

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA  
GRADUATE COLLEGE

PARENT AND PEER-GROUP FRIEND ATTITUDES AS THEY RELATE  
TO THE SELF-CONCEPT OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY  
SARAH GILLELAND ALLISON  
Norman, Oklahoma

1957

PARENT AND PEER-GROUP FRIEND ATTITUDES AS THEY RELATE  
TO THE SELF-CONCEPT OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT

APPROVED BY

P. T. Tesha

E. F. Glimmer

Carl R. Redmond

A. Heilman

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my advisor, Dr. P. T. Teska, I wish to express my very sincere gratitude. His wholehearted assistance and constant encouragement played a large part in the satisfactory completion of the study.

Also, I am indebted to the other members of my committee for their able suggestions and counsel: Dr. Carl R. Oldroyd, Dr. Alfred F. Glixman, and Dr. Arthur W. Heilman.

The kind thoughtfulness and patience of Mrs. P. T. Teska will always be remembered.

I am deeply appreciative of the sacrifices which my husband, Harry, and my son, Harry Bill, have made in bringing this study to completion.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM .....	6
Studies Using Methodology Similar to That of the Present Investigation .....	7
Studies Using Variables Similar to Those of the Present Investigation .....	11
Definition of the Variables .....	18
III. INSTRUMENTS OF MEASUREMENT .....	23
The Preliminary Study .....	23
The Check-List Questionnaire .....	25
The Friends Inventory .....	26
IV. THE PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY .....	28
The Subjects .....	28
The Experimental Procedure .....	31
Treatment of the Data .....	33
V. THE RESULTS .....	37
VI. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS .....	47
VII. SUMMARY .....	60
REFERENCES .....	65
APPENDIX .....	70

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Similarities in the Delinquent-Mother and the Delinquent-Friend Relationships .....	37
2. Protrusions in the Delinquent-Mother and the Delinquent-Friend Relationships .....	38
3. The Mutual-awareness of Self-attitudes between the Delinquent and His Mother and between the Delinquent and His Peer-group Friend .....	40
4. Comparison between the Least and Most Severely Delinquent Subjects on the Variables Protrusion, Similarity, and Mutual-awareness ....	43

PARENT AND PEER-GROUP FRIEND ATTITUDES AS THEY RELATE  
TO THE SELF-CONCEPT OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENT

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Despite the fact that much has been learned about the juvenile delinquent in the past several decades, a glance at the front page of any large city newspaper reveals that delinquent behaviors continue to be a pressing problem in modern psychopathology. There is a wealth of information coming from the fields of sociology, psychology, ecology, psychoanalysis, and penology regarding the etiology, prevention, and treatment of delinquency. However, much of this information at times seems contradictory because of the tendency of workers in each of these disciplines to stress their own areas of interest and methods of investigation while overlooking methods and findings from other areas. For example, there are a number of studies, typified by the early work of Bonger (7), which stress economic conditions as the sole determiners of delinquency. On the other hand, numerous sociologists have associated juvenile delinquency with the factors of deteriorating environment and social disorganization. This

emphasis, which began in the early 1930's, is exemplified in the pioneer writings of Shaw (42), Healy (22), Glueck (18), and Sullenger (48). At the same time, Aichorn (1) in Germany was pioneering in his attempts to apply psychoanalytic principles to the study of the individual delinquent. His continued influence is demonstrated in the compilation of psychoanalytic writings entitled Searchlights on Delinquency (14) and dedicated in his honor. More recently, Aichorn's approach and findings have been supplemented by the writings and therapeutic techniques of Friedlander (17), Lindner (29), Bettelheim (6), and Redl and Wineman (40).

Current psychological research and writings in the field of delinquency reflect an emphasis upon personality development and personality characteristics as they relate to antisocial acts (2, 16, 25, 32, 53, 55). A valuable source of clues as to the dynamics underlying personality development is to be found in the area of interpersonal relationships. Social scientists, who view personality in terms of relatively stable modes or patterns of learned behavior, look upon the central persons in the child's environment as important influences in the development of these behavior patterns. However, psychological investigators differ widely in their selection of these central or significant persons who have influenced the child's behavior. On the one hand, psychiatrists and clinical psychologists have tended to study the dynamics of the process through which the

parents' behavior and attitudes affect their children's personality. In contrast, sociologists and social psychologists have tended to point up the need for studying the process through which the child's attitudes and behavior have been affected by his interpersonal relationships with age-mates or peer-group members.

Psychological investigators also differ widely in the methodology which they employ to understand interpersonal relationships. The case history method commonly has been employed to study the parent-child interrelationships; sociometric techniques have been used most frequently to investigate the interpersonal relations existing in the group setting. As both methods lack quantifiable conclusions, they are limited in their use as research tools for understanding the determinants of antisocial behaviors.

Outstanding research needs in this area are, first, for a systematic approach in studying the development of delinquent behavior patterns; second, for clearer operational definitions of the variables concerned in the development of these behaviors; and third, for more objective methods of measuring these variables. It is the belief of this writer that the first of these needs is beginning to be realized, since the tendency within the last decade has been toward a theoretical reapproachment between disciplines. Although the clinician and social psychologist differ in their methodology and selection of central figures in the interpersonal



relationship, both groups are tending to employ self theory as the framework from which to understand and predict the effect of interpersonal relationships upon attitudes which determine observed behaviors.

The present investigation seeks first, to describe certain parent-child, child-peer group friend interaction patterns within the framework of self theory; second, to demonstrate a method whereby operationally defined variables of similarity, protrusion, and mutual awareness in interpersonal relationships can be determined in a projective yet quantitative manner; and third, to relate these variables to the social adjustment of the child.

The interaction patterns to be investigated were selected on the basis of their common application to adolescent delinquents, their mothers, and their peer-group friends. This commonality allowed for the possibility of using the same measuring device for the mothers, the delinquents, and their friends. The interaction patterns chosen for study included such self attitudes as interests, needs, aspirations, values, and fears. The fathers of the delinquents were excluded from the study because of their unavailability. White male adolescent delinquents being held in detention were chosen for this study because of their availability and because they are a selected group on whom extensive case history material is obtainable and whose social adjustment is a matter of public record.

This study represents an attempt to combine the statistical and clinical methods. Although a direct questionnaire was employed as the instrument on which the subjects were to express their self-attitudes, it was employed in a projective manner. The meaning of the data was sought, not in the responses themselves, but in the degree of similarity between responses in questionnaires answered by the mothers, the delinquents, and their peer-group friends; that is, only the interaction patterns, and not the specific self-attitudes, were studied. On the questionnaire, the mother, her delinquent child, and the best friend of the delinquent described independently their interests, needs, aspirations, values, and fears. In addition, the mother and friend described the delinquent in these same areas. Also, the delinquent described the friend and the mother in the same areas. Quantitative scores of similarity, protrusion, and mutual awareness were derived. These variables were then related to the social adjustment of the delinquent.

## CHAPTER II

### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

While the importance of the interpersonal relationships of the juvenile delinquent has long been asserted, controlled investigation of the specific dynamics involved is a product of only recent years. Earlier research workers in the field of delinquency had sought diligently to relate antisocial behavior to heredity, or intellectual or socio-economic factors. Only with the appearance in the clinical literature of such concepts as "over-protection," "aggression," "rejection," and "identification" was the important influence on child behavior of specific attitudes and behaviors of parents recognized. Also, with the appearance in the sociological literature of such concepts as "ascendence-submission," "status and role relationships," and "group norms and values," the influence of associates on the attitudes and behavior of the delinquent has been recognized.

Because this study is concerned with the interaction process between the delinquent and his mother and, also, between the delinquent and his age associates, the literature to be reviewed is from the areas of clinical and social

psychology. The research studies included in this review will be those whose variables are most nearly like those used in this study. Investigations employing a methodology similar to that of the present study will be reviewed. In short, only those studies will be reviewed which relate to the basic assumption underlying this study: that attitude formation is the result of an interaction process, which process takes place between the delinquent child, his parents, and his age mates.

The theoretical orientation of this investigation is that of self theory. Both the social and clinically oriented theoritician would agree that the self is primarily a psychological process developing as a result of the individual's experiences, and they would agree to a common definition of the self and would consider the self as a term designating the constellation of attitudes determining one's behavior which are learned in interpersonal relationships with significant others.

#### Studies Using Methodology Similar to That of the Present Investigation

While the more recent literature contains reports of many investigations in the parent-child area, only a few are concerned with the study of both children and their own parents. For the most part, in these studies either parents or children have been consulted with reference to the behavior

of the other. Brown (1) mentions Stott as the only investigator who had, up to 1942, attempted measurement of parental attitudes and the personality measurement of their children. More recently, only the research by Cass (11) has stressed the importance of the parent-child relationship by studying both the attitudes of the parents and their own children. However, the social psychologists, in their conviction that attitudes and resultant behaviors are determined by the individual's relationship with his group, have recognized the importance of studying both the attitudes of the individual and those of his associates.

Although it is a commonly expressed belief that one's behavior is determined by his relationships with both his parents and his age associates, there is no research reported where the behavior of the child was studied by measuring the attitudes of the child, his parents, and his age-mates. Thus, if attitudes are formed as the result of interaction with significant persons in one's environment, it would seem advisable to investigate the interaction patterns between the child, his parents, and his age associates without emphasizing one group to the exclusion of the others.

A review of the literature in the area of parent-child relationships reveals a variety of techniques employed to measure parental attitudes and behaviors. Some of the most frequently used techniques include personality inventories (12, 36, 37, 38), attitude questionnaires administered

to the parents (8, 9, 23, 26, 39, 47), questionnaires on parent behavior administered to the children (3, 10, 19, 27, 46, 55), autobiographical accounts from adults of parents' treatment of them in childhood (33, 41, 45, 49, 52), ratings of parent behavior in home interviews (4, 5, 21), and ratings of behavior reported in case history material (15, 50). For measuring children's behavior the techniques include ratings on behavior rating scales (5, 9, 21, 36, 37, 38, 50), "Guess Who" and other character identifications by classmates (3, 10), questionnaires on attitudes and behavior (3, 23, 46, 47, 55), personality inventories (9, 12, 36, 46), case studies (15, 35, 50), and interview techniques (3, 8, 27). The interaction patterns operating between a child and his associates are most frequently assessed by sociometric techniques (20, 31), or by having trained personnel observe interpersonal relationships of group members while they are participating in some activity (20, 44, 51).

The difficulty of measuring the parental and group attitudes is clearly evident in these studies. The wish to appear in a good light colors most responses to an attitude questionnaire administered to parents. The tendency for the parent-child and child-associates interactions to be a "secret" affair necessitates the use of some indirect measure in which the individual is unaware that he is giving his responses in terms of criteria of "social acceptability."

A recent attempt to fulfill these methodological

needs was made by Cass (11) in which she used an ingenious technique for studying parent-child relationships and delinquency. Her study is one of the first to have parents and their own children respond to the same instrument for measuring attitudes. She overcame some of the inherent weaknesses in the case history and questionnaire methods by employing a more "projective" means of studying the attitudes of parents as they affect their children. The children and their mothers filled out attitude inventories, the mothers taking the inventories once for themselves and once as they thought their children would answer them. The meaning of the data was sought not in the responses themselves but in the degree of correspondence between responses on the inventories answered by the mothers and by their adolescent sons and daughters.

In the Cass study of parent-child relationships the emphasis was placed on how the parent's attitudes affected those of the child. If the assumption is made that attitude formation is the result of an interaction process between two people, it would seem that studying how the attitudes of the parent influenced those of the child is to study only one part of this interpersonal relationship. That is, in her study, the mother was asked to fill out the inventory as the child would answer it; however, Cass did not have the child fill out the inventory as it would be answered by the mother. Also, her study was confined to the parent-child relationships and delinquency to the exclusion of the other

important interpersonal relationships of the delinquent child.

The present study is an attempt to overcome these limitations by assuming that attitude formation is the result of an interaction process, which process takes place not only between the parent and the delinquent child, but also between the child and his peer-group friends.

Studies Using Variables Similar to Those  
of the Present Investigation  
Identification

Identification is considered by many writers to be one of the most important of all the dynamics of the socialization process (13, 28). Cass defines identification as

. . . the tendency for a child or young person unconsciously to mold himself after somebody else. It is such identification when the little boy exhibits a special interest in his father or other adult and exhibits a propensity to grow up like the latter and to take on the latter's patterns of interest and occupation (11, p. 31).

She sees in identification the child's opportunity to meet most successfully the frustrations attendant upon the socialization process. Frustrated in his attempts at self-assertion, the child may learn to identify with the parents and thus incorporate into himself their values, ideals, and standards. She gives examples of identification as "dressing like the identified," "acting like him," "walking and talking like him," etc. Because the term identification is not always defined as in the Cass study, in the present investigation



the term similarity is used to denote the individual's imitation of the self-attitudes of another.

As early as 1927, sociological reports of juvenile delinquency recognized the importance of adolescent identifications as determiners of antisocial behavior. For example, Thrasher in his book, The Gang, states:

For the young gang boy one type of group which not only has prestige but offers a pattern which he may follow with little adaptation is the older gang. The older groups often start the younger ones stealing, but sometimes protect them when they get into trouble. Often the hardened gangster is the object of adolescent hero worship. The boys consciously ape their older brothers in numerous social and athletic clubs (51, p. 258).

In Clifford Shaw's Jack Roller (43) the central character is a boy whose major identifications were made with a reference group which was delinquent. He had come from a slum area upon which the rest of society looked down, and he found no secure identification with his family group. The informal groups of boys in which he functioned at various times in his development were the ones that gave him a sense of personal identity--they were his reference group and the ones with which he identified in everything that counted for him.

Although such phenomenological data as reported by Thrasher and Shaw suggest that the delinquents' identifications with parents are faulty or lacking and that delinquents tend to identify with other delinquents, research on the identification patterns of the delinquent is extremely limited.

Zucker reports a study in which he tested the hypothesis that

. . . affectional identification of most delinquents with their parents is either deficient or lacking and that this condition is dynamically related to the extent to which these children do not introject standards, morals, and values of their parents on an effective emotional level (55, p. 11).

Zucker incorporates into his measuring instrument of identification several different meanings of the term. Using a matched-group experimental design, he had as subjects 25 delinquent and 25 non-delinquent boys with a mean age of thirteen and a half years. The boys were equated as to intelligence and parental socio-economic status. One phase of the study made use of the incomplete story technique in which the ending chosen by the boy was interpreted as indicating, in the case of each story, respectively: first, the boy's attachment to his parents; second, his susceptibility to the group rather than to the parents' wishes; third, effectiveness of his parents' moralization; and fourth, his solicitude for his parents. Other parts of Zucker's paper and pencil test had to do with similarity between the attitudes and ambitions of the boy and his parents, inclusion of parents in his "wishes," and expression of admiration for his parents. No clear cut differentiation of these several meanings of the term "identification" is apparent in this study. Several significant differences were found between delinquents' and non-delinquents' responses to the items. In general, the

delinquent boy identified, in Zucker's terms, significantly less with parents than did the non-delinquent. The evidence presents fairly conclusive support of the original hypothesis.

One criticism of Zucker's study is that parents were not included in the study, and the similarity between their attitudes and those of their boys was evaluated only from the statements of the boys. Symonds (50) makes the criticism that Zucker's use of identification is too limited. This criticism seems valid only in so far as any generalization of results would be attempted to other types of identification. It has in part lost its specific meaning through long use in a loose and highly generalized fashion. Kates and Harrington (25) comment that parental identification among delinquents may be very high in those cases where the parents themselves are delinquent. Their criticism of Zucker's study seems to be a more valid one since it is quite possible that the delinquent children identify with parents who are socially and economically maladjusted just as much as do the non-delinquent children whose parents are hard workers and constructive individuals. This factor in delinquency seems very real and should be taken into account in a study which relates delinquency to identification.

These research findings and phenomenological data suggest that the attitudes of the delinquent are more similar to the attitudes of his peer-group than to the attitudes of his parent. Thus, the first hypothesis of this investigation

is that the self-attitudes of the delinquent are more similar to the self-attitudes of his peer-group friend than to the self-attitudes of his mother.

### Projection

The term, in the clinical setting, is used to denote the process of attributing to others unwanted drives and unacceptable impulses which belong to oneself. Situations through which this kind of projection has been demonstrated include play techniques wherein hostility toward others is borne by the subject's play characters. Social psychologists have also reported instances of research which show that attitudes actually possessed by the subjects may be projected to other groups.

In the Cass study (11) the term projection did not imply this aspect of hostility. For her, projection referred merely to the mother's assigning to her child preferences, ambitions, and fears which the child does not claim for himself. An example of such projections can be illustrated in the case of the mentally retarded child's mother who is unable to accept his limitations and interprets his behaviors to indicate average intellectual capabilities. Although such projections are readily observable in mother-child relationships, such projections are even more frequently characteristic of adolescent relationships. The adolescent, in his strivings to be like his associates, frequently has a

distorted perception of their attitudes. In his attempt to justify his own activities, manner of dress, etc., he frequently attributes these characteristics to his group and states, "Well, everyone is doing it." It is predicted that the delinquent, because of his strivings to be like his contemporaries, more than like his parents, will ascribe his self-attitudes to his friend more often than to his mother.

### Mutual-awareness

There are no studies reported in the literature which attempt to measure the degree of awareness between mother and child for each other's specific behavior preferences and attitudes, or between a child and his associates in these same areas.

By the term "mutual-awareness" as it is used in this study is meant this kind of superficial "understanding" between two persons. The term is used very frequently in clinical work, and also by the layman, but it has not been subjected previously to quantitative measurement.

An unpublished study by Conway (12) measured parents' ability to predict their children's personality as measured by the Bernreuter Personality Inventory. The parents' predictions were compared with the children's personality scores on the test. Conway found that mothers tend to understand their sons' personalities, as measured by the Bernreuter scales, much better than they do their daughters'. In arriv-

ing at the "understanding" correlation coefficients, Conway used the correspondence between scores on the tests taken by the parents about their children with the tests taken by the children themselves. No comparison of individual test responses was undertaken.

The Cass study (11) is one of the first to attempt a quantitative measure of the degree of awareness of mothers for their children's behavior. Using the methodology which has been described earlier in this chapter, Cass found that mothers of delinquent children have less awareness of their children's attitudes than do mothers of non-delinquent children. Cass's findings are limited to only one side of the mother-child relationship. On the basis of the assumption underlying this study that ego-attitudes are the result of an interaction process, it is then necessary to evaluate the mutual-awareness existing between both participants of this interpersonal relationship.

The lack of understanding between parents and adolescents is pointed out by the numerous articles appearing weekly in lay magazines attempting to advise parents on understanding their adolescent children. Case histories of delinquents are replete with statements made by the delinquents that their parents don't understand them; likewise parents frequently admit they do not understand their children or the factors causing them to commit antisocial acts.

In The Gang one section is entitled "The Unseeing

Adult" in which Thrasher describes this lack of understanding as follows:

It is hard for the grown-up with all his responsibilities and practical necessities to retain an understanding of the boy's imaginative outlook on life. Unless he is an "adolescent hold-over," he becomes too thoroughly conventionalized and incorporated in the social machinery of his community. He loses sympathetic touch with youth and becomes a scoffer at the precious dreams and sentiments which are such an essential part of boyhood. On this account he rarely has a complete understanding of the boy (51, p. 128).

In contrast to this lack of understanding between parents and their children the delinquent frequently reports a high degree of awareness or understanding between himself and his age associates. Thrasher states that in the close association between delinquents they learn to know each other better than their parents learn to know them. He further states that often this intimacy comes to supplant family and all other relationships (51, p. 299).

On the basis of these reports the following hypothesis was formed: There is greater mutual awareness of self-attitudes between the delinquent and his friend than between the delinquent and his mother.

#### Definition of the Variables

While the methodology of this investigation is similar to that used by Cass (11), the terms identification and projection which she used will not be used. The meanings of these terms in the Cass study are both limited and different from their conventional usage. To illustrate, the term

projection commonly denotes the attributing of self-attitudes to another which he does not possess. In the Cass study, projection denotes the attributing of self-attitudes to another which he says he does not possess. For this reason the terms protrusion and similarity have been substituted for the terms projection and identification respectively.

Although there are terminological differences between the present investigation and that of Cass, the results of this study can be compared directly with her obtained results since the methodology employed in these two investigations is similar. On the projection variable, only in so far as the individual may not possess the attitudes which he says he does not possess, the results may be compared with the reported studies on projection. Likewise, the results of this study can be compared only with those investigations which define identification as compared only with those investigations which define identification as the degree of similarity of self-attitudes between two persons. The three variables--similarity, protrusion, and mutual-awareness--are defined operationally in terms of the questionnaires administered to the mother, delinquent, and friend.

### Similarity

The term similarity is used to refer to the similarity of interests, needs, values, and fears of the mother and the delinquent; also, it is used to refer to the similarity



of interests, needs, values, and fears of the delinquent and his friend. In terms of the instrument used for measuring it, the similarity score is the number of specific items checked similarly by the mother and by the delinquent on their self-questionnaires; also it is the number of items checked similarly by the delinquent and his friend on their self-questionnaires.

#### Protrusion of self-attitudes

The term protrusion is used to refer to the assignment by the delinquent to the mother of interests, needs, values, and fears which he professes as his own but which are not claimed by the mother; it refers also to the assignment by the delinquent to the friend of interests, needs, values, and fears which he professes as his own but which are not claimed by the friend. In terms of the instrument used for measuring it, the protrusion of self-attitudes score consists of the number of items which the delinquent checked similarly on his self-questionnaire and for his mother which were not checked by the mother on her self-questionnaire; also it is the number of items which the delinquent checked similarly on his self-questionnaire and for his friend but which were not checked by the friend on his self-questionnaire.

#### Mutual-awareness

The term mutual-awareness is used to refer to the

ability of the mother and her delinquent son to predict each other's interests, needs, values, and fears; it is used to refer also to the ability of the delinquent and his friend to predict each other's interests, needs, values, and fears. In terms of the instrument used to measure it, the mutual awareness score consists of the sum of the number of items checked similarly by the mother for the delinquent and by the delinquent on his self-questionnaire and the number of items checked similarly by the delinquent for the mother and by the mother on her self-questionnaire; also, it is the sum of the number of items checked similarly by the friend for the delinquent and by the delinquent on his self-questionnaire and the number of items checked similarly by the delinquent for the friend and by the friend on his self-questionnaire.

Throughout this review the delinquent has been contrasted with the non-delinquent as though they represent two separate and easily distinguishable groups. Such a dichotomy can be only a legal and not a psychological one. If delinquent behaviors are seen as the result of self-attitudes which are developed over a period of years and are the result of interaction with parents and associates, the severity of antisocial attitudes found in a group of delinquents is one of degree. That is, there are individual differences within the delinquent group.

The attitudes and behaviors ascribed to the delinquent in the discussion of the variables of similarity,

protrusion, and mutual-awareness will be more characteristic of the seriously delinquent adolescent. On this basis the last hypothesis was formulated: The above hypotheses will be more true for those adolescents exhibiting seriously delinquent behaviors than for those whose behaviors are less seriously delinquent.

In summary, on the basis of the research findings and the phenomenological reports which have been outlined, it is hypothesized that the delinquent's self-concept is composed more of the reflected appraisals of the attitudes of his peer-group friend than of the reflected appraisals of the attitudes of his mother. More specifically, it is hypothesized that:

1. There is more similarity between the self-attitudes of the delinquent and his peer-group friend than between the self-attitudes of the delinquent and his mother.

2. There are more protrusions, or attributed unmatched self-percepts, characterizing the delinquent-friend relationship than characterizes the delinquent-mother relationship.

3. There is greater mutual-awareness of self-attitudes between the delinquent and his friend than between the delinquent and his mother.

4. The above three hypotheses will be more true for those adolescents exhibiting seriously delinquent behaviors than for those whose behaviors are less seriously delinquent.

## CHAPTER III

### INSTRUMENTS OF MEASUREMENT

The definitions of the concepts which serve as the variables in this research are made in terms of the instruments used in their measurement. For this reason, the measuring devices are described in some detail.

#### The Preliminary Study

A preliminary study which resulted in the use of the Check-List Questionnaire was conducted. Initially it was the plan of the author to have the subjects express their self-attitudes by answering items similar to those found on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. An inventory of 157 items, some from MMPI and some based on delinquents' case histories, was devised. This inventory was administered to eleven delinquents, their mothers, and some of the delinquents' friends. It was decided that this inventory should not be used in the final study because it was believed by the experimenter to be too threatening to a group of adolescent delinquents who are being held in detention. On several occasions the delinquents who willingly filled out the

inventory for themselves and for their mothers would object to describing the characteristics of their friends. It was felt that the delinquents interpreted the situation as one in which they were asked to "squeal" or to reveal information about their best friends. It was then decided that a less direct, less threatening technique for measuring self-attitudes was necessary.

The preliminary study also pointed up the need for devising an inventory which required less reading skill and used a simpler vocabulary than is found on instruments such as the MMPI. It was also found that the purpose of the study should be explained in some detail as a means of allaying the subject's anxiety and overcoming his suspiciousness. The preliminary study also revealed the need for using an instrument which was comprehensive but not needlessly time consuming, especially since one-third of the subjects fill in similar inventories three times.

The technique devised for measuring the delinquent-friend, delinquent-mother interaction variables of mutual awareness, similarity, and protrusion was a check-list questionnaire. In addition to the above mentioned requirements, the questionnaire was designed so that it could be used in a projective manner, yet could lend itself to quantitative analysis. It was designed so that the same measuring device would be applicable for the mothers, the delinquents, and their friends.

### The Check-List Questionnaire

The Check-List Questionnaire which was used in this study is a modification of items from The University of California Interest Attitude Inventory (24), The Cass Check-List Questionnaire (11), and Murray's (34) list of personality traits. The items were designed to reflect the attitudes composing the individual's self-concept as expressed in his interests, needs, aspirations, values, and fears.

The Check-List Questionnaire contains 10 sections--eight of which contain four sections of five items each--from which the subject is to choose one preference. In a section of school-subject preferences the subject is asked to choose from the two groups of five subjects listed the one liked most in each group. In a section containing six groups of five descriptive adjectives each, the subject is asked to choose the one from each group which most accurately describes him. The Check-List Questionnaire is to be found in the Appendix.

All the questionnaires administered to the delinquent, mother, and friend groups are identical in so far as the specific check-lists of items and the number of choices are concerned. A modification of the directions was made for the different questionnaires so they would be appropriate for the subject taking them. In four of the sections of the questionnaire relating to the mother's preferences, she and her son were asked to check preferences of her adolescent

rather than of her present experience. This direction was deemed necessary since the differences in preferences might occur merely as a function of age.

The delinquent, mother, and friend were asked to fill out the check-lists, the mother taking the list once for herself and once as her child would answer it; the delinquent filling out the list once for himself and also as he believed his friend and his mother would fill it out; the friend filling out the list for himself and as he believed the delinquent would fill it out.

#### The Friends Inventory

Since its advent, the sociometric technique (20, 31) has been employed by many to ferret out the interpersonal relationships among group members. Other investigators (51, 54) have relied upon personal observations over an extended period in determining group structure. Both of these devices were employed in the present study to determine the best friends of the delinquent subjects.

The sociometric questionnaire, or Friends Inventory, was composed of six questions as to whom one would prefer to sit by at meal-time, talk with after dinner, and work with on the assigned duties at the home. Each of the six questions was answered by listing three boys in order of preference. This inventory was administered to all boys committed to the detention home after they had been in residence for a

period of at least two weeks. The purpose of the inventory was explained and the subjects were assured that no one but the experimenter would see the results.

The Friends Inventory was scored by a system of weighting in which first choices were allotted a weight of three; second choices, two; and third choices, one. This scoring was done for each of the six questions. These weighted scores for each of the friends listed were then summed to determine the delinquent's best friend or the one with whom he engaged in activities with common motivational significance.



## CHAPTER IV

### THE PROCEDURE OF THE STUDY

#### The Subjects

A total of 57 persons served as subjects in this study: 19 white male juvenile delinquents, their mothers, and the best friend of each of the delinquents.

The juvenile delinquent is defined as any child under 18 years of age who deviates from the socially prescribed norms of conduct to the degree that he has been adjudged to be a violator of the law.

The delinquent population was selected from the total group of boys who had been adjudged by the Tulsa County Juvenile Court to be delinquent during a two month period and who had been placed in detention at the Mohawk Boys Home, Tulsa, Oklahoma. This group had committed a total of 69 offenses, with several of the subjects having committed as many as 8 known offenses. The most frequently committed acts were those classified as being against property, for example, auto theft, burglary, and larceny; however, several delinquents had committed acts against the person, such as robbery and assault. The following criteria were used in selecting the

delinquent subjects:

1. They must range in age from 12 through 17 years.
2. They must be of Borderline Intelligence or above (I.Q. scores of 70 or above) as measured by the Otis Test of Intelligence.
3. Their mothers and peer-group friends must be available for study.
4. They must be in detention for one month where they can be observed by the experimenter prior to participating in the study.

The peer-group friend was the person with whom the delinquent had engaged in activities with common motivational significance. He was selected on the basis of the delinquent's own responses to a sociometric questionnaire, The Friends Inventory. Also, the peer-group friend population was determined by observations as to who was the person with whom the delinquent most frequently associated. These observations were made by the experimenter and by staff members at the detention home.

The mean age of the delinquent group is 15.21 years, while the mean age of the peer-group friend group is 15.53 years. Since the Otis Test of Intelligence is routinely administered to all pupils of the Tulsa Public Schools, it was possible to obtain a measure of intelligence for each of the delinquent and peer-group friend subjects. The I.Q. scores of those of the delinquent group ranged from 74 to 117

with a mean I.Q. score of 93.26. Similarly, the I.Q. scores of the peer-group friends ranged from 72 to 119 with a mean I.Q. of 94.01. That the peer-group friend population as selected by The Friends Inventory is composed of the best friends of each of the delinquents was further substantiated by court records and direct questioning of the delinquent subjects. The court and police records revealed that 8 of the 19 delinquent subjects had been apprehended on one or more occasions along with the person chosen as their best friend. Also, direct questioning of the delinquents revealed that each of them had known the person they had selected as their best friend for several years prior to being placed in detention.

The 19 mothers of the delinquent boys ranged in age from 31 to 51 years with a mean age of 41.53 years. Although all of the delinquents had always lived with their mothers and were living with them at the time of their apprehension, only 9 of them had been reared in homes with their natural fathers and were living with both parents at the time of their commitments.

The delinquent population was sub-divided so that a comparison pertaining to severity of antisocial behavior could be made within this group. The basis for selection of the 5 most and the 5 least severely delinquent subjects was dependent upon the type of antisocial behavior exhibited, the date of the first delinquent offense, and the number of antisocial

offenses which had been committed. This information was obtained from the Court Clerk's office of the Tulsa County Juvenile Court.

### The Experimental Procedure

The Friends Inventory was administered individually to all boys committed to the detention home after they had been in residence for a period of at least two weeks. The purpose of the questionnaire was explained to each of the subjects and they were assured that no one but the experimenter would see the results.

The Check-List Questionnaires were administered individually to the delinquent subjects in a testing room at the detention home. Each subject was told that he was participating in a research project and that the information which he gave would be confidential and would not become a part of his court record or in any way affect his relationship with the court. Also, it was explained to the subject that the purpose of the study was to learn his preferences and to see how well he was able to predict the preferences of his best friend and his own mother.

Although the specific directions for each part of the questionnaire are printed at the beginning of each section, the examiner remained in the room with the subject to answer any questions which he might have concerning procedure.

The delinquent subject was asked to fill out the

self-questionnaire; then to fill it out as his mother would fill it out if she were taking the questionnaire; and then to fill it out as his friend, whom he had chosen previously on the sociometric questionnaire, would fill it out. All three check lists were filled out during one experimental setting. The order in which the delinquent subject filled out the three questionnaires was predetermined by the experimenter. One-third of the delinquent subjects filled out the self-questionnaire first, one-third of this group took first the questionnaire as their friend would fill it out, and the remaining delinquent subjects took first the questionnaire as the mother would fill it out.

The best friend of the delinquent participated as a subject immediately following the delinquent's participation in the study. This procedure was deemed necessary in order to prevent any discussion of the questionnaires or collaboration between these two subjects. The questionnaires were administered to the friend individually in a testing room at the detention home. Directions similar to those given the delinquent subject were given to the friend, except he was told that the study was for the purpose of learning his preferences and seeing how well he would be able to predict the preferences of a specified other person (the delinquent who chose him to be a best friend). Each of the subjects comprising the "friends" group filled out two questionnaires--his self-questionnaire and as the delinquent would fill it.

out. Ten of the friends group filled out the self-questionnaire first, and the remaining subjects in this group took first the questionnaire as the delinquent subject would fill it out.

The Check-List Questionnaires were administered to the mothers of the delinquent subjects either when they visited their sons at the detention or when they appeared in court to discuss their sons' problems with the probation counsellor. The questionnaires were administered to each mother individually. The purpose of the investigation was explained to her as it was to the delinquent and the friend, except the mother was told that an attempt was being made to learn her preferences and to see how well she would be able to predict the preferences of her son. Each of the mothers filled out two questionnaires--her self-questionnaire and one as the delinquent would fill it out. Ten of the mothers completed the self-questionnaire first; the remaining mothers took first the questionnaire as the son would fill it out.

#### Treatment of the Data

The 57 subjects, 19 delinquents, 19 friends, and 19 mothers, gave responses to a total of 133 questionnaires. The delinquent subjects responded to 57 questionnaires--19 self-questionnaires, 19 as their mother would fill out the questionnaire, and 19 as their best friend would fill it out. The mothers contributed 38 questionnaires--19 self-

questionnaires and 19 as they would fill out the questionnaire for their sons; and the friends contributed 38 questionnaires--19 self-questionnaires and 19 as they would fill out the questionnaire for the delinquents.

Quantitative indices of the three personal interaction variables, similarity, protrusion, and mutual-awareness, were obtained by scoring the questionnaires for each of these variables. Measures of central tendency and variability for similarity, protrusion, and mutual-awareness were obtained by computing the means and standard deviations for each of these variables for the mother-delinquent and the delinquent-friend groups. Comparisons in terms of these three variables were made between the delinquent and his mother as contrasted with the delinquent and his best friend. Similarly, comparisons were made between the most and least severely delinquent boys on these same variables.

### Similarity

The data for the similarity variable are based upon the 57 self-questionnaires on which a total of 38 comparisons were made. In order to determine whether there was a significant difference between the similarity scores of the delinquent and his mother as contrasted with the delinquent and his friend, a test of the significance of the difference between mean differences was computed. As this t test is based upon the method of paired score differences, the test for

significance of difference between correlated means as described by McNemar (30, p. 226, Formula 92) was employed.

### Protrusion

The data for the protrusion variable are based upon the responses to 95 of the questionnaires on which a total of 76 comparisons was made. In order to determine whether there was a significant difference between the protrusion scores of the delinquent-mother group as contrasted with the delinquent friend group, a test of the significance of the difference between mean differences was computed. Again, the indicated statistic was the  $t$  test for significance of difference between correlated means.

### Mutual-awareness

The data for the mutual-awareness variable are based upon the responses to 133 questionnaires on which a total of 76 comparisons was made. In order to determine whether there was a significant difference between the mutual-awareness scores of the delinquent-mother group as contrasted with the delinquent-friend group, a test of the significance of the difference between mean differences was computed, using again the  $t$  test.

Within the delinquent group, the most severely delinquent boys were compared with the least severely delinquent boys on each of the three variables. Means and sigmas for these two groups were computed for each variable and the



significance of the difference between these means was determined by the t test for uncorrelated means as described by McNemar (30, p. 224, Formula 91).

## CHAPTER V

### THE RESULTS

According to the first hypothesis, it is expected that there is more similarity between the self-attitudes of the delinquent and his peer-group friend than between the self-attitudes of the delinquent and his mother. The data employed to test this first hypothesis are to be found in Table 1.

Table 1  
Similarities in the Delinquent-Mother and  
the Delinquent-Friend Relationships

Groups	Mean	Sigma
Number of Items Checked Similarly on Mother's and Delinquent's Self- Questionnaires	10.00	3.16
Number of Items Checked Similarly on Delinquent's and Friend's Self- Questionnaires	12.05	2.79
( <u>df</u> = 18)	( <u>t</u> = 2.73)	( <u>P</u> < .02)

The t-technique for correlated means applied to this first variable, similarity, yields a probability value which is significant at the .02 level of confidence. It can be seen from an inspection of Table 1 that more items were checked similarly on the delinquent's and friend's self-questionnaires than were checked similarly on the mother's and delinquent's self-questionnaires. It is clear, therefore, that the data fully confirm this first hypothesis.

The second hypothesis predicts that there will be more protrusions characterizing the delinquent-friend relationship than will characterize the delinquent-mother relationship. The data employed to test this hypothesis are presented in Table 2.

Table 2  
Protrusions in the Delinquent-Mother and  
the Delinquent-Friend Relationships

Groups	Mean	Sigma
Number of Items Checked Similarly by Delinquent on Self-Questionnaire and for Mother not Checked by Mother on Her Self-Questionnaire	8.32	4.11
Number of Items Checked Similarly by Delinquent on Self-Questionnaire and for Friend not Checked by Friend on His Self-Questionnaire	13.89	4.45
(df = 18)	( <u>t</u> = 3.44)	( <u>P</u> < .01)

When the t-technique for correlated means was applied to this second variable of protrusion, a probability value which is significant at the .01 level of confidence was obtained. An inspection of Table 2 reveals that the obtained mean difference of 5.57 is in favor of the delinquent-friend group as opposed to the delinquent-mother group. That is, the delinquent tends more to attribute his self-attitudes to his friend than to his mother. Thus, the obtained data fully confirm this second hypothesis.

It has been postulated in the third hypothesis that there will be greater mutual-awareness of self-attitudes between the delinquent and his friend than between the delinquent and his mother. Table 3 represents the data upon which this comparison is based. When the t-technique for correlated means was applied to this third variable of mutual-awareness of self-attitudes, a probability value which is significant at the .05 level of confidence was obtained. An inspection of Table 3 reveals that the obtained mean difference of 4.57 is in favor of the delinquent-mother group as opposed to the delinquent-friend group. These data do not support the hypothesis that there would be greater mutual-awareness of self-attitudes between the delinquent and his friend than between the delinquent and his mother. Conversely, the data indicated that there is a significantly greater degree of mutual-awareness of attitudes existing between the mother and her delinquent son than exists between the delinquent

Table 3

The Mutual-awareness of Self-attitudes between the  
Delinquent and His Mother and between the  
Delinquent and His Peer-group Friend

Groups	Mean	Sigma
Number of Items Checked Similarly on Mother for Delinquent and Delinquent on Self-Questionnaire	16.16	5.49
Number of Items Checked Similarly on Delinquent for Mother and Mother on Self-Questionnaire	15.05	4.42
Sum	31.21	8.55
Number of Items Checked Similarly on Friend for Delinquent and Delinquent on Self-Questionnaire	13.11	2.97
Number of Items Checked Similarly on Delinquent on Friend and Friend on Self-Questionnaire	13.53	3.13
Sum	26.64	4.76
( <u>df</u> = 18)	( <u>t</u> = 2.19)	( <u>P</u> < .05)

and his peer-group friend.

A further analysis of the data presented in Table 3 reveals that the mother is significantly better able to predict the self-attitudes of her son than is the best friend

of her son. When the  $t$ -technique for uncorrelated means was applied to the difference between the mean number of items checked similarly on the mother for delinquent and delinquent on self-questionnaires and the mean number of items checked similarly on the friend for delinquent and delinquent on self-questionnaires, a probability value significant at the .05 level of confidence was obtained. Further inspection of the means presented in Table 3 suggests a tendency for the delinquent group to be able to predict better the attitudes of the mother than the attitudes of their best friends. However, a statistical comparison of these means (15.05 and 13.53) indicates they are not significantly different. Also, the trend indicated by the obtained means suggests that the mother is better able to predict her son's attitudes than he is to predict her attitudes. However, a statistical comparison of these means (16.16 and 15.05) does not yield a value which is significantly different.

In short, these data for the mutual-awareness variable do not support the third hypothesis. The data indicate that there is a significantly greater degree of mutual-awareness of attitudes existing between the mother and her delinquent son than exists between the son and his peer-group friend, and that the mother is significantly better able to predict the self-attitudes of her son than is his best friend.

According to the fourth hypothesis, it was predicted that the first three hypotheses would be more true for those

adolescents exhibiting seriously delinquent behaviors than for those whose behaviors are less seriously delinquent. That is, it was predicted that the five most as compared with the five least severely delinquent boys: first, would tend to imitate more the self-attitudes of the peer-group friend than the self-attitudes of the mother; second, would tend to ascribe their self-attitudes to their friends more than to their mothers; and third, would exhibit a greater degree of mutual-awareness of self-attitudes with their friends than with their mothers. The data for this comparison between the five most and five least severely delinquent boys on these three variables are presented in Table 4.

Employing the data presented in Table 4 for the protrusion variable, an uncorrelated means  $t$ -test of the significance of the difference between the means of the obtained difference scores for the most and least severely delinquent subjects was computed. The obtained  $t$  value of 1.59 with eight degrees of freedom is not significant at the required confidence level. However, the fact that both means are positive values suggests that both the least and most severely delinquent groups tend to attribute their self-attitudes to the friend more than to the mother. Also the difference of 5.40 between these means in favor of the most severely delinquent group suggests the tendency for attributing of self-attitudes to the friend to be greater for those subjects who exhibit more seriously delinquent behaviors. Although these

Table 4

Comparison between the Least and the Most Severely  
Delinquent Subjects on the Variables Protrusion,  
Similarity, and Mutual-awareness

Groups	Protrusion		Similarity		Mutual-Awareness	
	Mean*	Sigma	Mean*	Sigma	Mean*	Sigma
Most Severe Delinquents	8.80	5.67	2.80	1.33	.80	4.17
Least Severe Delinquents	3.40	3.77	1.40	3.01	-9.80	9.17

\*These means are the means of the difference scores based on the comparison between mother-delinquent and delinquent friend groups.

trends are in favor of the stated hypotheses, it is evident that the expected differences between the most and least severely delinquent groups did not reach statistical significance, and therefore the hypothesis is not substantiated.

A comparison between the least and the most severely delinquent subjects on the variable of similarity was made employing the data presented in Table 4. An uncorrelated means  $t$ -test of the significance of the difference between the means of the obtained difference scores for the most and least severely delinquent subjects was computed. A  $t$  value of .86 was obtained which with eight degrees of freedom is



not statistically significant at the required level of confidence. It is to be noted that since both means are positive values, there is a tendency for both the least and most severely delinquent groups to imitate more the self-attitudes of the peer-group friend than the self-attitudes of the mother. Also, the difference of 1.40 between these means in favor of the more severely delinquent group suggests the tendency for the imitation of self-attitudes to the friend to be greater for those subjects who exhibit more seriously delinquent behaviors. Although these trends are in favor of the stated hypotheses, the statistical comparison made between the most and least severe delinquent groups does not reveal that they differ significantly, and therefore the hypothesis is not substantiated.

Table 4 also presents the means and sigmas upon which a comparison between the least and the most severely delinquent subjects on the variable of mutual-awareness was made. Again, an uncorrelated means t-test of the significance of the difference between the means of the obtained difference scores for these two groups was computed. These data yielded a t value of 2.11 with eight degrees of freedom which is not significant at the required confidence level. The positive mean value of .80 suggests that for those subjects exhibiting the most severely delinquent behaviors there is greater mutual-awareness of self-attitudes with the best friend than with the mother. Conversely, the obtained negative mean

value of -9.80 for the least severe delinquent group suggests that for these subjects there is a greater degree of mutual-awareness of self-attitudes with their mothers than with their peer-group friends. The difference of 10.60 between these means is in favor of the stated hypothesis which predicted that the more severely delinquent subjects, in comparison with the less severely delinquent subjects, would possess a greater degree of mutual-awareness with their best friends than with their mothers. However, since this difference does not reach statistical significance, the hypothesis is not substantiated.

In summary, the data fully confirm the first two hypotheses since statistically significant differences were found between the mother-delinquent, delinquent-friends groups. That is, the delinquent imitates more the self-attitudes of the peer-group friend than the self-attitudes of his mother. Also, the delinquent attributes his self-attitudes to his friend more than to his mother. The data did not support the third hypothesis. The statistically significant group differences which were obtained support the converse of this hypothesis. That is, there is greater mutual-awareness of self-attitudes between the delinquent and his mother than between the delinquent and his best friend. The obtained data did not statistically confirm the fourth hypothesis. However, the differences obtained when comparing the most with the least severely delinquent subjects on the

variables--protrusion, similarity, and mutual-awareness--were in the predicted direction. That is, these data suggest the tendency for the more severely delinquent subjects as contrasted with the less severely delinquent subjects to imitate, to attribute to, and to experience a greater degree of mutual-awareness of self-attitudes with their peer-group friends than with their mothers.

## CHAPTER VI

### DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This study was designed to investigate the adolescent delinquent's relationships with central figures in his environment in an attempt to evaluate the nature of these interpersonal relationships and the concomitant attitudes which determine his behavior. It was hypothesized that certain of the attitudes comprising the delinquent's self-concept are formed more in his relationships with his age-mates than in his relationship with his mother.

The results were based upon comparisons made between the self-attitudes of the delinquent and his mother as contrasted with the self-attitudes of the delinquent and his delinquent friend. This study is designed as an analysis of certain relationships between the delinquent and his mother and the delinquent and the delinquent peer. The aim is to arrive at a characterization of these relationships. This study does not purport to be a comparative study of delinquents as differentiated from non-delinquent mother and peer relationships. Thus, the results were not based on any comparisons between delinquent adolescents and well-adjusted

well-adjusted adolescents. Since no control group of normal adolescents was employed, the obtained results and conclusions drawn from these results are limited to the sample of delinquents investigated. Also, any generalization from these results is restricted to the population of delinquents from which this sample was selected. Thus, any statements used to describe the delinquent's relationship with his mother as contrasted with his relationships with his peers does not imply that these same characterizations may not be equally as applicable to the interpersonal relationships of adolescents in general.

It was hypothesized that the delinquent would tend to imitate the self-attitudes of his delinquent-peer more than the self-attitudes of his mother and that he would ascribe his self-attitudes to his delinquent peer more than to his mother. It was hypothesized that there would be greater mutual-awareness of self-attitudes between the delinquent and his friend than between the delinquent and his mother. It was predicted that these hypotheses regarding the nature of the delinquent's self-concept would be more clearly substantiated for those adolescents exhibiting seriously delinquent behaviors than for those exhibiting less seriously delinquent behaviors.

These hypotheses were supported by the results obtained on the similarity and protrusion variables. However, the data obtained on the mutual-awareness variable did not

support the stated hypothesis. Although statistical confirmation was not obtained for the hypotheses regarding the differences in interpersonal relationships between the most and least severely delinquent subjects, the obtained differences were all in the predicted direction.

As predicted, the delinquents imitated the self-attitudes of their age associates more than the self-attitudes of their mothers. The marked similarities between adolescent delinquents, and their tendency to imitate each other in hair style, dress, manner of speaking and walking, are often noted by those working with them. Often these adolescent similarities between peer-group members are so apparent as to be commented upon by the lay observer. The data of this study suggest that not only does the delinquent imitate these more superficial and readily observable characteristics of his peer group, but he also incorporates the self-attitudes such as preferences, interests, needs, values, and fears of his delinquent friends.

The importance of the young child's imitation of his parents in the learning of socially acceptable behaviors has been stressed earlier. Imitation is seen as a process affording the child the opportunity to meet most successfully his frustrations and helping him to overcome his conflicting tendencies toward authority. The obtained data indicate that the delinquent has not formed these similarity patterns with his mother. Since the delinquent has not incorporated

the self-attitudes of this significant adult, these same needs for coping with frustrations and with conflicting tendencies toward authority may be the determiners of the delinquent's imitation of his antisocial associates.

Also, as predicted, the delinquent ascribes his self-attitudes to his friend more than to his mother. The term protrusion as used here refers to the assignment by the delinquent to his mother and to his friend of interests, needs, values, and fears not claimed by them. Protrusion is seen as the attempt on the part of the delinquent to gain satisfaction through a false belief that the significant others in his environment are similar to him.

The obtained data clearly indicate that for the delinquent the significant person whom he sees as having attitudes and behaviors similar to his own is his contemporary and not his mother. It is clear that the delinquent strives to be like his associates to the extent of erroneously ascribing his own characteristics to them. Perhaps the delinquent can attain to some degree the feeling of acceptance and security from his group by believing he is a good and conforming group member.

On the basis of phenomenological observations and reports, it was predicted that there would be greater mutual-awareness of self-attitudes between the delinquent and his delinquent friend than between the delinquent and his mother. The obtained results not only fail to confirm this hypothesis;

they support the converse of this hypothesis. That is, these data indicate that there is more mutual-awareness of attitudes existing between mother and son than exists between delinquent and associate. These findings are contradictory to those of writers like Thrasher (51) and Whyte (54), who stress that in the close associations between delinquents, they learn to know each other better than their parents know them.

Perhaps one explanation for the difference between these results and those of other writers is to be found in the type of delinquent subjects under observation. The population for this study was composed of detention home rather than reform school delinquents. That is, the boys in this study may not be as severely antisocial as those studied by other investigators. The results obtained when comparing the most with the least severe delinquents on this same variable, mutual-awareness, gives added support to this explanation. The more severe delinquents tended to experience greater awareness with their associates, whereas the less severe delinquents experienced greater mutual-awareness with their mothers. Other explanations for the disparity between predicted and obtained results for this mutual-awareness variable are to be found also in the type of delinquent population chosen for study. It is possible that these delinquents did not have the predicted awareness of the self-attitudes of their friends because their associations with their friends



were of shorter duration than were their associations with their mothers. It is to be noted that all of the delinquent boys lived at home with their mothers until they were placed in detention approximately two months prior to their participation in this investigation. Subjects of this study were not members of well-defined gangs which had engaged in activities with common motivational significance over a long period of time. Thus, it is possible that if the delinquents of this investigation had spent more time in association with their delinquent-peers and were members of a gang which had served as a reference group for them, there might have been a higher degree of mutual-awareness between them.

Throughout this investigation the assumption has been made that self-attitudes are the result of an interaction process. It is for this reason that mutual-awareness and not just the delinquent's awareness of others' attitudes, has been emphasized. However, a further analysis of the obtained data of each group's awareness of the other's attitudes is indicated in order to further describe the awareness patterns characterizing the delinquent's interpersonal relationships.

Despite the delinquent's frequent statements to the effect that they are not understood at home as they are by their teen-age friends, the results indicate that their mothers have a better understanding or awareness of their attitudes than do their best friends. Also, the mother knows her son's attitudes better than he knows her self-attitudes.

That the mother has significantly greater understanding or awareness of her son's preferences, values, and fears than does his friend, although her son does not believe this to be so, may be another example of the delinquent's misperception or distortion of himself and those about him.

Another explanation for this discrepancy between the data and the delinquent's statements regarding his feelings may be found in the definition of mutual-awareness. As used in this study, mutual-awareness is a kind of superficial understanding between two persons of each other's preferences, needs, values, ambitions, and fears. Thus, it is possible that the mother has an intellectual awareness or knowledge of her son's attitudes with little emotional accompaniment or empathy for her son's feelings and needs. This measure of mutual-awareness may be a measure of superficial understanding which is the accrual of knowledge about another person due to continued association over a long period of time. That mutual-awareness as measured here may be a measure of intellectual awareness of another's attitudes resulting from prolonged association is suggested by a further examination of the data obtained on this variable. For example, the data reveal that the delinquent tends to be able to predict the attitudes of his mother better than he is able to predict the attitudes of his best friend.

The last hypothesis was designed to ascertain possible differences in the formation of self-attitudes between the

most and least severely delinquent subjects. Antisocial attitudes and the resulting delinquent behaviors are seen as the result of self-attitudes which have been developed over a prolonged period of interaction with parents and associates. Therefore, contrasting the most with the least severely delinquent subjects on the three self-attitude variables is an attempt to discern certain characteristics common to the development of these attitudes.

It was predicted that the most severely delinquent boys, as contrasted with the least severely delinquent boys, would tend to imitate more the self-attitudes of the delinquent friend than the attitudes of the mother. It was predicted that they would tend to ascribe their self-attitudes to their friends more than to their mothers and that they would have a greater degree of mutual-awareness of the self-attitudes of their friends than they would have of their mothers' self-attitudes. Although statistical confirmation of this hypothesis was not obtained, the data reveal tendencies for the differences in interpersonal relationships to exist as predicted. The obtained results suggest that concomitant with the development of antisocial attitudes is a tendency for the delinquent's relationships with other delinquents to be more intense and meaningful than are his relationships with his mother. The lack of statistical confirmation for this last hypothesis may be because of the type of delinquent population used in this investigation. As

suggested above, the delinquents of this study may not be as severely delinquent as those studied by others who have employed a reform school population.

Considering the results obtained on the three variables, similarity, protrusion, and mutual-awareness, several conclusions can be drawn regarding the nature of the interpersonal relationships of the delinquents studied in this investigation. These delinquents had a relationship with their age associates which can be characterized in the following manner. These delinquents had markedly similar self-attitudes. In those areas where their self-attitudes were not similar they erroneously believed that they were. Further, they had less knowledge or awareness of each other's self-attitudes than they had of their mothers' self-attitudes.

These results support the beliefs of many of those who work in the area of delinquency. Currently, workers in this important area of pathology do not see delinquents as young criminals to be punished, but see them rather as misguided, maladjusted youths who are potential criminals if remedial measures are not taken. Theorists describe delinquents as youths who grossly distort their environment to the extent that they are living in an unrealistic world. Case histories of delinquents are replete with examples of their unrealistic thinking. For example, delinquents state that they do not need to attend school in order to obtain good jobs; they believe their difficulties are caused by the

"cops" who "have it in for them"; and they frequently state that it is all right to break rules if you do not get caught doing so. This investigation demonstrates the degree to which the delinquent in this study has a distorted picture of himself and those about him. He does not see his delinquent associates as they really are. He ascribes his own characteristics to them and follows them blindly in an attempt to be similar to them. Although he may report that he is misunderstood by his mother, she has more knowledge of his attitudes than he has of hers; and she has more awareness of his attitudes than does his best friend.

For the past several decades, workers and theorists have vacillated between two extremes in their thinking as to what constitutes a therapeutic program for the adolescent delinquent. On the one hand, some writers emphasize the necessity for removing the delinquent from his unwholesome environment and for placing him in a setting where he can learn more socially acceptable behaviors. On the other hand, the necessity for leaving the child in his present environment and treating both the child and family members has been emphasized. The results of this investigation suggest several important factors to be considered when imitating a therapeutic program for the individual delinquent. In general, the data indicate that the severity and type of offenses committed could be evaluated to determine a desirable treatment program. The more severely delinquent adolescent would seem

to benefit most by being placed in a detention home or other group setting where therapy could be oriented toward modification of his attitudes in conjunction with modifying the attitudes of his peers whom he is imitating. Counselling with the mother of a severely delinquent boy in order to help her gain a better understanding of her son does not seem indicated. The data suggest that she is not lacking in the superficial understanding which could be gained in short-term counselling. One might speculate that any modification of the mother's attitudes would probably have limited value for a severely delinquent son, since her attitudes and behaviors are not the ones which he is primarily imitating. In contrast, counselling with the mother of a less severely delinquent boy may be more beneficial since he, unlike the more severe delinquent, is still maintaining a closer relationship with his mother. Thus, it would seem possible to leave the less severe delinquent in his home environment and work concurrently toward changing his attitudes and those of the significant adult.

One purpose of this study was to demonstrate a method for investigating interpersonal relationships. Because the instrument of measurement employed in this study has demonstrated reliability, is used in a projective manner, and yields easily quantifiable results, it would seem to have value for other studies in this important area of interpersonal relationships. Also, the methodology employed provides

a means for measuring such operationally defined variables as similarity, protrusion, and mutual-awareness.

The Check-List Questionnaire was divided into ten sections. The content of these sections varied rather widely. The separate sections ranged from fears through reading interests to vocational preferences. In treating the data only the total of all sections together on each variable was used. No attempt was made to treat the data on each variable for each section. Statistically significant results were obtained on each variable using the totals. Had statistically significant results not been obtained, it would have been essential to analyze the data section by section on each variable since it would be possible for differences in direction by sections to have exerted a cancelling effect. This might have accounted for lack of statistical significance when the totals were employed. Although it goes beyond the scope of this study, it would be valuable to make an analysis of this data section by section on each variable. Such an analysis would yield information as to which sections were contributing the most to directions obtained in the total, which sections were contributing the least to the directions obtained in the total and which sections might yield directions opposite to those obtained in the total. Such an analysis might also reveal certain constellations of self-attitudes which are more typical of the delinquent-mother relationship as contrasted with the delinquent-friend relationship.

Employing this methodology, similar variables, and a control group of normal adolescents, further research with delinquents could be directed profitably toward an investigation of the chronological development of self-attitudes of delinquents of both sexes. It would be desirable for such a study to include severely delinquent adolescents, since it is believed that some of the results of the present investigation would have been even more conclusive if more severely delinquent boys, such as a reform school population, had been studied. Also, in a more intensive study of the formation of antisocial attitudes it would be desirable to have extensive case history and clinical information about the mother and the other significant persons with whom the delinquent has had meaningful relationships which have determined his self-attitudes and behaviors. Investigations of the determinants of self-attitudes of known clinical groups in modern psychopathology seem particularly warranted since attitude formation is so closely related to general level of adjustment. In short, it is believed that much could be learned about the motivation of human behavior by further research in this important area of interpersonal relationships and how they affect self-attitudes.



## CHAPTER VII

### SUMMARY

Although psychological investigators agree that attitudes are the result of an interaction process with significant persons in one's environment, they differ in their selection of the central or significant persons who are influencing the attitudes and behaviors of the juvenile delinquent. The purpose of this study was to investigate the interpersonal relationships of the adolescent delinquent in order to provide data on some aspects of the relationship between the parent and delinquent child attitudes as contrasted with the relationship between delinquent child and peer-group friend attitudes. No attempt was made to contrast the interpersonal relationships of the delinquent adolescent with those of the well-adjusted adolescent.

On the basis of phenomenological reports, it was hypothesized that the delinquent's self-concept is composed of the reflected appraisals of the attitudes of his friend more than of the reflected appraisals of the attitudes of his mother. More specifically, it was hypothesized that the delinquent would tend to imitate the self-attitudes of his

delinquent peer more than the self-attitudes of his mother, and that he would ascribe his self-attitudes to his delinquent peer more than to his mother. It was hypothesized that there would be greater mutual-awareness of self-attitudes between the delinquent and his friend than between the delinquent and his mother. It was predicted that all of these hypotheses regarding the nature of the delinquent's self-concept would be more clearly substantiated for those delinquent adolescents exhibiting seriously delinquent behaviors than for those exhibiting less seriously delinquent behaviors.

Fifty-seven persons served as subjects in this study: 19 juvenile delinquents who were being held in detention by the Tulsa County Juvenile Court, the mother of each of these delinquents, and the best friend of each of these delinquents.

The instrument of measurement, the Check-List Questionnaire, was designed to reflect the attitudes comprising the individual's self-concept as expressed by his interests, needs, aspirations, values, and fears. Although this instrument is a direct questionnaire, it was employed in a projective manner. That is, the meaning of the data was sought not in the responses themselves, but in the degree of similarity between responses in questionnaires answered by the mothers, the delinquents, and their peer-group friends. Only the three operationally defined interaction patterns, similarity, protrusion, and mutual-awareness, not the specific self-attitudes, were studied. The questionnaires were administered

individually to each subject. On the questionnaire, the mother, her delinquent child, and the best friend of the delinquent described independently their interests, needs, aspirations, values, and fears. In addition, the mother and friend described the delinquent in these same areas. The delinquent described the friend and the mother in the same areas. Quantitative scores of protrusion, similarity, and mutual-awareness were derived.

As predicted, the delinquents had attitudes which were more similar to the self-attitudes of their age associates than to the self-attitudes of their mothers. As predicted, the delinquent ascribed his self-attitudes to his friend more than to his mother. Contrary to the stated hypothesis, more mutual-awareness of self-attitudes existed between mother and delinquent son than existed between the delinquent and his associate. Although no statistically significant differences were obtained between the most and least severely delinquent adolescents on the three interaction variables, the obtained differences were all in the predicted direction.

Considering the limitations imposed by the selection of the sample for this investigation and the lack of a control group of normal adolescents, several conclusions were drawn regarding the nature of the interpersonal relationships of the delinquent population sampled. The delinquent's relationship with his age associate, in comparison with his

relationship with his mother, was characterized in the following manner. The delinquent and his age associate have markedly similar self-attitudes. In those areas where their self-attitudes are not similar they erroneously believe that they are. They have little knowledge or awareness of each other's self-attitudes. In contrast, the delinquent and his mother have markedly dissimilar self-attitudes. The delinquents do not erroneously believe that their attitudes are similar to those of their mother. Both the mothers and their delinquent sons have an awareness of the other's self-attitudes. Concomitant with the development of antisocial attitudes is the tendency for the delinquent's relationships with other delinquents to be more intense and meaningful than are his relationships with his mother.

These results were interpreted to be a demonstration of the degree to which the delinquent has an inaccurate picture of himself and those about him. The delinquent does not see his peers as they really are. He ascribes many of his own characteristics to his delinquent associates. Although he may report that he is misunderstood by his mother, she has more knowledge of his attitudes than he has of hers, and she has more knowledge of his attitudes than does his best friend. However, due to the nature of the measuring device used in this investigation, the mother's knowledge may be merely an intellectual or superficial awareness of her son's self-attitudes.

The findings of this study as they relate to a successful therapeutic program for the delinquent were discussed. It was suggested that counselling with the mother of a severely delinquent boy would have limited benefit since she is not lacking in the superficial understanding which could be gained in short-term counselling. The severely delinquent adolescent would seem to benefit most from placement in a group setting where therapy would be oriented toward modification of his attitudes in conjunction with modifying the attitudes of his peers with whom he is identifying. Prior to initiating a therapeutic program based on these suggestions, further investigation is indicated since these suggestions are based on differences between the delinquent groups which were not statistically significant.

Further research with delinquents could be directed profitably toward an investigation of the chronological development of self-attitudes of delinquents of both sexes, as compared with non-delinquents. The methodology and variables of this investigation are seen as useful tools for further research in the important area of interpersonal relationships.

## REFERENCES

1. Aichorn, A. Wayward youth. New York: Viking Press, 1935.
2. Allison, H. W. The temporal orientation of the juvenile delinquent. Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Univer. of Oklahoma, 1955.
3. Anderson, J. P. A study of the relationship between certain aspects of parental behavior and attitudes and the behavior of junior high school pupils. Teach. Coll. Contr. Educ., 1940, No. 809.
4. Baldwin, A., Kalhorn, J., & Beese, F. The appraisal of parent behavior. Psychol. Monogr., 1945, 58, No. 3.
5. Baldwin, A., Kalhorn, J., & Beese, F. Patterns of parent behavior. Psychol. Monogr., 1949, 63, No. 4.
6. Bettelheim, B. Love is not enough. Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press, 1950.
7. Bonger, W. A. Criminality and economic conditions. Boston: Little, Brown, 1916.
8. Bowers, S. M. A study of the parent-child relationship. Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Ohio State Univer., 1931.
9. Brown, A., Morrison, Joan, & Couch, Gertrude. Influence of affectional family relationships on character development. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1947, 42, 422-428.
10. Brown, F. Parental attitudes and child adjustments. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1942, 12, 224-230.
11. Cass, Loretta. Parent-child relationships and delinquency. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 101-104.

12. Conway, F. J. A study of understanding of family unit groups. Unpublished master's thesis, Colorado Coll., 1942.
13. Courtney, F. D. Identification and learning; a theoretical analysis. Unpublished doctor's dissertation, Harvard, 1949.
14. Eissler, K. R. (Ed.) Searchlights on delinquency. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1949.
15. Fitz-Simmons, M. Some parent-child relationships as shown in clinical case-studies. Teach. Coll. Contr. Educ., 1935, No. 643.
16. Frankel-Brunswick, E., & Sanford, R. N. Some personality factors in anti-Semitism. J. Psychol., 1945, 20, 271-291.
17. Friedlander, K. The psycho-analytical approach to juvenile delinquency. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1947.
18. Glueck, Eleanor. Culture, conflict, and delinquency. Ment. Hyg., 1937, 21, 44-66.
19. Golden, H. The relation of parental protection to the level of aspiration behavior of high school girls. Unpublished master's thesis, Ohio State Univer., 1949.
20. Harvey, O. J. An experimental approach to the study of status relations in informal groups. Amer. Sociol. Rev., 1953, 18, 357-367.
21. Hattwick, B. W. Interrelations between the preschool child's behavior and certain factors in the home. Child Developm., 1936, 7, 200-226.
22. Healy, W. The individual delinquent. Boston: Little, Brown, 1915.
23. Hirschberg, Grace, & Gilliland, A. R. Parent-child relationships in attitude. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1942, 37, 125-130.
24. Jones, M. C. University of California Institute of Child Welfare Interest Record. Berkeley, California: Univer. of California Publications.

25. Kates, S. L., & Harrington, R. W. Authority figure perspective and aggression in delinquents. J. genet. Psychol., 1952, 80, 193-210.
26. Lair, W. S. Identification in the socialization process. Peabody J. Educ., 1949, 26, 212-219.
27. Leonard, E. A. Problems of freshman college girls. A study of mother-daughter relationships and social adjustments of girls entering college. Child Developm. Monogr., 1932, 9, 1-140.
28. Lewin, K. A dynamic theory of personality. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.
29. Lindner, R. M. Rebel without a cause. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1944.
30. McNemar, Q. Psychological statistics. New York: Wiley, 1949.
31. Moreno, J. L. Who shall survive?, Nerv. ment. Dis. Monogr. Ser., 1934, No. 58.
32. Mowrer, O. H. Dynamic theory of personality. In J. McV. Hunt (Ed.) Personality and the behavior disorders. Vol. 1, Chap. 3. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1944.
33. Mullahy, P. A study of interpersonal relations. New York: Hermitage Press, Inc., 1949.
34. Murray, H. A., et. al. Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford Univer. Press, 1938.
35. Newell, H. W. The psycho-dynamics of maternal rejection. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1934, 4, 387-401.
36. Patterson, C. H. A note on Bernreuter personality of mothers and some measures of child personality. J. soc. Psychol., 1943, 17, 89-92.
37. Patterson, C. H. The relationship of Bernreuter personality scores to other parent characteristics, including parent-child behavior. J. soc. Psychol., 1943, 17, 77-88.
38. Patterson, C. H. The relationship of Bernreuter scores to parent behavior, child behavior, urban-rural residence, and other background factors in 100 normal adult parents. J. soc. Psychol., 1946, 24, 3-49.



39. Read, Katherine H. Parents' expressed attitudes and children's behavior. J. consult. Psychol., 1945, 9, 95-104.
40. Redl, F., & Wineman, D. Controls from within. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952.
41. Rose, A. A. Insecurity feelings in adolescent girls. Nerv. Child, 1944, 4, 46-59.
42. Shaw, C. R. Delinquency areas. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1929.
43. Shaw, C. R. The Jack-roller. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1930.
44. Sherif, M. An outline of social psychology. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
45. Stagner, R., & Krout, M. A correlation study of personality development and structure. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1940, 35, 339-345.
46. Stott, L. H. Adolescents' dislikes regarding parental behavior and their significance. J. genet. Psychol., 1940, 57, 393-414.
47. Stott, L. H. Parent attitudes of farm, town, and city parents in relation to certain personality adjustments in their children. J. soc. Psychol., 1940, 11, 325-339.
48. Sullenger, T. E. Social determinants in juvenile delinquency. New York: Wiley, 1936.
49. Sullivan, H. S. The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton and Co., 1953.
50. Symonds, P. M. Some basic concepts in parent-child relationships. Amer. J. Psychol., 1937, 50, 195-206.
51. Thrasher, F. M. The gang. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1927.
52. Tolman, E. C. Drives toward war. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1942.
53. Watson, G. A. A comparison of the effects of lax versus strict home training. J. soc. Psychol., 1934, 5, 102-105.

54. White, R. W. The abnormal personality. New York: Ronald Press, 1948.
55. Whyte, W. F. Street corner society. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1943.
56. Zucker, H. J. Affectional identification and delinquency. Arch. Psychol., 1943, 40, No. 286.

## APPENDIX

## SELF QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Here are lists of places to go. Choose 1 from each group of 5 places listed that you would like most of all to go. Put a check (✓) in front of the one you would like best in each group.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. band concert        | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. club meeting             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. basketball game     | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. dance hall               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. church              | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. horse race               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. public library      | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. opera                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. to visit relatives  | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. car riding with a friend |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. card party          | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. swimming pool            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. football game       | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. lecture                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. museum of art       | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. movies                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. to a friend's house | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. automobile show          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. picnic              | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. circus or fair           |

II. Suppose you could be anything you wanted to be. Choose 1 from each group of 5 jobs listed that you would like best. Put a check (✓) in front of the one you would like best in each group.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. aviator or airline hostess | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. scientist                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. teacher                    | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. salesman or saleslady    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. secretary                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. factory worker           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. electrician                | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. bus or truck driver      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. policeman                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. nurse                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. farmer or rancher          | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. newspaper reporter       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. librarian                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. social worker            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. mechanic                   | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. filling station operator |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. carpenter                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. bank clerk               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. actor or actress           | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. plumber                  |

III. Here are lists of magazines to read. Choose 1 from each group of 5 magazines listed that you would like most to read. Put a check (✓) in front of the one you would like best in each group.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. a motion picture magazine | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. comics                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. a news weekly             | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. a magazine of adventure        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. one about movie stars     | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. sports magazine                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. a detective story         | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. animal stories                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. a travel magazine         | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. short stories of ordinary life |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. a magazine about arts, crafts or hobbies      | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. a magazine about science and invention |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. a magazine about government and world affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. an art magazine                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. a household magazine                          | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. picture magazine like "Life"           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. a western story magazine                      | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. a religious magazine                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. a romantic "true confessions magazine"        | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. a magazine of jokes                    |

IV. Of the following subjects, which did you like best in grade school? Choose 1 from each group of 5 subjects listed that you liked best. Put a check (✓) before the one you liked best in each group.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. arithmetic         | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. writing         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. geography          | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. general science |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. history and civics | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. reading         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. English            | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. art and music   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. spelling           | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. gym             |

V. Here are lists of things which frighten some people. Choose one from each group of five things listed which frightens you the most. Put a check (✓) in front of the one which frightens you most in each group.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. spiders  | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. snakes                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. bad dreams   | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. punishment after death                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. thinking you might catch a disease such as "Polio" | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. becoming blind or deaf                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. thunder and lightning                              | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. fires                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. becoming insane                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. loss of money                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. thinking we may have a war                         | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. being separated from your family        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. thinking about dying                               | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. being operated on                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. being in a serious car accident                    | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. tornadoes                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. not being successful in your work                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. thinking someone in your family may die |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. being severely punished by someone                 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. becoming lost in a crowd                |

VI. If you were allowed only one adjective to describe yourself from each of the groups of adjectives listed, which would you choose? Put a check (✓) before the one adjective in each group which describes you most accurately.

- |  |                                       |   |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. patient      | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. restless  | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. nervous     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. happy        | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. moody     | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. sociable    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. worrisome    | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. lazy      | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. sincere     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. popular      | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. cheerful  | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. thrifty     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. ill-tempered | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. clever    | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. slow-acting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. sad          | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. busy      | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. easy-going  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. smart        | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. quiet     | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. quick       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. kind         | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. impatient | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. ambitious   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. timid        | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. careful   | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. scary       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. boastful     | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. peppy     | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. talkative   |

VII. Here are lists of things to contribute to. Suppose you had a large sum of money to give away, to which of the following organizations would you give this money? Put a check (☒) before the one in each group which you would like most to give it to.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. church                | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. home for orphans                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. city parks            | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. mental health and hospitals          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. symphony orchestra    | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. scientific laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. art museum                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. YMCA & YWCA           | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. sports, such as a home baseball team |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. library               | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Red Cross & Salvation Army           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. schools and colleges  | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. public hospitals                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. homes for old folks   | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. play grounds                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. industry              | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. housing developments                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. political campaign    | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. detention homes                      |

VIII. This is a list of things to own. Suppose that you didn't have any of them. Choose one from each of the groups of things listed that you would like most to own. Put a check (☒) before the one in each group which you would like most.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. bicycle                      | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. microscope                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. baseball and bat             | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. mechano or erector set            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. radio                        | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. sewing machine                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. extra nice outfit of clothes | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. gun                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. pool table                   | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. victrola with records             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. camping outfit               | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. piano or other musical instrument |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. collection of stamps         | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. tennis racket                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. a pet dog or cat             | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. wrist watch                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. nice jewelry                 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. ping pong set                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. large library of books       | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. basketball                        |

IX. Here are lists of things to talk about with your friends. Choose one from each group of five topics listed which you talk most about with your friends. Put a check (✓) before the one in each group which you talk most about.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. movies                        | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. having dates                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. latest song hits              | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. radio programs                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. what you were going to be     | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. money & things you needed      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. traveling                     | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. parties                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. studies and classwork         | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. outdoor sports                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. art painting or music         | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. teachers                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. clothes & things to wear      | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. dancing                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. books you have read           | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. your family                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. other boys and girls          | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. church & things about religion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. school activities, committees | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. new inventions & science       |

X. Here are lists of things to do. Choose 1 from each group of 5 things listed that you like most to do. Put a check (✓) in front of the one in each group which you like most to do.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. collect pictures of movie stars | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. paint or draw pictures                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. dance                           | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. play cards                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. sing in a choir                 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. play the piano or other musical instrument |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. go camping                      | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. go for rides in a car                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. go to a party                   | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. play with pet dog or cat                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. go fishing                      | <input type="checkbox"/> 1. talk with older persons                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. go for a walk alone             | <input type="checkbox"/> 2. write stories                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. help with work around the house | <input type="checkbox"/> 3. take long hikes with friends               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. act in plays                    | <input type="checkbox"/> 4. read                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. ride horseback                  | <input type="checkbox"/> 5. get together with friends just to talk     |

## FRIENDS INVENTORY

- I. Suppose you were asked to choose 3 boys to go fishing with you. Which 3 would you choose? List them in order of preference. That is, list the boy you would like most to go fishing with first, your second choice second and your third choice last.

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_

- II. Suppose you were asked to choose 3 boys to go home with you on a week-end. Which 3 would you choose? List them in order of preference. That is, list the boy you would like most to go to your home first, your second choice second and your last choice third.

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_

- III. Suppose you were asked to choose 3 boys to have a bull session with after dinner. Which 3 would you choose? List them in order of preference by putting the one you would like most to have a bull session with first, etc.

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_

- IV. Suppose you were asked to choose 3 boys to sit near you at the table. Which 3 would you choose? List them in order of preference by putting the one you would like most to sit near you first, your second choice second and your 3rd choice third.

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_



- V. Suppose you were assigned a work detail such as cleaning up the yard, kitchen duty, etc., and were asked to choose 3 boys to work with you. Which 3 would you choose? List them in order of preference by putting your first choice first, your 2nd choice second, and your 3rd choice third.

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

- VI. Who are your 3 best friends? List them in order of preference. Put your best friend first, your next best friend second, and your third best friend third.

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_