Moreover, a significant number of adult inmates displayed negative perceptions of legal authorities.

Similarly, Ganzer and Sarason (1973) analyzed thirty-four variables in an attempt to discriminate between recidivism and nonrecidivism in a sample of formerly institutionalized delinquents. The diagnosis of sociopathic personality, characterized by negative perceptions of authority figures, demonstrated the strongest relationship to recidivism for both male and female delinquents of any diagnostic category.

The social control theory of Hirschi (1969) addresses the issue of social-perception from a slightly different perspective. According to Hirschi (1969), the strength of a juvenile's "social bond" determines whether or not he/she will become and remain delinquent. Hirschi sees this bond as being composed of four primary elements; attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. If the juvenile is strongly bonded to a conventional way of life, as reflected in the four elements, conventional behavior is to be expected. On the other hand, if the juvenile's social bond is weak, delinquency may

be the result. Essentially, it is a strong conventional social bond that keeps (controls) a juvenile from engaging in delinquent behavior.

The strength of juveniles' social bonds would seem to be at least partly reflected in their perceptions of certain conventional social status groups. Unfavorable social-perceptions of such groups would seem to indicate elements of a weak social bond and, accordingly, may be conducive to the production and retention of delinquent behavior.

A study by Chapman (1966) is applicable to this theoretical position. Chapman's purpose was to determine how persons perceive others who represent legitimate and illegitimate value systems and to determine how they perceive the "self" in regard to the legitimate value system. Chapman (1966) found that delinquents perceived persons who embody illegitimate value systems more positively than nondelinquents. Nondelinquents were found to perceive persons who embody legitimate value systems more positively than delinquents. Nondelinquents also showed a more positive self-perception in relationship to a legitimate value system than did delinquents. Similarly, Knapp (1964) studied the values of offender and nonoffender samples of enlisted Navy men. He found that offenders placed less importance on conformity and greater importance on independence than non-offenders. Offenders displayed more favorable attitudes toward nonconformity to rules and regulations.

In summary, it seems well documented in the literature, (e.g., Chang, 1977; Chang & Iacovetta, 1981; Chang & Winter, 1974; Chang & Zastrow, 1976; Maher & Stein, 1968) that both juvenile and adult offenders often display unfavorable social-perceptions of important

status groups with whom these offenders must deal successfully if rehabilitation is to occur. Furthermore, literature exists (Chapman, 1966; Hirschi, 1969) to support the hypothesis that a weak social bond, characterized by such things as favorable attitudes toward nonconformity and identification with persons who embody illegitimate value systems, is not conducive to the control of delinquent behavior.

In addition to focusing on the self-perception variable, another purpose of the present study is to compare the social-perceptions of a group of institutionalized delinquents with the similar perceptions of a group of noninstitutionalized high school students and determine if significant differences are present. More specifically, the present study is especially interested in determining if differences in social-perception exist between the two groups in regard to status groups having a high degree of freedom-restricting potential, (e.g., police officers, judges, correctional officers, and school teachers).

In order to gain further empirical insight into the theory of Hirschi (1969), an additional purpose of the present study is to determine the social status group(s) with which the institutionalized and noninstitutionalized subjects identified themselves most closely. Moreover, if the results of Chapman's (1966) study are reliable, noninstitutionalized subjects would identify themselves most closely with status groups who represent legitimate value systems, (e.g., police officers, judges, priests and ministers, and medical doctors). Similarly, institutionalized subjects would identify themselves most closely with status groups who represent more illegitimate value systems, (e.g., rock stars and criminals).

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Subjects

Male ($n=89$) and female ($n=121$) control subjects for this study were drawn from a public high school in rural southern Indiana. Institutionalized-male subjects ($n=30$) were drawn from a private, minimum-security juvenile institution in west-central Indiana. Institutionalized-female subjects ($n=41$) were drawn from a state-supported, minimum-security juvenile institution in north-central Kansas. Male control subjects ranged in age from 14 to 18 years (mean age=15.6 years). Female control subjects ranged in age from 14 to 18 years (mean age=15.8 years). The institutionalized-male subjects ranged in age from 12 to 17 years (mean age=15.5 years), and the institutionalized-female subjects ranged in age from 13 to 18 years (mean age=16.2 years). All control subjects were white. The institutionalized-male group had one black and one Indian subject. The institutionalized-female group was composed of the following: 22 white subjects, 10 black subjects, and 9 subjects from other ethnic groups.

Institutionalized-male subjects were selected by the staff of the institution on the basis of the subjects' abilities (via Wide Range Achievement Test scores) to read and understand the questionnaire. Institutionalized-female subjects were selected on a totally voluntary basis. High school subjects were drawn from large study halls.

Questionnaire

The complete questionnaire used in this study was composed of 15 pages, including instructions and demographic variables. The middle 13 pages constituted the instrument for measuring social- and self-perceptions. The instrument was the semantic differential scale presented in Table 1 of the Appendix.

The general semantic differential scale was developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1976), and it allows one to obtain an idea of perception direction and intensity. The scale has been acclaimed valid and reliable in attaining subjects' responses (Heise, 1981). It is relatively easy to administer, and confidentiality is assured since subjects are not asked to reveal their names.

The specific scale presented in Table 1 was used in the Chang et al. (Chang, 1977; Chang & Iacovetta, 1981; Chang & Winter, 1974; Chang & Zastrow, 1976) studies of adult inmates' perceptions. With the assistance of Chang, the researcher utilized status-group categories which were potentially more applicable to the juvenile level.

Subjects were asked to rate the following status groups (one group per page): rock stars, parents, police officers, medical doctors, teachers, criminals, social workers, problem teenagers, businessmen, juvenile court judges, priests and ministers, and correctional officers. Subjects were asked to rate themselves on the final scale page ("I am"). All ratings were made on the five-point basis with lower ratings indicating negative or unfavorable perceptions toward the status group categories and higher ratings indicating positive or favorable perceptions. Hence, a rating of one was the most negative, and a rating of five was the most positive.

Administering the questionnaire to institutionalized delinquents necessitated other special considerations. The researcher revised and simplified the instructions sheet (with the assistance of Chang) until it was analyzed to be at approximately a 6.2 grade reading level. It was not possible to obtain the exact reading level of the actual scale, (i.e., bipolar adjectives and status-group categories) due to the lack of an appropriate analytical method. However, an attempt was made to ascertain the probability of a person with a low reading level being able to read and understand the scale. An extensive list of word meanings, applicable to words used in the scale, and their familiarity scores (Dale & O'Rourke, 1979) was analyzed. It was found that an average of 79.5 percent of the persons with a mean education of 5.2 grades could successfully read and understand approximately 90 percent of the bipolar adjectives. (Approximately 10 percent of these adjectives were not listed in Dale & O'Rourke, 1979.) Furthermore, it was found that an average of 80 percent of the persons with a mean education of 4.7 grades could successfully read and understand 100 percent of the status-group categories, when these categories were analyzed as separate words, (e.g., "correctional"/"officers" rather than "correctional officers").

Despite these rough, and admittedly imperfect, figures, it was the researcher's opinion that the instructions, the bipolar adjectives, and the status-group categories were sufficiently simple to permit reading and understanding by subjects selected for this study. Field test results, obtained from 20 fourth and fifth graders, reinforced this opinion.

Procedure

The questionnaire was group administered to all subjects, with the administrator(s) providing assistance to subjects as needed. The questionnaire was administered to groups of the following approximate sizes: 30 institutionalized-males, 48 institutionalized-females, and 50 to 75 control-males and females. The questionnaire was administered to institutionalized-males by one of the staff counselors. It was administered to institutionalized-females by the researcher and two staff members of the institution and to control subjects by the researcher and various teachers at the school.

Before subjects began the actual scale pages, several steps were taken to insure that valid and standardized data would be obtained. Subjects were first informed as to the purpose of the study via the following statement: "The aim of this study is to find out what you think of different kinds of people." Next, subjects were given a concrete example so that they would understand how the scales were to be completed. Subjects were also assured of the confidential nature of their responses. In addition, prior field test results indicated that two status groups required special, standardized definitions. Subjects were given the following verbal definitions of "problem teenagers" and "correctional officers":

problem teenagers: Included here are persons in their teen years who pose special and consistent problems for legal officials, school authorities, and/or parents.

correctional officers: Included here are persons who work in the corrections branch of our legal system. For example, probation and parole officers, security guards in prisons, child care workers in juvenile

institutions, and correctional counselors would all be considered correctional officers.

Subjects were then informed to inquire about any bipolar adjective definition problem they may have encountered during completion of the scales. All subsequent questions were dealt with on an individual basis.

Once a subject had turned in his/her questionnaire, an attempt was made by the administrator(s) to check the questionnaire for completeness. If a subject offered an incomplete questionnaire, he/she was asked to return to his/her seat and finish the incomplete portion.

Prior to data analysis, a single score was obtained for each subject for each status-group questionnaire and for the "I am" questionnaire. This was accomplished by summing the 20 separate numbers for each questionnaire scale sheet.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

It will be recalled that the primary purpose of the present study was to determine if significant differences exist between the social- and self-perceptions of groups of institutionalized delinquents and noninstitutionalized high school students. Visual inspection of the demographic variables of each of the four main groups, (i.e., institutionalized-males, institutionalized-females, control-males, and control-females) suggested possible heterogeneity for the institutionalized-female group. More specifically, it was shown that this group was composed of the following: 22 Caucasian Americans, 10 Black Americans, and 9 subjects from other ethnic groups. To ascertain the propriety of pooling the data from these subjects for subsequent analysis, a separate one-way analysis of variance was performed on the data from each status group and the "I am" questionnaire for the institutionalized-females. The results of these analyses yielded a significant group effect, $F(2,38) = 3.78$, $p < .05$ for only the Rock Stars questionnaire. The results of all 13 analyses are shown in Table 2 of the Appendix. In view of these data it was deemed appropriate to pool the data for all the institutionalized-females for subsequent analyses for the 12 questionnaires yielding nonsignificant results: parents, medical doctors, teachers, police officers, criminals, social workers, problem teenagers, businessmen, juvenile court judges, priests and ministers, correctional officers,

and "I am". More specialized analyses were designed for the rock stars data. These rock stars analyses will be discussed in a separate section.

A separate two-way weighted-means analysis of variance incorporating Gender (male versus female) and Confinement Status (institutionalized versus noninstitutionalized) was performed on the data for the 12 group categories listed above. These analyses are summarized in Table 3 of the Appendix. Briefly summarized, these analyses indicated that the Gender factor was significant for the medical doctors, teachers, social workers, and correctional officers status groups, while the Confinement Status factor was significant for the parents, police officers, criminals, social workers, problem teenagers, juvenile court judges, and correctional officers status groups. The Gender by Confinement Status interaction was found to be significant for the police officers, criminals, social workers, businessmen, juvenile court judges, and priests and ministers status groups. The significant interactions were further probed through the use of simple effects analysis (Keppel, 1982). The results of these subsequent analyses are summarized below for each respective status group.

Police Officers

The evaluation of Gender effects at specific levels of Confinement Status indicated that institutionalized-males displayed significantly higher perceptions of police officers than did institutionalized-females, $F(1,277) = 24.05$, $p < .05$. In addition, control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of police officers than did control-males, $F(1,277) = 7.45$, $p < .05$. The comparison of Confinement Status effects at specific Gender levels indicated that control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of police officers than did institutionalized-females, $F(1,277) = 88.40$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference between control-males and institutionalized-males in their perceptions of police officers.

Criminals

The evaluation of Gender effects at specific levels of Confinement Status indicated that control-males displayed significantly higher perceptions of criminals than did control-females, $F(1,277) = 6.23$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference between institutionalized-males and institutionalized-females in their perceptions of criminals. The comparison of Confinement Status effects at specific Gender levels indicated that institutionalized-males displayed significantly higher perceptions of criminals than did control-males, $F(1,277) = 4.41$, $p < .05$, and that institutionalized-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of criminals than did control-females, $F(1,277) = 38.93$, $p < .05$.

Social Workers

The evaluation of Gender effects at specific levels of Confinement Status indicated that control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of social workers than did control-males, $F(1,277) = 21.18$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference between institutionalized-males and institutionalized-females in their perceptions of social workers. The comparison of Confinement Status at specific Gender levels indicated that control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of social workers than did institutionalized-females, $F(1,277) = 39.65$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference between control-males and institutionalized-males in their perceptions of social workers.

Businessmen

The evaluation of Gender effects at specific levels of Confinement Status indicated that control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of businessmen than did control-males, $F(1,277) = 6.67$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference between institutionalized-males and institutionalized-females in their perceptions of businessmen. The comparison of Confinement Status at specific Gender levels indicated that there were no significant differences between institutionalized and noninstitutionalized subjects in their perceptions of businessmen. However, the difference between institutionalized-females' and control-females' perceptions approached significance, $F(1,277) = 3.76$, $p > .05$, with the control-females' perceptions being somewhat higher.

Juvenile Court Judges

The evaluation of Gender effects at specific levels of Confinement Status indicated that control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of juvenile court judges than did control-males, $F(1,277) = 6.65$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference between

institutionalized-males and institutionalized-females in their perceptions of juvenile court judges. The comparison of Confinement Status at specific Gender levels indicated that control-males displayed significantly higher perceptions of juvenile court judges than did institutionalized-males, $F(1,277) = 5.09$, $p < .05$, and that control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of juvenile court judges than did institutionalized-females, $F(1,277) = 34.19$, $p < .05$.

Priests and Ministers

The evaluation of Gender effects at specific levels of Confinement Status indicated that institutionalized-males displayed significantly higher perceptions of priests and ministers than did institutionalized-females, $F(1,277) = 6.63$, $p < .05$, and that control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of priests and ministers than did control-males, $F(1,277) = 7.75$, $p < .05$. The comparison of Confinement Status effects at specific Gender levels indicated that control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of priests and ministers than did institutionalized-females, $F(1,277) = 12.26$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference between control-males and institutionalized-males in their perceptions of priests and ministers.

Recall that more specialized analyses were designed for the rock stars data. An independent groups t test was employed to compare the white institutionalized-female subjects' data with the data from institutionalized-female subjects from other ethnic groups. The results of this test were not significant. Subsequently, a two-way analysis of variance, similar to those reported above, was performed utilizing the following groups of subjects: institutionalized-males, black institutionalized-females, control-males, and control-females. The results of this analysis revealed that only the Gender by Confinement Status interaction was significant, $F(1,246) = 7.40$, $p < .05$. This significant interaction was further probed through the use of simple effects analysis (Keppel, 1982). The evaluation of Gender effects at specific levels of Confinement Status indicated that institutionalized-males displayed significantly higher perceptions of rock

stars than did black institutionalized-females, $F(1,246) = 6.02$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference between control-males and control-females in their perceptions of rock stars. The comparison of Confinement Status effects at specific Gender levels indicated that control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of rock stars than did black institutionalized-females, $F(1,246) = 6.31$, $p < .05$. There was no significant difference between institutionalized-males and control-males in their perceptions of rock stars. A two-way weighted-means analysis of variance, utilizing the following groups of subjects, was also performed: institutionalized-males, combined institutionalized-females, control-males, and control-females. The results of this analysis failed to yield significant effects.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The self- and social-perceptions of groups of institutionalized delinquents and noninstitutionalized high school students were assessed by the use of a semantic differential scale. The resulting data were analyzed to determine if significant differences existed in perceptions and to determine the social status group(s) with which the institutionalized and noninstitutionalized subjects identified themselves most closely.

Self-Perception Variable

When sex of subjects was controlled, comparison of group means indicated that both institutionalized and noninstitutionalized groups displayed self-perceptions that were positive relative to their social-perceptions (see Table 4 of the Appendix). This finding is consistent with the work of Chang and his associates (Chang, 1977; Chang & Iacovetta, 1981; Chang & Winter, 1974; Chang & Zastrow, 1976) who found that adult inmates displayed self-perceptions that were relatively positive compared to the inmates' social-perceptions.

Moreover, recall that no significant differences in self-perceptions were found between institutionalized and noninstitutionalized groups. Hence, no support was obtained for the earlier finding that delinquent subjects tended to be overly defensive of the "self" (Eyo, 1981) and overaffirming of positive attributes (Lund & Salary, 1981) relative to control subjects. In addition,

the results of the present study failed to support the earlier Fiedler and Bass (1959) finding that institutionalized delinquents exhibited significantly higher self-concepts than did control subjects. The current results are somewhat consistent with the results of earlier studies (Chassin, Eason, & Young, 1981; Chassin, Presson, Young, & Light, 1981; Maher & Stein, 1968) which found that delinquents do not always tend to view themselves as delinquents. For both institutionalized and noninstitutionalized groups, the means of the "I am" questionnaire are considerably higher than the means of the Problem Teenagers and Criminals questionnaires (see Table 4 of the Appendix).

Although institutionalized subjects did display significantly higher perceptions of problem teenagers and criminals than did noninstitutionalized subjects, Jensen's (1972) report that officially labeled delinquents tend to think of themselves as delinquent more often than those who have not been so labeled failed to receive robust support in the present study. This would appear to be true because of the discrepancy in group means described above. This point will be taken up again in a later section of this chapter.

Social-Perception Variable

The 12 status groups constituting objects of social-perception were grouped into "conventional" and "unconventional" subcategories, based on the researcher's conception of the social integrity of each status group. To further enhance the interpretation of results, the "conventional" subcategory was divided into groups possessing: (1) a high degree of freedom-restricting potential and direct legal role affiliation, (i.e., police officers, social

workers, juvenile court judges, and correctional officers); (2) a high degree of freedom-restricting potential and no direct legal-role affiliation, (i.e., parents and teachers); (3) a low degree of freedom-restricting potential and no direct legal-role affiliation, (i.e., medical doctors, businessmen, and priests and ministers). The "unconventional" subcategory was composed of the following status groups: rock stars, criminals, and problem teenagers.

Recall that the present study was especially interested in determining if differences in social-perception exist between institutionalized and noninstitutionalized groups in regard to status groups having a high degree of freedom-restricting potential. The results of the present study are generally consistent with the results of earlier studies (Chang, 1977; Chang & Iacovetta, 1981; Chang & Winter, 1974; Chang & Zastrow, 1976; Ganzer & Sarason, 1973; Maher & Stein, 1968) which found that adult and juvenile offenders tended to display relatively unfavorable perceptions of status groups possessing a high degree of freedom-restricting potential and direct legal-role affiliation. In the present study, this finding was most robust in regard to the juvenile court judges and correctional officers status groups. Control-males and control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of these groups than did institutionalized-males and institutionalized-females respectively. However, this finding did not hold true for male subjects in regard to the police officers and social workers status groups. Control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of police officers and social workers than did institutionalized-females, but there were no significant differences between control-

and institutionalized-males in their perceptions of these groups.

In reference to status groups possessing a high degree of freedom-restricting potential and no direct legal-role affiliation, noninstitutionalized subjects displayed significantly higher perceptions of parents than did institutionalized subjects. Hence, support was obtained for the findings of Anolick (1980) who reported that delinquents were more likely than controls to display negative family perceptions. However, there were no significant differences between institutionalized and control subjects in their perceptions of teachers. Hence, the finding of Kelly (1977) that delinquents were more likely than controls to exhibit negative perceptions of teachers did not find support in the present study.

Finally, it will be recalled that an additional purpose of the present study was to empirically explore the social control theory of Hirschi (1969). Visual inspection of Table 4 of the Appendix reveals that the means of the "I am" questionnaire, for both institutionalized-male and female subjects, most closely match the respective means of the Parents questionnaire. To the extent that this trend can be interpreted as meaning that institutionalized subjects identified themselves most closely with the parents status group, the current data would appear to be in direct contradiction with the theory of Hirschi (1969). Note that the means of the "I am" questionnaire, for both male- and female-control subjects, most closely match the respective means of the Medical Doctors questionnaire. This trend would appear more consistent with Hirschi's (1969) hypothesis. Moreover, the theory cannot be discredited without qualification as it may have some merit. In regard to the "unconventional" subcategory described earlier, insti-

tutionalized subjects displayed significantly higher perceptions of problem teenagers than did control subjects. Institutionalized-males and institutionalized-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of criminals than did control-males and control-females respectively. And although institutionalized subjects tended to identify themselves most closely with the "conventional" status group parents, noninstitutionalized subjects displayed significantly higher perceptions of parents than did institutionalized subjects. This same significant trend was obtained for the "conventional" status group correctional officers. Also, noninstitutionalized-males and females displayed significantly higher perceptions of the "conventional" status group juvenile court judges than did institutionalized-males and females respectively. In addition, control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of police officers, social workers, and priests and ministers than did institutionalized-females.

Limitations and Implications

The present study contains several limitations that would seem to limit extrapolation of results. Probably the major limitation concerns the selection of subjects. It will be recalled that institutionalized-male subjects were selected by the staff of the institution on the basis of the subjects' predetermined abilities to read and understand the questionnaire. The very fact that staff members selected the subjects could have added confounding elements to some subjects' self-perception responses. That is, some subjects may have viewed their being asked to participate in the study as a form of individual favoritism shown by the staff. Stated another way, some subjects could have concluded that the

staff possessed a higher perception of them than of other adolescents at the institution. Conceivably, this could have lead to these subjects displaying higher self-perceptions. Also, recall that institutionalized-female subjects were selected on a totally voluntary basis and that high school subjects were drawn from large study halls. Although very difficult to obtain in the case of institutionalized subjects, randomization is lacking in the selection of all groups. Also, subjects were drawn from very specific geographic regions. All control subjects were from the same area, while institutionalized-males came from a different area. Institutionalized-females came from yet another area. This could have added confounding elements to both the self- and social-perception data.

Another limitation of the study concerns the questionnaire. Although an attempt was made to assess the reading level of the scale, it was not possible to obtain an exact figure due to the lack of an appropriate technique. In addition, the length of the questionnaire could have promoted subject boredom and, hence, the possibility of routine responding.

One final limitation involves the distinction of the present study between institutionalized and noninstitutionalized subjects. Although the researcher felt that this distinction was considerably more accurate than the traditional delinquent - nondelinquent distinction, the former distinction does not take into account the issue of self-perception being affected by labeling. That is, the issue of whether the self-perception affected delinquency or whether delinquency affected the self-perception (Bynner, O'Malley, & Bachman, 1981; Rosenberg & Rosenberg, 1978) cannot be adequately

addressed because of the distinction.

Despite the limitations described above, the present findings would seem to hold several implications for future research and current treatment methodologies. First, it is essential that sex differences be taken into account when research is conducted on the perceptions of juvenile offenders. Female offenders are often treated differently during the course of system processing (Giallombardo, 1982), and this could be conducive to the formation of differential perceptions of legal officials in all branches of the system. The present data supported the presence of such differential male - female perceptions with regard to the following status groups: rock stars, police officers, medical doctors, teachers, criminals, social workers, businessmen, juvenile court judges, priests and ministers, and correctional officers. (The finding that females displayed significantly higher perceptions of teachers than did males would make interesting future research material in its own right.) More specifically, in reference to status groups possessing a high degree of freedom-restricting potential and direct legal-role affiliation, it will be noted that: (1) institutionalized-males displayed significantly higher perceptions of police officers than did institutionalized-females, but control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of this status group than did control-males; (2) institutionalized- and control-females displayed significantly higher perceptions of correctional officers than did institutionalized- and control-males respectively.

Sex would not appear to be the only demographic variable conducive to the formation of differential perceptions. Variables such as social class background (Myerhoff & Myerhoff, 1964) and

race (Rosenquist & Megargee, 1969) could also influence the formation of self- and social-perceptions.

Future research in this area could concern itself with specifying the prior delinquency record (official and/or self-report) of control subjects. This may provide insight into the issues of delinquency affecting self-perception and self-perception affecting delinquency.

In terms of implications for analyses of current treatment methods and recidivism rates among juvenile offenders, the finding that institutionalized subjects did not tend to identify themselves with the criminals and problem teenagers status groups implies that institutionalized delinquents may often fail to view their past illegal behaviors as wrong. This may contribute to the rejection of treatment intervention efforts and to subsequent recidivism. It would seem that delinquent adolescents must first be convinced of the illegitimate and self-defeating nature of their previous unconventional behavior, before new behaviors can be taught to and internalized by delinquents. That is, institutionalized delinquents must be convinced that their previous illegal behaviors merit change.

Moreover, the finding that institutionalized delinquents often tended to display significantly more negative perceptions than control subjects of status groups possessing a high degree of freedom-restricting potential and direct legal-role affiliation implies that legal officials, throughout the system, should be aware of these perceptions. Perhaps legal officials should attempt to assess, and if necessary alter, these perceptions before proceeding with other forms of intervention. Otherwise, various forms of

treatment may be rejected and, consequently of minimal value to everyone involved.

The finding that institutionalized subjects displayed significantly lower perceptions of parents than did control subjects is consistent with past research (Andry, 1962; Bandura & Walters, 1959; Nye, 1969) in this area. Interestingly, however, in the present study institutionalized subjects identified themselves most closely with the parents status group. This trend was not obtained for control subjects. Such a finding would seem to pose important questions for future research to address. One such question, for example, deals with the issue of occupational aspirations. Rosenquist and Megargee (1969) reported that the delinquents in their study displayed significantly lower occupational aspirations than control subjects. Could the level of occupational aspiration somehow be correlated with the differential self-identity of institutionalized and noninstitutionalized juveniles?

Finally, aspects of the social control theory of Hirschi (1969) were empirically tested in the present study. On the basis of the current findings, it would seem that social control theory is best conceptualized in terms of degree of social bond strength rather than in terms of rigid weak - strong dichotomies. The hypothesis that a relatively strong social bond acts to control juveniles from engaging in delinquent behavior could well be valid. However, it cannot be concluded that a relatively weak social bond causes juveniles to engage in delinquent behavior. Perhaps many juveniles who engage in illegal behaviors possess a social bond that is significantly weaker, in degree, than the social bond of adolescents who do not engage in such behavior. However, the bond may be

rather strong even though it is significantly weaker than the bond of nonoffenders. The techniques of neutralization, outlined by Sykes and Matza (1957), could allow an offender to preserve a nondelinquent self-perception and, hence, a social bond that is basically strong. Further research combining the theoretical positions of Hirschi (1969) and Sykes and Matza (1957) seems warranted.

REFERENCE NOTES

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Chang, D.H. & Winter, W.F. Inmate and non-inmate perceptions of "self" and "other" status groups. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Sociological Society, 1974.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Andry, R.G. Parental affection and delinquency in Wolfgang, M.E.; Savitz, L., & Johnston, N. (Eds.). The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1962.
- Anolick, S.A. The family perceptions of delinquents, high school students, and freshman college students. Adolescence, 1980, 15, 903-911.
- Bandura, A. & Walters, A.H. Adolescent Aggression: A Study of the Influence of Child-Training Practices and Family Interrelationships. New York: Ronald Press, 1959.
- Bynner, J.M.; O'Malley, P.M., & Bachman, J.G. Self-esteem and delinquency revisited. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1981, 10, 407-441.
- Chang, D.H. Crime & Delinquency. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1977.
- Chang, D.H. & Iacovetta, R.G. Perceptual evaluations as an index for conflict resolution and criminal rehabilitation. Indian Journal of Criminology and Criminalistics, 1981, 1, 28-39.
- Chang, D.H. & Zastrow, C.H. Inmates' and security guards' perceptions of themselves and of each other: A comparative study. International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 1976, 4, 89-98.
- Chapman, I. Role and self-concept assessments of delinquents and nondelinquents. Sociological Quarterly, 1966, 7, 373-379.
- Chassin, L.; Eason, B.J., & Young, R.D. Identifying with a deviant label: The validation of a methodology. Social Psychology Quarterly, 1981, 44, 31-36.

- Chassin, L.; Presson, C.C.; Young, R.D, & Light, R. Self-concepts of institutionalized adolescents: A framework for conceptualizing labeling effects. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1981, 90, 143-150.
- Clinard, M.B. & Meier, R.F. Sociology of Deviant Behavior (5th Ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Dale, E. & O'Rourke, J. The Living Word Vocabulary: The Words We Know. Elgin, Ill.: Dome Press, 1979.
- Eyo, I.E. Relationship between social desirability and self-criticism in subgroups of male and female delinquents and nondelinquents. Psychological Reports, 1981, 49, 711-716.
- Fiedler, F.E. & Bass, A.R. Delinquency confinement and interpersonal perception. Technical Report No. 6, U.S.P.H. Grant M1774, University of Illinois, 1959.
- Ganzer, V.J. & Sarason, I.G. Variables associated with recidivism among juvenile delinquents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40, 1-5.
- Giallombardo, R. Female delinquency in Giallombardo, R. (Ed.). Juvenile Delinquency: A Book of Readings (4th Ed.). New York: Wiley, 1982.
- Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Heise, D.R. The semantic differential and attitude research in Chang, D.H. & Iacovetta, R.G. (Eds.). Perceptual evaluations as an index for conflict resolution and criminal rehabilitation. Indian Journal of Criminology and Criminalistics, 1981, 1, 28-39.

- Hepburn, J.R. The impact of police intervention upon juvenile delinquents. Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 1977, 15, 235-262.
- Hirschi, T. Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley and L.A., Cal.: University of California Press, 1969.
- Jensen, G.F. Delinquency and adolescent self conceptions. A study of the personal relevance of infraction. Social Problems, 1972, 20, 84-101.
- Jurkovic, G.J. The juvenile delinquent as a moral philosopher: A structural - developmental perspective. Psychological Bulliten, 1980, 88, 709-727.
- Kelly, D.H. Labeling and the consequences of wearing a delinquent label in a school setting. Education, 1977, 97, 371-380.
- Keppel, G. Design & Analysis: A Researcher's Handbook (2nd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice - Hall, 1982.
- Knapp, R.P. Value and personality differences between offenders and nonoffenders. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 59-62.
- Loeber, R. The stability of antisocial and delinquent child behavior: A review. Child Development, 1982, 53, 1431-1446.
- Lueger, R.J. & Cadman, W. Variables associated with recidivism and program-termination of delinquent adolescents. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1982, 38, 861-863.
- Lund, N.L. & Salary, H.M. Measured self-concept in adjudicated juvenile offenders. Adolescence, 1980, 15, 65-74.
- Maher, B. & Stein, E. The delinquent's perception of the law and community in Wheeler, S. (Ed.). Controlling Delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1968.

- Myerhoff, H.L. & Myerhoff, B.G. Field observations of middle class gangs. Social Forces, 1964, 42, 328-336.
- Nye, F.I. Family relationships and delinquent behavior in Rosenquist, C.M. & Megargee, E.I. (Eds.). Delinquency in Three Cultures. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1969.
- Osgood, C.E.; Suci, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. The Measurement of Meaning in Chang, D.H. & Zastrow, C.H. (Eds.). Inmates' and security guards' perceptions of themselves and of each other: A comparative study. International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 1976, 4, 89-98.
- Quicker, J.C. A consideration of the relationship of "punitiveness" to delinquency as developed in opportunity theory. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1973, 13, 333-338.
- Rosenberg, F.R. & Rosenberg, M. Self-esteem and delinquency. Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 1978, 7, 279-291.
- Rosenquist, C.M. & Megargee, E.I. Delinquency in Three Cultures. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1969.
- Schur, E.M. Radical Non-Intervention: Rethinking the Delinquency Problem. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Sykes, G.M. & Matza, D. Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 644-670.
- Tangri, S.S. & Schwartz, M. Delinquency research and the self-concept variable. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1967, 58, 182-190.
- Valins, S. Cognitive effects of false heart-rate feedback in Liebert, R.M. & Spiegler, M.D. (Eds.). Personality: Strategies & Issues (3rd Ed.). Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1978.

Yochelson, S. & Samenow, S.E. The Criminal Personality: A Profile for change (Vol. 1). New York: Jason Aronson, 1976.

APPENDIX: TABLES

TABLE 2

Summary of One-Way Analysis of Variance
 Performed on the Institutionalized-Female Data

<u>Rock Stars</u>				
<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	2190.14	2	1095.07	3.78*
Within Groups (error)	11008.80	38	289.71	
Total	13198.94	40		

*p < .05

<u>Parents</u>				
<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	109.73	2	54.87	.48
Within Groups (error)	4345.48	38	114.36	
Total	4455.21	40		

<u>Police Officers</u>				
<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	1471.13	2	735.56	1.61
Within Groups (error)	17398.80	38	457.86	
Total	18869.93	40		

<u>Medical Doctors</u>				
<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	74.38	2	37.19	.36
Within Groups (error)	3979.44	38	104.72	
Total	4053.82	40		

Teachers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	26.95	2	13.48	.07
Within Groups (error)	7833.48	38	206.14	
Total	7860.43	40		

Criminals

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	6.03	2	3.02	.01
Within Groups (error)	18453.10	38	485.61	
Total	18459.13	40		

Social Workers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	9.56	2	4.78	.01
Within Groups (error)	15615.50	38	410.93	
Total	15625.06	40		

Problem Teenagers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	399.29	2	199.65	1.20
Within Groups (error)	6317.49	38	166.25	
Total	6716.78	40		

Businessmen

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	751.83	2	375.91	1.21
Within Groups (error)	12765.90	38	335.95	
Total	13517.73	40		

Juvenile Court Judges

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	616.58	2	308.29	.48
Within Groups (error)	24261.00	38	638.45	
Total	24877.58	40		

Priests and Ministers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	202.97	2	101.48	.69
Within Groups (error)	5550.97	38	146.08	
Total	5753.94	40		

Correctional Officers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	33.33	2	16.66	.03
Within Groups (error)	18658.60	38	491.02	
Total	18691.93	40		

I am

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Between Groups	89.09	2	44.55	.17
Within Groups (error)	9697.94	38	255.21	
Total	9787.03	40		

TABLE 3

Summary of Two-Way Weighted-Means Analysis of
Variance for Specific Status Groups and I Am Questionnaire

<u>Parents</u>				
<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	31.80	1	31.80	.28
Confinement Status	1028.60	1	1028.60	9.11*
Interaction	3.70	1	3.70	.03
Within Groups (error)	31274.10	277	112.90	
Total	32338.20	280		

*p < .05

<u>Police Officers</u>				
<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	2.70	1	2.70	.01
Confinement Status	11921.70	1	11921.70	57.36*
Interaction	6542.80	1	6542.80	31.48*
Within Groups (error)	57572.80	277	207.84	
Total	76040.00	280		

*p < .05

<u>Medical Doctors</u>				
<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	1473.20	1	1473.20	16.95*
Confinement Status	1.60	1	1.60	.02
Interaction	1.10	1	1.10	.01
Within Groups (error)	24082.10	277	86.94	
Total	25558.00	280		

*p < .05

Teachers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	1165.80	1	1165.80	6.77*
Confinement Status	33.60	1	33.60	1.00
Interaction	125.00	1	125.00	.73
Within Groups (error)	47708.60	277	172.23	
Total	49033.00	280		

*p < .05

Criminals

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	354.61	1	354.61	2.10
Confinement Status	6281.86	1	6281.86	37.26*
Interaction	1024.56	1	1024.56	6.08*
Within Groups (error)	46698.09	277	168.59	
Total	54359.12	280		

*p < .05

Social Workers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	2636.30	1	2636.30	13.34*
Confinement Status	6724.40	1	6724.40	34.02*
Interaction	1630.40	1	1630.40	8.25*
Within Groups (error)	54744.90	277	197.64	
Total	65736.00	280		

*p < .05

Problem Teenagers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	456.78	1	456.78	2.67
Confinement Status	1336.88	1	1336.88	7.82*
Interaction	186.70	1	186.70	1.09
Within Groups (error)	47374.76	277	171.03	
Total	49355.12	280		

*p < .05

Businessmen

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	431.30	1	431.30	2.66
Confinement Status	50.30	1	50.30	.31
Interaction	881.30	1	881.30	5.44*
Within Groups (error)	44914.20	277	162.15	
Total	46277.10	280		

* $p < .05$

Juvenile Court Judges

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	919.60	1	919.60	3.11
Confinement Status	10325.90	1	10325.90	34.89*
Interaction	1298.40	1	1298.40	4.37*
Within Groups (error)	81989.50	277	295.99	
Total	94533.40	280		

* $p < .05$

Priests and Ministers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	123.60	1	123.60	1.24
Confinement Status	226.20	1	226.20	2.26
Interaction	1312.90	1	1312.90	13.14*
Within Groups (error)	27671.30	277	99.90	
Total	29334.00	280		

* $p < .05$

Correctional Officers

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	4694.90	1	4694.90	17.59*
Confinement Status	6538.00	1	6538.00	24.49*
Interaction	47.70	1	47.70	.18
Within Groups (error)	73946.90	277	266.96	
Total	85227.50	280		

* $p < .05$

I am

<u>Source</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Gender	822.40	1	822.40	.48
Confinement Status	3995.30	1	3995.30	2.35
Interaction	28.30	1	28.30	.02
Within Groups (error)	471787.00	277	1703.20	
Total	476633.00	280		

TABLE 4

Summary of Group Means with Sex of Subjects Controlled

Status Groups	Institutionalized		Noninstitutionalized	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Rock Stars	62.87	63.98	59.80	61.99
Parents	76.03	76.34	80.15	80.96
Police Officers	73.40	56.41	75.42	80.91
Medical Doctors	82.33	87.17	82.67	87.24
Teachers	70.00	71.80	69.01	73.92
Criminals	40.50	44.85	34.74	30.21
Social Workers	72.93	70.78	77.74	86.78
Problem Teenagers	49.50	54.93	46.69	48.30
Businessmen	78.27	74.61	74.48	79.07
Juvenile Court Judges	67.03	63.24	75.22	81.42
Priests and Ministers	88.77	82.59	85.02	88.91
Correctional Officers	59.53	69.05	71.60	79.46
I am	75.33	77.78	83.22	87.04