

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Chris B. Shafer for the Master of Science

in General Psychology: Concentration in Clinical Psychology

presented on December 22, 1978

Title: The Personality Characteristics of Delinquents, Miscreants,  
and Status-Offenders

Abstract approved:

Cooper B. Holmes

Past psychological research pertaining to juvenile offenders has been primarily concerned with offenders as a group, or homogeneous unit. In this study three legally subdivided juvenile offender groups, the delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders, were investigated to determine if there were significant psychological differences among them. The testing instrument utilized in this investigation was the revised Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ), developed by Cattell and Beloff in 1962. The HSPQ was administered to sixty, twelve to eighteen year old juvenile offenders divided equally into delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders, based on the seriousness of their offense. There were ten males and ten females in each group. The analysis of variance test and the least significant difference technique were the statistical procedures utilized for data analysis.

Analysis of the data indicated that there were no significant differences between delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders as

measured by the HSPQ. There were differences computed between males and females on two factors of the HSPQ. There was also an interaction effect. However, relative to the entire protocol, these differences proved fairly slight. Consequently, the results of this investigation indicate that the legal subdivisions of delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders are not representative of psychologically distinct sub-categories of juvenile offenders.

THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF DELINQUENTS,  
MISCREANTS, AND STATUS-OFFENDERS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Department of Psychology  
Emporia State University

---

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

---

by  
Chris B. Shafer  
December 1978

76-1  
1998  
5

Det. H. Cass

Approved for the Major Department

David E. Dunt

Approved for the Graduate Council

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Cooper Holmes, Dr. Ray Heath, and Dr. Christopher Joseph for their guidance and assistance in the preparation of this work.

I would also like to thank my mother and father for the infinite number of things they have done which have enabled me to attend this university and enjoy a fuller life.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to my wife, Shelli, and to our daughter, Brooke, because their love makes life beautiful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
THEORETICAL FORMULATION. . . . .	1
THE PROBLEM. . . . .	3
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	4
Statement of the Research Hypotheses . . . . .	4
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	4
Significance of the Study. . . . .	4
DEFINITION OF TERMS. . . . .	5
Adjudication . . . . .	5
Crime Index Offenses . . . . .	5
Juvenile Delinquent. . . . .	6
Miscreant. . . . .	6
Status-Offender. . . . .	6
Truant . . . . .	6
Wayward. . . . .	6
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	7
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	8
JUVENILE CRIME STATISTICS. . . . .	8
RELATED RESEARCH . . . . .	11

## Chapter

THE HSPQ . . . . .	14
CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	18
3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	19
POPULATION AND SAMPLING . . . . .	19
MATERIALS AND INSTRUMENTATION . . . . .	20
DESIGN OF THE STUDY . . . . .	22
PROCEDURE AND DATA COLLECTION . . . . .	22
DATA ANALYSIS . . . . .	23
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	24
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS . . . . .	24
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	39
SUMMARY . . . . .	39
CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	40
RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	42

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means of the Independent Variables for the Fourteen Factors of the HSPQ . . . . .	25
2. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable A. . . . .	26
3. Least Significant Difference Table for Factor A of the HSPQ. . . . .	27
4. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable B. . . . .	28
5. Least Significant Difference Table for Factor B of the HSPQ. . . . .	29
6. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable C. . . . .	30
7. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable D. . . . .	31
8. Least Significant Difference Table for Factor D of the HSPQ. . . . .	32
9. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable E. . . . .	33
10. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable F. . . . .	33
11. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable G. . . . .	34
12. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable H. . . . .	34
13. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable I. . . . .	35
14. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable J. . . . .	35



Table	Page
15. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable $Q_0$ . . . . .	36
16. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable $Q_2$ . . . . .	36
17. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable $Q_3$ . . . . .	37
18. Analysis of Variance Summary Table for Dependent Variable $Q_4$ . . . . .	37

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

In this chapter the development of the theoretical background is discussed. In addition, the following sections are discussed: the statement of the problem, the statement of the hypotheses, the purpose of the study, significance of the study, definition of terms, and the limitations of the study.

### THEORETICAL FORMULATION

In the United States, as in other similarly economically prospering, rapidly changing societies, crimes committed by juveniles have been increasing at a disproportionately faster rate than the concomitant increase in the youthful population. For example, the Uniform Crime Reports of 1973 stated that 1,138,004 juveniles were arrested compared to only 466,174 in 1960. Juveniles represented 16 percent of the population but accounted for 33 percent of all Crime Index offenses solved.<sup>1</sup>

As of 1975 the number of juveniles arrested in the United States had risen approximately 150 percent above the number arrested in 1960. Also, almost one-half of all serious crimes were committed by juveniles under eighteen years of age.

---

<sup>1</sup>Clarence Kelly, "Crime In The United States," Uniform Crime Reports, 1971, pp. 6-12.

Nationally, 70 percent of the juveniles arrested under the age of eighteen were re-arrested within a three- to four-year period, often as adults, all of which indicates that treatment programs which attempt the psychological evaluation and rehabilitation of those offenders need to function more efficiently.<sup>2</sup> Research concerning the psychology of juvenile offenders should be more relevant and easily applicable to the judicial system and juvenile adjudication.

Juvenile crime is a many-faceted problem which has inspired research into many socio-cultural, legal, and psychological areas. However, psychological investigations in the past have been primarily concerned with juvenile offenders as a unit. Few studies have endeavored to distinguish personality differences between subgroups of juvenile offenders.

No one has yet attempted to investigate the psychological characteristics of the legal subdivisions of juvenile offender groups that are used in Kansas. Included are the juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders. Categorization of juveniles into particular groups is based on the seriousness of crimes that have been committed.

Delinquents, legally defined in Kansas, are juveniles whose crimes would have been considered felonies had they been adults at the time of their crime.<sup>3</sup> This category represents offenders who have committed the most serious crimes, e.g., murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.

---

<sup>2</sup>Kelly, 1975, pp. 9-16.

<sup>3</sup>Vern Miller, A Guide To The Juvenile Code, 1973, pp. 2-3.

Miscreancy defines the legal status of juveniles in Kansas whose crimes would have been considered misdemeanors had they been adults at the time of their crime. Less serious crimes, as compared to crimes committed by delinquents, were committed by offenders in this category, e.g., larceny under fifty dollars, many sex offenses except forcible rape, DWI (driving while intoxicated), reckless driving, and negligent homicide.<sup>4</sup>

Status-offenders are youths whose offenses have been determined primarily by the statutory age limits allocated by state law. Statutory age limits usually run from seventeen to nineteen years of age. The Kansas statutory age limit is eighteen and status-offenses include waywardness and truancy.

#### THE PROBLEM

The term "juvenile delinquency" has been used consistently by investigators in the past to represent all offenders collectively, and the homogeneity of that classification has often been taken for granted. Therefore, this examiner investigated the psychological characteristics of the three previously described legally subdivided groups of juvenile offenders--the delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders--to determine if there were significant personality differences among them. Also, would there be any differences between males and females in the study. An instrument which has been effective in the personality assessment of junior and senior high school students from twelve to eighteen years of age, the Jr.-Sr. High School Personality

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

Questionnaire, henceforth to be called the HSPQ, was utilized in this investigation.

### Statement of the Problem

Are there significant differences in the psychological characteristics of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders as measured by the fourteen factors of the HSPQ?

Are there significant differences in the psychological characteristics between males and females as measured by the fourteen factors of the HSPQ?

### Statement of the Research Hypotheses

There are no significant differences in the psychological characteristics of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders as measured by the fourteen factors of the HSPQ.

There are no significant differences in the psychological characteristics between males and females as measured by the fourteen factors of the HSPQ.

### Purpose of the Study

This study was conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in the psychological characteristics of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders. These categories represent the three legally subdivided offender groups used in Kansas.

### Significance of the Study

Determining whether there are or are not significant personality differences among delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders could be of value to psychologists, probation officers, social workers, and

other professionals who must work with large numbers of juvenile offenders. Although this investigation could have many legal and psychological implications, the results would still be considered significant should they function primarily to satisfy scientific inquisitiveness. Finally, it was desired that this initial investigation into the psychological characteristics of delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders would serve as a catalyst for further study in this area.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following are terms that are defined for this study. Each term is operationally defined according to the manner in which it is employed in relation to this study.

##### Adjudication

Adjudication refers to the judgment by the court regarding the arraignment of a juvenile, which usually involves considerations for placement and possible psychiatric treatment of the offender.

##### Crime Index Offenses

Crime Index Offenses are those regarded by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to constitute a fairly representative sampling, for generalization purposes, of the serious crimes committed in the United States. The crimes used in the sample include murder, forcible rape, aggravated assault, larceny over fifty dollars, and auto theft.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>J. Edgar Hoover, "Crime in the United States," Uniform Crime Reports, 1967, pp. 7-8.

### Juvenile Delinquent

A delinquent child is ". . . a child less than eighteen years of age who does an act which, if done by a person eighteen years of age or older, would make such a person liable to be arrested and prosecuted for the commission of a felony".<sup>6</sup>

### Miscreant

A miscreant child is ". . . a child less than eighteen years of age who does an act which, if done by a person eighteen years of age or older, would make that person liable to be arrested and prosecuted for the commission of a misdemeanor".<sup>7</sup>

### Status-Offender

Status-offenders are youths who have committed offenses which would not have been considered crimes had they been eighteen years of age or older. Included in this category are truants and waywards.

### Truant

A truant is ". . . a child who, being required by law to attend school, absents himself or herself therefrom".<sup>8</sup>

### Wayward

A wayward child is ". . . a child less than eighteen years of age (1) whose behavior is injurious to his or her welfare; (2) who has deserted his or her home without good or sufficient cause; or (3) who is

---

<sup>6</sup>J. C. Weeks, The Juvenile Code, Kansas Statutes Annotated, Vol. 3 (1973), pp. 476-478.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid.

habitually disobedient to the reasonable and lawful commands of his or her parents, guardian, or other lawful custodian".<sup>9</sup>

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was made with a sample of twelve to eighteen year old male and female juvenile offenders who had either been on probation or in a detention facility in Kansas. No attempt was made to control for the ages of subjects in each offender group, although the ages were fairly evenly distributed because, in general, there was no relationship between the seriousness of an offense and the age of an offender. Sixty juveniles were used in this study, with twenty in each group, and although it is considered an adequate number, a larger sample might enhance the validity of the results. It was determined that no other states employed precisely the same system for categorizing juvenile offenders into delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders, and, therefore, the direct applicability of the results of this study is limited to the judicial system of Kansas.

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.



## Chapter 2

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Past research concerning the psychological characteristics of juvenile offenders has produced little in the way of conclusive and replicable results. Not one investigative effort has attempted to measure the personality differences in the legally subdivided offender groups used in Kansas.

The literature review in this chapter is divided into three sections. The first presents statistically relevant information taken from fifteen years of data collection by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and publicized in the Uniform Crime Reports. The second section presents studies which attempted to differentiate among juvenile offender subgroups but which utilized varied strategies in their approaches to the problem. Studies relating to the HSPQ are presented in the third section.

### JUVENILE CRIME STATISTICS

In 1967, although youths ages ten through seventeen years of age represented just 15 percent of the total population of the United States, they accounted for 33 percent of all Crime Index offenses solved. Youths accounted for 24 percent of all arrests which was an increase of 22 percent from 1960 to 1967.

Of youths first arrested in 1963, 70 percent were re-arrested within a three- to four-year period. It was estimated that of "persons

who have seemingly made a career of crime almost one-half are in their teens at the time of their first arrest".<sup>10</sup>

In 1968, youths ten through seventeen years of age represented 16 percent of the population but accounted for 26 percent of the total arrests and 34 percent of all Crime Index offenses solved. When only serious crimes were considered it was found that 43 percent of the arrests were for persons under eighteen years of age. This represented an increase in the serious crime incidence among youth of 25 percent from 1960 to 1968. At that time males outnumbered female offenders approximately seven to one.<sup>11</sup>

During the years of 1969<sup>12</sup> and 1970<sup>13</sup> the youth of the United States continued to represent 16 percent of the population but accounted for 22 percent of the total arrests and 25 percent of all Crime Index offenses solved. From 1960 to 1970 this represented an increase of 113 percent in the number of Crime Index offenses attributed to young people. Again, where only Crime Index offenses were considered, 44 percent of the arrests were for juveniles under eighteen years of age.

In 1971, arrests involving juveniles increased 5 percent over 1970, 31 percent over 1966, and 124 percent over 1960. Violent crimes involving youth rose a sharp 67 percent during the five-year period from 1966 to 1971, while crimes against property were up 28 percent.<sup>14</sup>

The statistics were similar in 1972. While representing 16 percent of the population, youths under eighteen years of age accounted for

---

<sup>10</sup>Hoover, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

<sup>11</sup>Hoover, 1968, pp. 9-14.

<sup>12</sup>Hoover, 1969, pp. 8-14.

<sup>13</sup>Hoover, 1970, pp. 6-10.

<sup>14</sup>P. L. Gray, "Crime in the United States," Uniform Crime Reports, 1971, pp. 8-12.

27 percent of all Crime Index offenses solved, 26 percent of all police arrests, and 44 percent of all serious crimes committed in the United States. During the period from 1970 to 1972 youths were re-arrested more than any other age group.<sup>15</sup>

From 1960 to 1973 arrests involving juveniles increased 144 percent, while adult arrests rose only 16 percent. However, percentages can be deceiving by themselves. The actual number of youths arrested was still far below that of adults. In 1960 a total of 466,174 juveniles were arrested compared to 2,776,400 adults, which increased to 1,138,004 juveniles and 3,243,922 adults by 1973.<sup>16</sup>

In 1967 the proportion of male to female offenders was almost eight to one. By 1974 this ratio was five to one. Female arrests were increasing at a far higher rate than male arrests. However, female crimes often involved drug or sex-related offenses and still did not follow the re-arrest pattern of male offenders.<sup>17</sup>

From 1960 to 1975 arrests of juveniles between the ages of ten and seventeen years of age had increased approximately 150 percent. Almost 50 percent of the serious crimes committed in the United States involved juvenile offenders. Males outnumbered females only four to one. Thirty-three percent of all Crime Index offenses involved juveniles, although they still represented only 16 percent of the population.<sup>18</sup> The trend, as evidenced by the statistics, indicates that crimes committed by juveniles are increasing at a higher rate than the increase in the juvenile population.

---

<sup>15</sup>Kelly, 1972, pp. 6-12.

<sup>16</sup>Kelly, 1973, pp. 6-13.

<sup>17</sup>Kelly, 1974, pp. 5-11.

<sup>18</sup>Kelly, 1975, pp. 8-13.

## RELATED RESEARCH

Although most investigators chose to compare juvenile delinquents to non-delinquents, a handful attempted to distinguish personality differences among subgroups of juvenile offenders. None, however, had studied the subdivisions investigated by this researcher. Even so, there were certain instances where efforts to discriminate among subgroups of offenders were significant.

A study by Schaedler is an example of such an instance.<sup>19</sup> In an attempt to establish the existence of subgroups or types of juvenile delinquents, Schaedler administered the MMPI and the Harris Lingoes Subscales to three groups of delinquent boys who were divided according to their scores on the Personal Opinion Survey. Significant differences were found in the personality characteristics of the separate groups.

Group one in Schaedler's experiment, classified as the neurotic disturbed group, was more psychologically disturbed than the other two groups. Its members ". . . had more concern about bodily functions, more somatic complaints, more depression, more difficulty with family conflicts, were more alienated, and had more thought disorders." The other two groups were classified as the socialized subcultured and the unsocialized psychopathic group. The socialized subcultured group was the least disturbed of all the groups. Its members ". . . had difficulty with the rules of society, more denial of social anxiety, and felt greater needs to be liked." The unsocialized psychopathic group ". . . had difficulty in interpersonal relationships but did not seem to care

---

<sup>19</sup>T. J. Schaedler, "Personality and Attitude Characteristics as a Function of Delinquency Dimensions," DAI, 34, No. 7-B (1974), 3508.

about this difficulty, and were much less concerned about their offenses than the other two groups." This research was the initial attempt to discern differences in the personality characteristics among subgroups of juvenile delinquents.

In another study, rigidity, a characteristic of the anal-compulsive personality and felt to be ". . . a definite indicator of psychopathology" was measured by Breskin and Burchill in ninety-six juveniles, according to the severity of their offenses.<sup>20</sup> The test for rigidity was the Breskin Rigidity Test (BRT). The higher the score, on a scale from one to fifteen, the higher the measured rigidity.

Breskin and Burchill's groups, ranging in age from twelve to nineteen years of age, were scored as to the severity of offense, i.e., whether crimes were committed against property (e.g., theft), against people (e.g., assault), or crimes which endangered health (e.g., drug-related offenses). They were also scored as to the repetitiveness of their offenses, i.e., whether it was a first or a later offense. Crimes that were against people and later offenses were considered the worst.

The authors found that the BRT scores were the highest (most indicative of rigidity) for juveniles whose crimes were against people. Later offenses also received higher BRT scores than first offenses. It was felt that psychopathology, as indicated by the degree of rigidity, was positively correlated to the severity of crimes committed in their study.

---

<sup>20</sup>Steven Breskin and Philip Burchill, "Non-verbal Rigidity and Severity of Criminal Offenses in a Group of Juvenile Delinquents," Journal of Psychology, 78, No. 2 (1971), 265-267.

An investigation into the homogeneity of juvenile offenders was conducted by Meyer.<sup>21</sup> In testing one hundred juvenile offenders with the MMPI, Meyer found five distinct personality patterns which he classified as (1) subcultured offender, (2) neurotic offender, (3) anti-social offender, (4) psychopathic offender, and (5) manipulative offender. The MMPI scores and their relationships to the discovered five personality patterns were not discussed.

In a study by Tsubouchi and Jenkins the psychological characteristics of a motivationally affected group of juvenile delinquents were compared to a group of delinquents whose behavior was felt to be affected by frustration.<sup>22</sup> The first group was called the socialized delinquent group because their behavior was ". . . characterized by gang activity such as cooperative stealing, having undesirable companions, and which developed in large part from peer group pressure in economically depressed urban areas." The second group was comprised of runaways, what the authors termed as unsocialized aggressive offenders. Both groups consisted of fifty members, ages fourteen through nineteen years of age, from the Iowa Training School for Boys.

Comparison of their MMPI protocols indicated a significantly lower incidence of psychopathology in the socialized delinquent group, where a type of interpersonal communication and participation was maintained. Maladjustment in the frustration group was closely tied

---

<sup>21</sup>James Meyer, "A Validation Investigation of an Empirical Typology of Youthful Offenders," DAI, 34, No. 10-B (1974), 5200.

<sup>22</sup>Kosuke Tsubouchi and R. L. Jenkins, "Three Types of Delinquents: Their Performance on MMPI and PCR," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25, No. 4 (1969), 353-358.

to maternal rejection or neglect. This group's MMPI scores were said to be much more deviant than the motivationally affected group's scores.

In an attempt to determine the degree of socialization of juvenile delinquents as related to the severity of their offenses, Smith and Austrin administered the Socialization Scale of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) to three groups of offenders.<sup>23</sup> Group one was comprised of twenty male Level I offenders convicted of minor or misdemeanor crimes. Group two was comprised of twenty male Level II offenders convicted of felony crimes. The third group was made up of normal males used as a control group.

Significant differences were found between the scores of the Level I offenders and the normal group and between the Level II offenders and the normal group but not between Level I and Level II offenders. It was suggested that the Socialization Scale of the CPI was a useful instrument for determining the degree of socialization between normal populations and juveniles convicted of misdemeanor or felony offenses but was not capable of distinguishing between the two groups of offenders. What the differences were between the offender and normal groups was not explained.

#### THE HSPQ

The research reviewed in this section concerns the HSPQ as it relates to the personality assessment of juvenile offenders. The information gained from the personality assessment utilizing this questionnaire

---

<sup>23</sup>Patricia Smith and Harvey Austrin, "Socialization as Related to Delinquency Classification," Psychological Reports, 34, No. 2 (1974), 677-678.

has been of value to professionals engaged in a variety of educational, counseling, and guidance situations.

The HSPQ was the object of research by Person, where he attempted to relate the fourteen factors of the test to juvenile delinquency.<sup>24</sup> Ten HSPQ factors were relatively consistent in describing the delinquents he investigated. They were Factors A+ (warmheartedness), C+ (good emotional stability), D- (undemonstrative), E- (easily led), H+ (adventurous), J+ (individualistic), O- (self-assured), Q<sub>3</sub>- (poor self-esteem), and Q<sub>4</sub> (ergic tension). It was suggested that the strength of association of Factor J+ (neurosthenic or fastidiously individualistic) to Factor Q<sub>3</sub>- (poor self-esteem) be carefully considered, for these two factors accounted for enough of the variance in his studies to make delinquency prediction feasible.

A study to discover if there are meaningful diagnostic categories of juvenile delinquents, using the syndrome delinquent types set forth by Jenkins, was conducted by Carlson.<sup>25</sup> Two hundred juveniles were divided, according to their court records, into the group delinquent reaction, the runaway reaction, and the unsocialized aggressive reaction types. A high school group of equivalent size was used to represent a normal population. The HSPQ and the Motivation Analysis Test (MAT), also developed by Cattell, were utilized.

Major differences were found when comparing the delinquent types with the normal group collectively but differences among delinquent

---

<sup>24</sup>George Person, "The HSPQ as a Delinquency Proneness Assessment Instrument," DAI, No. 5-B (1970), 2964.

<sup>25</sup>Lester Carlson, "The Relationship of Delinquency Types of an Industrial School Setting to Personality--Motivation Profiles," DAI, 29 No. 5-A (1968), 1446.



types were slight. It was concluded that neither the HSPQ nor the MAT was capable of identifying the factors necessary to differentiate among Jenkins' categories of juvenile delinquents, or that the groups measured did not represent meaningful diagnostic categories.

Person and Kelly analyzed the HSPQs of 1,300 juveniles committed to the Fort Warden Diagnostic and Treatment Center in Washington. Their findings differed on several factors from those reported by Cattell.<sup>26</sup> Their results are presented below.

A higher score was obtained for Factor A which indicated a "more outgoing, adventurous, extroverted personality" than was previously indicated. Factor B scores were also consistently higher which indicated at least average intellectual ability in many cases. Factor Q<sub>3</sub> was higher than previously reported indicating that ego-strength and self-control were better than previously believed. To explain many of the differences between their study and Cattell's, Person and Kelly suggest the possibility of subgroups or different types of delinquents.

To provide normative data on female juvenile delinquents, 287 girls between the ages of twelve and eighteen years of age and confined to the Indiana Girls School were administered the HSPQ by Stern and Grosz.<sup>27</sup> Also, to determine the temporal stability of the HSPQ factors with female populations, a group of thirty randomly selected girls was retested between eight and nine weeks later and another group of sixty-three girls was tested again at approximately eleven months.

---

<sup>26</sup>George Person and Robert Kelly, "HSPQ Norms on a State-wide Delinquent Population," Journal of Psychology, 56, No. 1 (1963), 185-192.

<sup>27</sup>Herbert Stern and Harnes Grosz, "HSPQ Personality Measurements in Institutionalized Delinquent Girls and Their Temporal Stability," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25 (1969), 289-293.

The results of Stern and Grosz' study were compared with those obtained by Cattell and Beloff (which involved a mixed population of males and females). It was found that thirteen of the fourteen factors deviated from the norm in the same direction. Their findings supported Cattell's contention that when compared to normal children ". . . teenage delinquents are very definitely lower in intelligence (Factor B), less dependable (Factor E), and more obstructively individualistic (Factor J)."

Test-retest correlations in Stern and Grosz' study, at two and eleven months, showed that none of the test scores differed significantly ( $p < .05$ ). It was concluded that ". . . the reliability of the HSPQ factors is not seriously reduced at least up to a period of one year and that the degree of the stability of the individual HSPQ factors becomes manifest even after as relatively short period of time interval as two months."

To test whether or not the 1962 revision of the HSPQ would differentiate delinquents from non-delinquents as did its predecessor, Person, Moseley, and Olsen administered the HSPQ to 338 male delinquents who were admitted to the Division of Juvenile Rehabilitation in Washington.<sup>28</sup> The HSPQ did a good job of distinguishing delinquents from the non-delinquents of the standardization sample, as did the original version, and confirmed the author's contention that the HSPQ is a valuable instrument in determining several important personality characteristics.

---

<sup>28</sup>George Person, John Moseley, and Mark Olsen, "The Personality and Character Structure of the Delinquent: Some Social-Psychological Implications," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 110, No. 1 (1967), 139-147.

## CONCLUSIONS

It has already been established that there are personality differences between juvenile offenders when taken collectively, and non-offenders. However, there have been few attempts to discover if there are differences in the psychological characteristics among subgroups of offenders, especially when seriousness of offense was a variable, and the results have been inconclusive or questionable. Not one study could be found in the literature concerning the psychology of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders.

## Chapter 3

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this experiment was to objectively measure if there were significant differences in the psychological characteristics of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders. This chapter contains sections on population and sampling, materials and instrumentation, design of the study, procedure and data collection, and data analysis.

### POPULATION AND SAMPLING

The subjects for this study were sixty, twelve to eighteen year old male or female juvenile offenders who had either been on probation or held in a detention facility in Kansas. The offenders were divided equally into three groups: the juvenile delinquents, the miscreants, and the status-offenders. There were ten males and ten females in each category.

The subjects for each group were randomly selected from a list of names compiled by reviewing current juvenile court files. Their names were then placed in a container and randomly removed until each category was completed. Juveniles who had been administered the HSPQ within a period of one year were included in the sample. Protocols more than one year old are not considered valid for interpretation.

## MATERIALS AND INSTRUMENTATION

The Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) developed by Cattell and Cattell in 1958, and revised by Cattell and Beloff in 1962, was the test utilized in this investigation. The HSPQ is an instrument which primarily assesses the same personality factors as the Children's Personality Questionnaire (CPQ), applicable to the age range just below it and overlapping it at the lower end of the HSPQ, and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF), applicable to the post-high school years.

The HSPQ was designed for use with children between the ages of twelve and eighteen. This questionnaire was designed to give ". . . the maximum information in the shortest time about the greatest number of dimensions of personality."<sup>29</sup>

There are fourteen relatively independent factors referred to by letters of the alphabet A through Q<sub>4</sub>, used for personality evaluation. Factor A is sizothymia (reserved) versus affectothymia (warmhearted), Factor B is general intelligence, Factor C is ego strength, Factor D is excitability, Factor E is dominance, Factor F is surgency, Factor G is super-ego strength, Factor H is threctia (shy) versus parmia (adventurous), Factor I is harria (self-reliant) versus presmia (insecure), Factor J is zeppia (zestful) versus coasthenia (individualism), Factor O is guilt proneness, Factor Q<sub>2</sub> is self-sufficiency, Factor Q<sub>3</sub> is self-concept, and Factor Q<sub>4</sub> is ergic tension.

---

<sup>29</sup> Raymond Cattell, Handbook for the Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ), 1962, p. 4.

Descriptions of the factorially independent dimensions of personality are presented on a bi-polar continuum, with the extremes represented by very low (1-3) or very high (8-10) sten scores. An extremely high or low score must be viewed in relation to other scores and does not necessarily indicate a good or bad personality characteristic by itself.

Only one form of the HSPQ was employed due to the limited amount of time available for testing in most instances. Test-retest reliability coefficients using a single form over a six-month interval were as follows on each of the fourteen factors: .62 on A, .60 on B, .58 on C, .65 on D, .57 on E, .53 on F, .62 on G, .69 on H, .65 on I, .58 on J, .56 on O, .55 on Q<sub>2</sub>, .60 on Q<sub>3</sub>, and .58 on Q<sub>4</sub>. Over a twelve-month period the reliability coefficients were .55 on A, .38 on B, .50 on C, .55 on D, .47 on E, .57 on F, .44 on G, .48 on H, .69 on I, .49 on J, .56 on O, .39 on Q<sub>2</sub>, .41 on Q<sub>3</sub>, and .39 on Q<sub>4</sub>. It was emphasized that because reliability is based on long-term retests, the stability coefficient is often more reflective of the stability of the trait being measured than the dependability of the test.

Fair to good construct validities were computed for the HSPQ factors depending on the personality trait measured. Coefficients for each of the fourteen factors were as follows: .67 on A, .69 on B, .71 on C, .63 on D, .65 on E, .68 on F, .68 on G, .72 on H, .70 on I, .58 on J, .77 on O, .61 on Q<sub>2</sub>, .57 on Q<sub>3</sub>, and .74 on Q<sub>4</sub>. According to Cattell, he was:

. . . less successful in measuring Factors D, Q<sub>2</sub>, Q<sub>3</sub>, and J, while the best validities can be depended on for C (ego strength),

H (parmia), I (presmia), O (guilt proneness), and Q<sub>4</sub> (ergic tension), and good ones for A (affectothymia), B (intelligence), G (superego strength), E (dominance), and F (surgency).<sup>30</sup>

#### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The nature of this study was exploratory. The investigation employed two independent variables and one dependent variable with fourteen levels. One independent variable, juvenile offenders, had three levels identified as delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders which were equally numerically represented in the study. The second independent variable was gender, having two levels: male and female offenders. There was an equal number (ten) of males and females in each group. The dependent variable, the HSPQ, contains fourteen relatively independent factors for personality assessment, and therefore, there were fourteen separate two-way between subjects ANOVA.

#### PROCEDURE AND DATA COLLECTION

The HSPQ was administered in group as well as individual testing situations. In cases where the HSPQ had been previously administered, protocols less than a year old were utilized in the data collection. Old protocols accounted for approximately one-third of the data utilized in this investigation. The testing was done at the Johnson County Mental Health Center, the Family and Youth Counseling Division of the Juvenile Court, and at the residence of the examiner. The standard instructions for administration were followed according to the Handbook

---

<sup>30</sup>  
Ibid., p. 12.

for the HSPQ. All questions pertaining to the test were answered promptly. No unusual or additional instructions were given other than calling out the time at specified intervals, as suggested in the manual, to help the slower subjects keep up. On the average, subjects took from forty-five minutes to one hour to complete the questionnaire.

#### DATA ANALYSIS

All tests were hand scored by the examiner. The analysis of variance test was the statistical measure that was utilized to analyze the raw score data obtained from administering the HSPQ. There were two independent variables, juvenile offenders and gender, necessitating the use of the two-way between subjects analysis of variance with this study. Where a significant F-ratio was obtained using the analysis of variance test, the least significant difference (lsd) technique was employed to determine which groups differed from each other.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>M. Linton and P. S. Gallo, Jr., The Practical Statistician, Simplified Handbook of Statistics (Monterey, California: Book/Cole Publishing Co., 1975), pp. 145-155.



## Chapter 4

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study investigated if there were significant differences in the psychological characteristics of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders as measured by the fourteen factors of the HSPQ. In this chapter are sections on data analysis, a table of means, tables for the results of the 3 x 2 analysis of variance test for each of the fourteen factors of the HSPQ, and tables for the results of the least significant difference (lsd) technique for Factors A, B, and D.

### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

For this investigation means were computed for each of the six cells in the design and for each of the fourteen factors of the HSPQ, as presented in Table 1. The null hypotheses under investigation were as follows:

There are no significant differences in the psychological characteristics of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders as measured by the fourteen factors of the HSPQ.

There are no significant differences between males and females in the study as measured by the fourteen factors of the HSPQ.

Table 2, p. 26, presents the results of the analysis of Factor A. An F-ratio of .500 was obtained for Factor A, Type of Offender; consequently, there was no significant difference in offender groups. An F-ratio of 3.15 was required for significance, at the .05 level of probability.

Table 1

Means of the Independent Variables for the  
Fourteen Factors of the HSPQ

Independent variables	Factors													
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	O	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Q <sub>4</sub>
Delinquent males	6.5	4.6	6.8	4.8	6.3	6.4	6.0	6.2	5.8	5.3	5.1	5.6	4.3	6.1
Delinquent females	5.0	5.6	6.4	5.7	6.4	4.9	5.1	6.0	5.7	5.2	4.6	6.4	4.2	5.6
Miscreant males	5.5	4.3	5.5	4.8	5.5	4.3	5.7	5.6	6.5	6.1	4.9	6.0	3.6	4.8
Miscreant females	5.0	4.8	5.4	6.2	6.2	4.6	5.1	6.5	5.8	5.9	5.4	6.1	4.4	4.9
Status-offender males	4.8	4.4	6.2	5.2	6.1	4.7	5.6	5.3	5.8	5.5	4.9	6.3	4.4	6.0
Status-offender females	6.5	6.5	5.8	6.2	6.4	5.4	4.8	5.5	5.9	5.7	4.8	4.7	3.2	6.0
Grand means	5.6	5.0	6.0	5.5	6.2	5.1	5.4	5.9	5.9	5.6	5.0	5.9	4.0	5.6

Table 2

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable A

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	2.800	1.400	.500	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	.150	.150	.054	NS
A x B	2	26.800	13.400	4.789	.05
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	151.100	2.798		

At the .05 level of probability, an F-ratio of 4.00 with one degree of freedom was needed to indicate a significant difference between males and females on Factor A. An F-ratio of .054 was obtained, however, which indicates that no significant difference existed between males and females on Factor A.

To indicate a significant interaction effect, at the .05 level of probability, an F-ratio of 3.15 was needed. An F-ratio of 4.789 was obtained, and therefore as indicated in Table 2, there was a significant interaction effect.

The least significant difference (lsd) technique was utilized to determine which groups differed. Employing this method an lsd value of 1.131, at the .05 level of probability, was needed to indicate a significant difference between groups. Significant lsd values, as presented in Table 3, were computed for delinquent males and status-offender females when compared to delinquent females, miscreant females, and status-offender males. This means that delinquent males and status-offender

females tended to be more cooperative, good natured, and socially outgoing than the other above cited groups.

Table 3  
Least Significant Difference Table for  
Factor A of the HSPQ

Treatment	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X} - 4.8$	$\bar{X} - 5.0$	$\bar{X} - 5.0$	$\bar{X} - 5.5$	$\bar{X} - 6.5$
1 (delinquent males)	6.5	1.7*	1.5*	1.5*	1.0	0.0
6 (status-offender females)	6.5	1.7*	1.5*	1.5*	1.0	
3 (miscreant males)	5.5	0.7	0.5	0.5		
2 (delinquent females)	5.0	0.2	0.0			
4 (miscreant females)	5.0	0.2				
5 (status-offender males)	4.8					

\*1sd value of 1.13 at the .05 level of probability indicates a significant 1sd value.

Table 4 presents the analysis of Factor B. On Factor B of the HSPQ an F-ratio of 3.15 with two degrees of freedom was needed to indicate a significant difference, at the .05 level of probability. An F-ratio of 1.066 was obtained, thus no significant difference in offender groups was indicated on Factor B.

With two degrees of freedom, an F-ratio of 3.15 was required to indicate a significant interaction effect, at the .05 level of probability, on Factor B. However, an F-ratio of .858 was obtained, and consequently, no significant interaction effect was noted.

Table 4  
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable B

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	9.233	4.617	1.066	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	20.417	20.417	4.717	.05
A x B	2	7.433	3.717	.858	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	233.900	4.331		

For a significant difference to occur between males and females, at the .05 level of probability, an F-ratio of 4.00 with one degree of freedom was needed on Factor B. An F-ratio of 4.717 was obtained, and therefore there was a significant difference between males and females on Factor B of the HSPQ.

Utilizing the least significant difference technique an lsd value of 1.75, at the .05 level of probability, was necessary to indicate a significant difference between groups. As presented in Table 5, significant differences were computed for status-offender females when compared to delinquent males, miscreant males, and status-offender males. Consequently, it can be inferred that the male and female offenders cited above differed significantly on Factor B of the HSPQ. Female status-offenders scored higher and thus tended ". . . to show better morale, more persistence, and greater school interest."<sup>32</sup> Because Factor B measures general intelligence, it can be concluded that female

<sup>32</sup>Cattell, op. cit., p. 28.

status-offenders displayed a higher level of intellectual functioning than males in the study as indicated by the results of the data analysis on Factor B of the HSPQ.

Table 5  
Least Significant Difference Table for  
Factor B of the HSPQ

Treatment	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X} - 4.3$	$\bar{X} - 4.4$	$\bar{X} - 4.6$	$\bar{X} - 4.8$	$\bar{X} - 5.6$
6 (status-offender females)	6.5	2.2*	2.1*	1.9*	1.7	.9
2 (delinquent females)	5.6	1.3	1.2	1.0		
4 (miscreant females)	4.8	.4	.3	.1		
1 (delinquent males)	4.6	.3	.2			
5 (status-offender males)	4.4	.1				
3 (miscreant males)	4.3					

\*1sd value of 1.75 at the .05 level of probability indicates a significant 1sd value.

As indicated in Table 6 there were no significant differences in offender groups, or between males and females on Factor C of the HSPQ. There was also no significant interaction effect, and therefore no significant differences were computed for ego strength as measured by Factor C of the HSPQ.

Table 6

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable C

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	13.233	6.617	1.751	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	1.350	1.350	.357	NS
A x B	2	.300	.150	.039	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	204.100	3.779		

Table 7 demonstrates that an F-ratio of 3.15 with two degrees of freedom was required to indicate a significant difference, at the .05 level of probability, in offender groups on Factor D. An F-ratio of .259 was obtained, however, and consequently no significant difference in offender groups was measured.

With two degrees of freedom an F-ratio of 3.15 was needed, at the .05 level of probability, to indicate a significant interaction effect. However, an F-ratio of .089 was computed, and consequently no significant interaction effect was noted on Factor D. The sum of squares was .700 and the mean square was .350 for the interaction effect on Factor D.

A significant difference between males and females was computed on Factor D of the HSPQ. An F-ratio of 4.00, at the .05 level of probability, was required to indicate a significant difference while an F-ratio of 4.621 was obtained.

Table 7  
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable D

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	2.033	1.017	.259	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	18.150	18.150	4.621	.05
A x B	2	.700	.350	.089	NS
C (A, B or replication factor)	54	212.100	3.928		

The least significant difference technique was utilized to determine which groups differed. An lsd value of 1.58, at the .05 level of probability, was needed to indicate a significant difference. As seen in Table 8 no significant lsd values were computed for Factor D. However, the groups which came closest to the required lsd value of 1.58, and were most likely responsible for a significant F-ratio, were miscreant and status-offender females when compared to delinquent and miscreant males.

Miscreant and status-offender females scored higher and therefore demonstrated tendencies to be more impulsive and excitable than delinquent and miscreant males, as measured by Factor D. According to Cattell an individual who scores high on Factor D tends to be ". . . a restless sleeper, easily distracted from work by noise or intrinsic difficulty, is hurt and angry if not given important positions, or whenever he is restrained, or punished, and so on."<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 29.



Table 8

Least Significant Difference Table for  
Factor D of the HSPQ\*

Treatment	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X} - 4.8$	$\bar{X} - 4.8$	$\bar{X} - 5.2$	$\bar{X} - 5.7$	$\bar{X} - 6.2$	$\bar{X} - 6.2$
4 (miscreant females)	6.2	1.4	1.4	1.0	.5	0.0	0.0
6 (status-offender females)	6.2	1.4	1.4	1.0	.5	0.0	
2 (delinquent females)	5.7	.9	.9	.5			
5 (status-offender males)	5.2	.4	.4				
1 (delinquent males)	4.8	0.0					
3 (miscreant males)	4.8						

\*1sd value of 1.58 at the .05 level of probability indicates a significant lsd value.

There were no significant differences found in the psychological characteristics of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders nor between males and females on the remaining ten factors of the HSPQ. There also were no significant interaction effects. Factors B and D, which measure intelligence and excitability, provided data which indicated a significant difference between males and females. There was a significant interaction effect on Factor A. However, no significant differences were computed for Factors E, F, G, H, I, J, O, Q<sub>2</sub>, Q<sub>3</sub>, and Q<sub>4</sub>. These results are presented in Tables 9 through 18, pgs. 33-37. The fact that there were no significant differences among offender

Table 9  
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable E

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	2.800	1.400	.485	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	2.017	2.017	.698	NS
A x B	2	.933	.467	.162	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	155.900	2.887		

Table 10  
Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable F

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	14.400	7.200	2.366	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	.417	.417	.137	NS
A x B	2	13.733	6.867	2.257	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	164.300	3.042		

Table 11

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable G

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	1.233	.617	.131	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	8.817	8.817	1.875	NS
A x B	2	.233	.117	.025	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	253.900	4.702		

Table 12

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable H

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	6.100	3.050	.899	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	1.350	1.350	.398	NS
A x B	2	3.100	1.550	.457	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	183.100	3.391		

Table 13

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable I

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>P</u>
A (type of offender)	2	1.733	.867	.127	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	.817	.817	.119	NS
A x B	2	1.733	.867	.127	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	368.300	6.820		

Table 14

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable J

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>P</u>
A (type of offender)	2	5.633	2.817	.704	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	.017	.017	.004	NS
A x B	2	.433	.217	.054	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	216.100	4.002		

Table 15

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable O

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	1.200	.600	.161	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	.017	.017	.004	NS
A x B	2	2.533	1.267	.340	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	201.100	3.724		

Table 16

Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
Dependent Variable Q<sub>2</sub>

Source	df	SS	MS	F	<u>p</u>
A (type of offender)	2	3.700	1.850	.515	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	.817	.817	.227	NS
A x B	2	15.230	7.617	2.121	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	193.900	3.590		

Table 17  
 Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
 Dependent Variable Q<sub>3</sub>

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
A (type of offender)	2	2.033	1.107	.279	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	.417	.417	.114	NS
A x B	2	10.033	5.017	1.378	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	196.500	3.639		

Table 18  
 Analysis of Variance Summary Table for  
 Dependent Variable Q<sub>4</sub>

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p
A (type of offender)	2	15.633	7.817	2.856	NS
B (sex of offender)	1	.267	.267	.097	NS
A x B	2	1.033	.517	.189	NS
C (A, B or error- replication factor)	54	147.800	2.737		

groups or gender was important because it indicates that the juveniles in this study possessed very similar personality characteristics as measured by the remaining ten factors of the HSPQ.

The results of the statistical analysis indicate that no significant differences were demonstrated in juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders as measured by the fourteen factors of the HSPQ. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there would be no differences was accepted. Significant differences were demonstrated between males and females on Factors B and D of the HSPQ, and thus the null hypothesis that there would be no differences was rejected.

## Chapter 5

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into three sections designed to present an overview of the essential elements of the study, evaluate the results, and make recommendations for future research. Included in this chapter are the summary, conclusions, and recommendations sections.

#### SUMMARY

This study was an initial attempt to discern if there were significant differences in the psychological characteristics of a mixed population of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders. Previous investigators had already established that collectively, the personalities of juvenile offenders differed from those of non-offenders. However, few investigations endeavored to distinguish psychologically distinct subgroups of juvenile offenders, especially when seriousness of offense was a variable.

In this study, the HSPQ was administered to sixty subjects divided equally into delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders, based on the seriousness of their offenses. Subjects for each group were randomly selected from a list of names compiled by reviewing juvenile court files. Criteria for selection were that juveniles had to have been on probation or held in a detention facility in Kansas and had to be between twelve and eighteen years of age. There were ten males and ten females in each group. The statistical procedures used to analyze



the data were the 3 x 2 analysis of variance test and the least significant difference technique. The HSPQ contains fourteen relatively independent factors for the assessment of personality which necessitated the use of fourteen two-way between subjects ANOVA.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The statistical analyses of data for each of the fourteen factors of the HSPQ indicated that there were no significant differences in the psychological characteristics of juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders. There were, however, significant differences, at the .05 level of probability, between males and females in the study on Factors B and D of the dependent variable. Female offenders scored higher on Factor B, which is felt to measure general intelligence, thus they tended to display a higher level of intellectual functioning and had greater interest in school than did their male counterparts. On Factor D, which is a measure of impulsiveness, females scored higher than males, and consequently females demonstrated tendencies to be more impatient and excitable than males. There was also a significant interaction effect, at the .05 level of probability, on Factor A of the HSPQ. This indicated that delinquent males and miscreant females were inclined to be more socially outgoing, easygoing, and participating than the other juvenile offenders. However, when viewed in relation to the complete personality profile, these differences proved fairly slight.

Based on the results of this investigation, it may be concluded that either the HSPQ was ineffective in measuring the relevant factors necessary to differentiate among the psychological characteristics of

juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders, or there were no significant psychological differences among the three groups. Should the latter be true, it could be surmised that the legal subdivisions of delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders do not represent psychologically distinct sub-categories of juvenile offenders. Consequently, the results of this study give no reason to suggest different types of treatment programs based on the legal categorization of juvenile offenders.

Juvenile crime remains a growing problem for law enforcement agencies, social workers, parents, psychologists, and concerned persons in general who are interested in the welfare of children. Crimes committed by juveniles continue to increase each year, indicating the need for continued research into the psychology of juvenile offenders, and a more effective judicial system.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Although little evidence utilizing the HSPQ was found to indicate personality differences in juvenile delinquents, miscreants, and status-offenders, this represented an initial investigation and therefore, further research in this area should be conducted. To enhance the validity of future research a larger sample size could be employed. It would also be desirable if a larger collection of standardized and well matched tests could be administered in future investigations.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Breskin, Stephen R., and Philip Burchill. "Non-verbal Rigidity and Severity of Criminal Offenses in a Group of Juvenile Delinquents," Journal of Psychology, 78, No. 2 (1971), 265-267.
- Carlson, Lester. "The Relationship of Delinquency Types of an Industrial School Setting to Personality-Motivation Profiles," Dissertation Abstracts International, 29, No. 5-A (1968), 1446.
- Cattell, R. B. Handbook for the Jr.-Sr. High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ, 1962).
- Gray, Patrick L. "Crime in the United States," Uniform Crime Reports, 1971, pp. 8-12.
- Hoover, J. Edgar. "Crime in the United States," Uniform Crime Reports. 4 vols., 1967-1970.
- Kelly, Clarence. "Crime in the United States," Uniform Crime Reports. 5 vols., 1971-1975.
- Linton, M., and P. S. Gallo, Jr. The Practical Statistician. Simplified Handbook of Statistics. Monterey, California: Book/Cole Publishing Co., 1975.
- Meyer, James. "A Validation Investigation of an Empirical Typology of Youthful Offenders," DAI, 34, No. 10-B (1974), 5200.
- Miller, Vern. A Guide to the Juvenile Code, 1973.
- Person, George R. "The HSPQ as a Delinquency Proneness Assessment Instrument," DAI, 31, No. 5-B (1970), 2964.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Robert F. Kelly. "HSPQ Norms on a State-wide Delinquent Population," Journal of Psychology, 56, No. 1 (1963), 185-192.
- \_\_\_\_\_, John Moseley, and Mark Olsen. "The Personality and Character Structure of the Delinquent: Some Social-Psychological Implications," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 110, No. 1 (1967), 139-147.
- Schaedler, Thomas J. "Personality and Attitude Characteristics as a Function of Delinquency Dimensions," DAI, 34, No. 7-B (1974), 3508.
- Smith, Patricia, and Harvey Austrin. "Socialization as Related to Delinquency Classification," Psychological Reports, 34, No. 2 (1974), 677-678.

- Stern, Herbert, and Harnes Grosz. "HSPQ Personality Measurements in Institutionalized Delinquent Girls and Their Temporal Stability," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25 (1969), 289-293.
- Tsubouchi, Kosuke, and R. L. Jenkins. "Three Types of Delinquents: Their Performance on MMPI and PCR," Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25, No. 4 (1969), 353-358.
- Weeks, J. C. The Juvenile Code, Kansas Statutes Annotated, 3 (1973), 476-478.