This dissertation has been microfilmed exactly as received

69-17,652

KELTON, Dale L., 1940-THE SELF CONCEPT OF JUVENILE DELIN-QUENTS: A STUDY OF MALADAPTIVES, LOSERS AND INTEGRATORS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1969 Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

THE SELF CONCEPT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS: A STUDY OF MALADAPTIVES, LOSERS AND INTEGRATORS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ΒY

- -

DALE L. KELTON Norman, Oklahoma

THE SELF CONCEPT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS: A STUDY OF MALADAPTIVES, LOSERS AND INTEGRATORS

APPRO BY ugelino n Mill

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to those who helped in the preparation of the dissertation and served on the examining committee. Appreciation is extended to the Oklahoma Department of Public Welfare for allowing me to conduct this study in the training school and to my colleagues and friends at the Helena State School for their assistance during the early stages of the research. I wish to thank Drs. Henry Angelino, Jack Kanak, and John R. Morris for serving on my committee and for their criticism and advice during the preparation of this paper. Special thanks is given to Dr. Paul D. Jacobs for serving as Chairman of the dissertation committee and for his inspiration and guidance which made this study possible. I am especially grateful to my wife Dottie whose many years of understanding and patience has contributed to the attainment of this degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

.

•

.

.

.

.,4

		page
LIST OF	TABLES	v
LIST OF	ILLUSTRATIONS	vii
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	METHOD	23
III.	RESULTS	30
IV.	DISCUSSION	76
V.	SUMMARY	93
REFEREN	CES	95
APPENDIX	<pre>< A</pre>	99
APPENDIX	B B.	100
APPENDIX	< C	101
APPENDIX	<pre>{ D</pre>	102
APPENDIX	< E	106
APPENDIX	۲	107
APPENDIX	۲ G	108
APPENDIX	K H	109
APPENDIX	< I	110

LIST OF TABLES

.

.

Table		page
1.	Group means and Variances	31
2.	Analysis of Variance Summary Table	33
3.	Differences in mean True/False (T/F) Scale Scores Between Groups	40
4.	Differences in mean Total Positive Scale Scores Between Groups	41
5.	Differences in mean Identity (Row 1) Scale Scores Between Groups	42
6.	Differences in mean Self Satisfaction (Row 2) Scale Scores Between Groups	44
7.	Differences in mean Behavior (Row 3) Scale Scores Between Groups	45
8.	Differences in mean Physical Self (Column A) Scale Scores Between Groups	46
9.	Differences in mean Moral-Ethical Self (Column B) Scale Scores Between Groups	47
10.	Differences in mean Personal Self (Column C) Scale Scores Between Groups	48
11.	Differences in mean Family Self (Column D) Scale Scores Between Groups	50
12.	Differences in mean Social Self (Column E) Scale Scores Between Groups	51
13.	Differences in mean Defensive Positive (DP) Scale Scores Between Groups	52
14.	Differences in mean General Maladjustment (GM) Scale Scores Between Groups	53

15.	Differences in mean Psychosis (PSY) Scale Scores Between Groups	54
16.	Differences in mean Personality Disorder (PD) Scale Scores Between Groups	56
17.	Differences in mean Neurosis (N) Scale Scores Between Groups	57
18.	Differences in mean Personality Integration (PI) Scale Scores Between Groups	5 े
19.	Differences in mean Number of Deviant Signs (NDS) Scale Scores Between Groups	59
20.	Differences Between mean Scale Scores of Maladaptive Group	61
21.	Differences Between mean Scale Scores of Loser Group	64
22.	Differences Between mean Scale Scores of M-Integrator Group	66
23.	Differences Between mean Scale Scores of L-Integrator Group	68

•

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

age	ure H	Fig
29	. Pictorial Representation of Split-Plot Factorial Design: Type SPF 5.20	1.
70	. Self Concept Pattern of Maladaptive Group	2.
71	. Self Concept Pattern of Loser Group	3.
72	. Self Concept Pattern of M-Integrator Group	4.
73	. Self Concept Pattern of L-Integrator Group	5,
74	. Self Concept Pattern of ML-Integrator Group	6.
75	. Comparison of Self Concept Fatterns Among Groups	7.

vii

.

THE SELF CONCEPT OF JUVENILE DELINQUENTS: A STUDY OF MALADAPTIVES, LOSERS, AND INTEGRATORS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquents are often thought of as offenders of society who will not or can not establish themselves as a part of the total social environment. Yet, looking at the psychological substructure, the juvenile delinquent is usually highly identified with his most immediate group and frequently gains his ego rewards through this smaller setting. Sherif and Sherif (1956) suggest that the individual's sustained experience and position in a group is the outcome of considerable psychological development reached through a prolonged give-and-take process. In other words, every person has his particular place in society. He does not just happen to be in that place; it is attained and achieved through the course of interaction with others. These authors present the idea that in order to maintain this social position it is necessary to exhibit certain qualities, skills, and accomplishments; therefore, the attainment of this standing is considered to be a function of our ego (Sherif & Sherif, 1956). Knowing the position one has attained in a group can give valuable

clues as to the psychological makeup of the individual. Therefore, it follows that those who have been identified as delinquents would have a different psychological structure from those who have been identified as non-delinquents.

Several studies in the literature have attempted to explain the behavior of delinquents by comparing them to their non-delinquent counterparts (Deitche, 1959; Epstein, 1962; Lively, Dinitz & Reckless, 1962; Motoore, 1963; Reckless, Dinitz & Kay, 1957; Reckless, Dinitz & Murray, 1956). As Hamner (1968) reports, a major difficulty with this approach is in the defining and sampling of delinquent and non-delinquent populations. He states, "There is always the possibility that the two groups differ on some variable other than that of delinquent behavior and that some uncontrolled variable may account for the difference... Even more serious is the possibility that the non-delinquent sample may be the 'uncaught' delinquent" \sqrt{p} . $2\sqrt{2}$. The idea expressed by Hamner appears to be valid, but the mere fact that an individual has not been "caught" would be reason enough to conduct comparative research. Of greater importance is the idea that the most fruitful approach to the study of delinquency may be found in a detailed study identifying, describing, and comparing delinquent groups to each other rather than to non-delinquent groups. This idea stimulated interest in the complexity of delinquency and as a result several questions were raised about the substructure of the delinquent group. Are there delinquent sub-groups which differ in basic personality structure? If so, how do these differences

exhibit themselves? If differences exist, how may they most effectively be studied?

Attempts to Identify Delinquent Sub-groups

A review of the literature soon reveals that most researchers approach the study of delinguents as a molar unit. However, there are some attempts to identify the molecular units which comprise the delinquent group as a whole (Fannin & Clinard, 1965; Halleck, 1967; Hamner, 1968; Jenkins, 1955; Sheldon, 1949; Spiva, 1968; Thorp & McCune, 1967). Fannin and Clinard (1965) give some evidence of a possible relationship between the type of self concept and type of behavior in lower class and middle class delinguents. They found that lower class delinguents see themselves as tough, fearless, powerful, fierce and dangerous. Middle class delinquents conceive of themselves as smart, smooth, bad and loyal. In addition, the lower class delinquents were found to commit violent offenses more often than the middle class delinquents. Thorp and McCune (1967) found that recidivists (those who are marked by falling back into prior criminal habits) in a training school population tend to produce a greater elevation on the Schizophrenic Scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory than do non-recidivists.

Hamner (1968) reports on an unpublished doctoral dissertation by R. J. Balester which studied four groups of delinquents. Balester compared Q-sort scores of recently incarcerated first offenders, recently incarcerated repeaters, already incarcerated

first offenders, and already incarcerated repeaters. The two groups of first offenders were found to be more like one another with respect to Q-sort score variance than they were like either group of repeater delinquents. The two groups of repeater delinquents were found to be more like one another than they were like first offenders. Mean positive Q-sort self concept scores revealed no consistent significant differences among the groups of the three sortings. However, Hamner (1968) quotes Balester as saying,

On the second and third sortings, there is a significant difference between the means of the recently incarcerated first offenders and already incarcerated repeaters. The former group has a more positive score than the latter. Also, on the third sorting, the recently incarcerated first offenders show a significantly greater self concept score than the recently incarcerated repeaters. The two groups of first offender delinquents have similar mean positive Q-sort self concept scores while the two groups of repeater delinquents have similar mean positive Q-sort self concept scores. The mean positive score of the first offenders is higher than the mean positive score of the repeaters [4].

Hamner (1968) also reports on an unpublished doctoral dissertation by J. A. Lefeber which used the Tennessee Self Concept Scale to differentiate first offenders from recidivists. Lefeber found that the two groups differ significantly on the Total Positive, Self Satisfaction, and Behavior scores. Lefeber states, "Lower scores obtained by the delinquent recidivists indicate that a high degree of self-devaluation exists among this population. These findings tend to strengthen the contention that there is a relationship between a poor self concept and delinquent behavior" \sqrt{p} . 207. Hamner (1968) concludes that although Balester's and Lefeber's studies employ different instruments, both point up the same general patterns of self concept differences between non-delinquents, delinquents, and recidivists.

In another study Spiva (1968) identified two delinquent sub-groups which he calls "Winners" and "Losers." Projective data suggest that the Winners view themselves as more adequate, are less likely to feel themselves victims and express a higher aspiration level than do the Losers. The Winners appear to express themselves in a more socially acceptable manner, are more critical in their judgements and express a greater recognition of the necessity for impulse control. In short, the Winners appear to be more organized in their thinking than the Losers. Specifically, those exibiting the "Loser Syndrome" are characterized as individuals with a view of the world as an oppressive place which does not provide adequate gratification. The Loser seems to experience a profound sense of helplessness, internal turmoil, and closely resembles the so-called psychotic offender. He demonstrates a difficulty in testing reality and is often unable to control his aggressive impulses. Underlying his perception of himself is the assumption of a destiny to fail and he is often found to express the feeling that he is "born to lose."

Jenkins (1955) takes a different approach and suggests that there are two general types of offenders: those who are emotionally disturbed and those who might be considered relatively normal from a clinical point of view. He makes a distinction

between <u>adaptive</u> and <u>mal-adaptive</u> delinquency. He considers the latter to be a form of emotional disturbance in that maladaptive behavior is not in the pursuit of a goal, but is self destructive and is often the result of a gross frustration of the individual's primary needs. He seems to be putting forth the idea that there exists a maladaptive delinquent who is less well integrated than the normal or adaptive delinquent.

Observations of Sub-groups in a Training School For Delinquent Boys

A sub-group has been observed in a training school for delinquent boys which, with some explanation, may be referred to as Maladaptive. Jenkins' (1955) term is utilized here because it focuses one's attention on the emotional disturbance which appears to set these delinquents apart from the rest of the group, emphasizes the fact that these individuals are self-destructive, and stresses the idea that their behavior does not appear to be in pursuit of a goal. By observation these delinquents do not appear to have the psychological capacity to relate themselves to the values or goals of any group---delinquent or non-delinquent. These individuals are often seen as being "crazy" by the other boys because the Maladaptives' behavior is frequently unpredictable. The delinquent population often refer to them in derogatory terms for they frequently break the conduct code established by the boys. Although like the "Loser" the Maladaptive can be described as resembling the psychotic offender, there appear to be distinctive social and behavioral differences. For example, it

seems the Maladaptive is the most disliked among the boys whereas the Loser often "rates" with his peers. The Maladaptive often resorts to name calling whereas the Loser's response is more apt to be physical aggression. In addition, the Maladaptive does not appear to display a basic identity whereas the Loser is generally known by his identifying himself as being "born to lose."

Both Jenkins (1955) and Spiva (1968) refer to sub-groups which appear to be more integrated than the Maladaptive or Loser. Jenkins speaks of a successful criminal career for some individuals as being adaptive behavior. Such individuals are not considered emotionally disturbed but are products of social disorganization. Spiva's "Winners" have been described as viewing themselves as more adequate, expressing a higher aspiration level, and appearing to be more organized than the Losers. If one keeps within the framework of delinquency we may say there is evidence to suggest the existence of an integrated delinquent.

<u>A Theory of Personality Integration</u> <u>Applied to a Delinquent Sub-group</u>

Seeman (1959) points out the relative paucity of research and theory in the area of personality integration and puts forth the concept of <u>organismic integration</u> as a valuable theoretical framework from which such research might proceed. He states, "First, the term <u>organismic</u> suggests that we are talking about an inclusive phenomenon. Second, the term <u>integration</u> is intended to suggest some form of interaction which takes place among subsystems of the organism--more specifically, an interaction which is

adaptive or self-enhancing" $/\overline{p}$. 6337. Within this theory, an individual's total behavior is organized in terms of a series of behavioral subsystems. Personality integration is defined in terms of the quality of the interaction within these systems. Therefore, the delinquent who has been described as the Integrator would be expected to show a higher quality of interaction within these systems than would either the Maladaptive or Loser.

The definition of personality integration and effective behavior will ultimately be derived by a combination of theoretical and empirical advancements. Conceptual papers on the subject have been presented by Jahoda (1958), Seeman (1959), Shoben (1957), and Smith (1959). The empirical task is to study the organism from a wide variety of behavioral perspectives in order to develop a comprehensive description of the integrated person. The same task awaits those interested in understanding the integrated delinquent.

The reader should keep in mind that the concept of an integrated delinquent expressed in the present study has been developed in terms relative to the delinquent group and therefore must not be thought of as being synonymous with the integrated personality found in the non-delinquent population. Research in the future may show the two to have similar properties but that comparison is beyond the scope of the present research.

<u>Usefulness of Recognizing Sub-groups</u> <u>In a Training School Setting</u>

Experience has shown that the delinquents which make up

sub-groups in training schools are not readily identifiable and become known to the staff only after weeks and sometimes months of observation. It takes time for the social order and behavioral characteristics of the boys to be exhibited to the staff and often these characteristics are not revealed at all. Nevertheless, Sherif reminds us that the individual's position within a group is important to know for the qualities and skills which led him to fall within a certain category are the "outcome of considerable psychological development reached through a prolonged giveand-take process... and the attainment of this standing is very much a function of our ego" (Sherif & Sherif, 1956, p. 619). Therefore, if it were possible to identify sub-groups to which an individual belongs and describe the ego or "self" variables which led him to attain his particular position within a group valuable information would be gained which could then be put to therapeutic If the individuals are found to differ between sub-groups use. then the necessity for a differential treatment program may be indicated.

The usefulness of knowing some of the differences in the personality characteristics of sub-groups has been demonstrated by Spiva (1968) in his discussion of the necessity for a differential treatment program for Winners and Losers. He states:

In the case of the Loser, therapeutic efforts might be organized around providing these youngsters with an environment which might facilitate ego growth. That is, on the assumption that Losers are best described as undifferentiated, and typically have low opinions of their own ability for mastery, they should be placed in

a situation where certain of their needs are met. The mere verbalization of concern for them is not sufficient. They need good food, good fun and interaction with people who can be compassionate and tolerant. Perhaps even more critical is the need for the experience of an ever increasing degree of success in skills as well as in interpersonal relationships. Only out of such a matrix can ego develop.

The Winners, in contrast, need the opportunity to modify their defenses. This may, at times, require dramatic intervention on the part of the staff which may involve putting the boy in the position of an emotional crisis. In other words, Winners are better able to make use of a program geared for character disorders. Confrontation, for instance, may be a technique which is of help much earlier in the therapeutic program. $\underline{/p}$. $45\overline{/}$

Results of a Pilot Study

Interest in identifying Maladaptives, Losers, and Integrators in a training school setting led to a decision to conduct a pilot study in order to determine if these groups could be established on the basis of peer and staff nominations. The nomination technique has been found to be an effective method of selection in several studies (Duncan, 1966; Lewis, 1959; Seeman, 1963; Wiggins & Winder, 1961; Winder & Wiggins, 1964) and summaries of such research may be found in Cartwright and Zander (1960), Hare, Borgatta, and Bales (1955), and Hare (1962). One cottage at a state training school for boys was utilized for conducting the pilot study to determine if agreement existed among the boys, among the staff, and between the boys and staff as to who are Maladaptives, Losers, and Integrators. Two paragraphs, one describing what the researcher felt were the salient characteristics of the Maladaptive and one describing the characteristics

of the Loser, were administered to the boys. The Maladaptive paragraph was administered on one day and the Loser paragraph was administered twenty four hours later. The cottage committee (staff) was given the paragraphs at the same time the boys received theirs. Both boys and staff were asked to rate the five boys who were most like the paragraph and the five boys who were least like the paragraph. Those who were chosen to be least like the Maladaptive were designated M-Integrators and those who were chosen as least like the Losers were designated L-Integrators since by definition they are considered least like the pathological groups.

The findings indicated that a high degree of agreement existed among the boys, among the staff, and between the boys and staff as to who were nominated as Maladaptives, Losers, and Integrators. Also, half of the boys nominated as Integrators were found to be in both of the "least like" groups. They were designated as ML-Integrators. Another interesting observation is that the Maladaptive paragraph appeared to be more threatening to the boys than did the Loser paragraph. For that reason it was concluded that in the present research the Loser paragraph would be administered first in order to minimize the effect of contamination from one administration to another.

Rationale for Using the Self Concept

It is believed that a detailed analysis of a person's self concept would reveal the important psychological variables which lead to his being nominated as a Maladaptive, Loser, or

Integrator. For Rogers the self concept is considered a valuable dimension to study. It is seen as the criterion determining the "repressing" or "awareness" of experiences and as a regulator of behavior (Rogers & Dymond, 1954). Many theorists, most notably Rogers (1961), have characterized the integrated person as one who has a positive self concept. There is a body of research literature which suggests that as therapy progresses the number of positive statements made about the self increases (Bulter & Haigh, 1954; Dymond, 1954; Lipkin, 1948; Raimy, 1948; Seeman, 1949; Sheerer, 1949; Snyder, 1945; Vargas, 1954). Therefore in the study of the self concept, one might expect the Integrated delinquent to have a more positive self concept than the Maladaptive or Loser and that one measure of success in a therapeutic program would be a shift of the self concept in a positive direction.

Fitts (1965) reminds us that the individual's concept of himself has been shown to be highly influential in much of his behavior and to be directly related to his general personality and state of mental health. He states, "Those people who see themselves as undesirable, worthless, or 'bad' tend to act accordingly. Those who have a highly unrealistic concept of self tend to approach life and other people in unrealistic ways. Those who have very deviant self concepts tend to behave in deviant ways" \sqrt{p} . 17. Raimy (1948) speaks with greater affirmation and states,

... what we perceive in ourselves may have only partial correspondence with what other people see in

us or the so-called objective personality. Yet, as always, we behave in accordance with our own perceptions even though the opinions of others and the urgencies of our biological make-up interact to influence our perception of ourselves \sqrt{p} . $154\sqrt{-7}$.

More directly related to the present paper is a statement made by Spiva (1968) in his study on Winners and Losers. Although he utilized a battery of four different tests in his research he concluded, "The evidence for this study suggests that a variable which differentiates the two groups lies in differences in the self-concept" \sqrt{p} . 437. Therefore, a detailed and multidimensional study of the self concept should prove to reveal valuable psychological data for identifying, differentiating, and understanding the individuals which make up the Maladaptive, Loser, and Integrator groups.

Descriptionof anInstrumentforMeasuringTheSelfConcept

Since juvenile delinquents are known typically to demonstrate a low tolerance for frustration and are often observed to have a short attention span, any consideration given to an instrument to be administered to them must take these factors into account. It is important for the instrument to be simple, interesting, and easily comprehended by adolescents. If the purpose is to identify and specify the variables which differentiates groups on the basis of self-perception, then the instrument must be well standardized and multi-dimensional in its description of the self concept. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form, meets these requirements. Because of its complexity and

relevance to the present study some explanation of the scores and data which it provides should be described. For a more complete description of the instrument the reader is referred to Fitts (1965).

The Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Clinical and Research Form, provides a profile sheet with twenty-nine scales. Twenty of these scales are relevant to the present study and therefore a description of themwill follow.

The Self Criticism Score (SC). This scale is composed of mildly derogatory statements that most people admit as being true of them. Individuals who deny most of these statements are considered as being defensive and making a deliberate effort to present a favorable picture of themselves. High scores generally indicate a normal, healthy openness and a capacity for selfcriticism. Extremely high scores (above the 99th percentile) indicate that the individual may be lacking in defenses and may in fact be pathologically undefended. Low scores indicate defensiveness and suggest that the Positive Scores are artificially elevated by this defensiveness (Fitts, 1965).

The Positive Scores (P). The overall self concept "... is reflected in the Total Positive Score which indicates the person's general level of self-esteem. This, in turn, is partitioned into a 3 x 5 matrix of subscores. The three rows are concerned with how the individual describes himself" (Hamner, 1968, p. 3). Row 1 represents the individual's Basic Identity or "what he is" as he perceives himself at the most basic level. Row 2

gives a measure of Self Satisfaction with his basic identity or how the individual accepts himself. Row 3 deals with the individual's concept of himself as reflected in his own Behavior. "The three rows then may be seen as focusing on (1) 'what he is' (2) 'How he feels about it' and (3) 'What he does.'" (Hamner, 1968, p. 4).

The five columns relate to the frames of reference the individual uses to describe himself.

Column E: Social Self (Self in relation to the secondary social group)

<u>Total Variability Score</u>. The Total Variability score provides a simple measure of the amount of variability, or inconsistency, from one area of self perception to another. It represents the total amount of variability for the entire record. High scores mean that the person's self concept is so variable from one area to another as to reflect little unity or integration. "High scoring persons tend to compartmentalize certain areas of self and view these areas quite apart from the remainder of self. Well integrated people generally score below the mean on these scores but above the first percentile" (Fitts, 1965, p. 3). <u>The True-False Ratio.(T/F)</u>. This is a measure of response set or response bias. It is "... an indication of whether the subject's approach to the task involves any strong tendency to agree or disagree regardless of item content" (Fitts, 1965, p. 3). Considered from the framework of self theory

... high T/F Scores indicate the individual is achieving self definition or self description by focusing on what he <u>is</u> and is relatively unable to accomplish the same thing by eliminating or rejecting what he is <u>not</u>. Low T/F Scores would mean the exact opposite, and scores in the middle ranges would indicate that the subject achieves self definition by a more balanced employment of both tendencies--affirming what is self and eliminating what is not self (Fitts, 1965, p. 4).

The Total Conflict Score. Statements about the self may be presented in either positive or negative terms.

Thus, it is one thing to say 'I consider myself a sloppy person,' and quite another to say, 'I like to look nice and neat all the time.' The subject who tends to describe himself by affirming his positive attributes but finds difficulty in denying negative qualities might answer "Mostly true" to both items. On the other hand, the person who tends to deny negative traits but sees little positive about himself might answer "Mostly false" to both. In either case there is a conflict between his responses to positive and negative items.... In order to give an absolute measure of amount of such conflict without regard to direction the positive-negative differences are summed non-algebraically. This yields a Total Conflict Score (Hamner, 1968, p. 5).

In giving an interpretation of the Total Conflict Score

Fitts (1965) states,

High scores indicate confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self perception. Low scores have the opposite interpretation, but extremely low scores (below the red line on the Profile Sheet) have a different meaning. The person with such low scores is presenting such an extremely tight and rigid self description that it becomes suspect as an artificial defensive stereotype rather than his true self image p. 4/.

The Total Conflict Score is a reflection of conflicting responses to positive and negative items within the same area of self perception. This score should not be confused with the Total Variability Score which reflects fluctuations from one area of self perception to another.

<u>The Empirical Scales</u>. Six of the scales on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale have been empirically derived. These six scales, on order of their appearance on the Profile Sheet, are as follows: The Defensive Positive Scale (DP), the General Maladjustment Scale (GM), the Psychosis Scale (PSY), the Personality Disorder Scale (PD), the Neurosis Scale (N), and the Personality Integration Scale (PI). Hamner (1968) reports, "The Psy, N, and PD Scales successfully differentiate normals from psychotics, neurotics, and sociopaths, respectively and differentiate these groups from each other" \sqrt{p} . 67.

The Number of Deviant Signs (NDS) Score. The general principle in scoring the NDS is to count one deviant sign for each score that deviates beyond its specified normal limits and to add an additional deviant sign for each standard deviation by which any score exceeds its limits. Fitts states "the NDS Score is the Scale's best index of psychological disturbance" (Fitts, 1965, p. 5).

<u>Studies Attempting to Determine The Self Concept</u> <u>Structure of Delinquents by Utilizing</u> <u>the Tennessee Self Concept Scale</u>

Several studies based on group means of the Tennessee Self Concept Profiles have shown an extremely consistent pattern for delinquents. Hamner (1968) reports data on profiles from investigations by Angelino (1956), Deitche (1959), Joplin (1967), Lefeber (1965) and Richard (1967) which show striking similarities in form as well as level. The similarities in profiles are revealed in the following paragraphs.

<u>Positive Scores (P)</u>. The mean Total P Score reported in these five studies fall one to one and a half standard deviations below the mean of the normative group on which the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was standardized. Hamner (1968) states,

The dimensions of self concept (Row P Scores) show significant deviation in the negative direction in every group. Self Satisfaction (Row 2) is less deviant than are Identity (Row 1) and Behavior (Row 3), forming the inverted "V" common to each of the samples. Thus, the delinquent seems to be saying that he isn't much good and that his behavior is proof of this, but that he is not really so dissatisfied with what he is.

The Column P Scores reveal the same impoverished self concept. In no area does the delinquent see himself positively, but he has a much less negative SC when using the Physical Self (Column A) as his frame of reference. The Moral-Ethical Self (Column B) and the Family Self (Column D) are quite negative and form the low points on the profiles. The Social Self (Column E) is much higher than the Family Self. The Personal Self (Column C) is also moderately well defended. Thus, the mean P scores on the five column scores form the "W" profile which appears to be characteristic of the delinquent population <u>/pp. 8, 9</u>7.

Variability Scores (V). The Variability Scores for all

the groups are found to be higher than for the general population.

Hamner states,

This higher variability is also reflected in the profiles of P Scores where there are marked differences in the level of self-esteem between the different components of the self. These findings indicate that delinquents typically reveal less consistent, or more variable, self concepts than non-delinquents.... More specifically delinquents show a greater tendency to compartmentalize different areas of the self and rate them very differently from each other (Hamner, 1968, pp. 9, 11).

<u>Self Criticism Score</u>. In all groups the mean Self Criticism Scores were found to suggest a normal healthy openness on the part of the delinquents.

<u>Total Conflict Scores</u>. The Total Conflict mean scores were found to be high, reflecting the delinquent's contradiction and confusion in his perception of himself.

Empirical Scales. Similarity among the groups was found to be even stronger across the Empirical Scales than on any other segment of the overall profile. Both the GM and PD scores are high and on the latter the mean score of every group is outside the normal limits. Hamner (1968) reports,

On the GM Scale, all groups exceed the normal limits except Joplin's group which lies at the 85th percentile and falls just below the cutoff point. All groups fall between one-half and one SD above the mean on the Psy Scale and only slightly higher on the N Scale. The scores on the DP Scale are uniformly below the mean but are not considered low enough to have interpretive significance.

The degree of personality integration is rather poor. PI Scale mean scores for all groups are below the 30th percentile p. 127.

<u>Number of Deviant Signs (NDS)</u>. All groups are found to score high on the NDS and above the normal limits.

Statement of Problem

A review of the literature reveals that delinquents have been traditionally viewed as an aggregate group to be compared to the "norm" group. However, there is evidence to suggest that the delinquent group is actually a composite of sub-groups which differ from each other. The present study is designed to identify delinquent sub-groups and to describe some of the variables which contribute to individuals being classified into these groups. More specifically, the research represents an attempt to determine if differences exist among delinquent Maladaptives, Losers, and three groups of Integrators by using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale for analyzing the self concepts of the various groups.

Based on past experience the following research hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis I. There will be differences among the means of the groups in scores on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

Hypothesis II. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Self Criticism Scale.

Hypothesis III. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the True-False Ratio (T/F) Scale.

Hypothesis IV. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Total Conflict Scale.

Hypothesis V. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Total Positive Scale.

Hypothesis VI. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Identity (Row 1) Scale.

Hypothesis VII. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Self Satisfaction (Row 2) Scale.

Hypothesis VIII. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Behavior (Row 3) Scale.

Hypothesis IX. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Physical Self (Column A) Scale.

Hypothesis X. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Moral-Ethical Self (Column B) Scale.

Hypothesis XI. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Personal Self (Column C) Scale.

Hypothesis XII. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Family Self (Column D) Scale.

Hypothesis XIII. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Social Self (Column E) Scale.

Hypothesis XIV. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Total Variability Score.

Hypothesis XV. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Defensive Positive (DP) Scale.

Hypothesis XVI. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the General Maladjustment (GM) Scale.

Hypothesis XVII. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Psychosis (Psy) Scale.

Hypothesis XVIII. There will be mean score differences

22

among the groups on the Personality Disorder (PD) Scale.

Hypothesis XIX. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Neurosis (N) Scale.

Hypothesis XX. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Personality Integration (PI) Scale.

Hypothesis XXI. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Number of Deviant Signs (NDS) Scale.

Hypothesis XXII. There will be mean score differences among the Scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Test.

Hypothesis XXIII. There will be mean score differences among the scales of the Maladaptive Group.

Hypothesis XXIV. There will be mean score differences among the scales of the Loser Group.

Hypothesis XXV. There will be mean score differences among the scales of the M-Integrator Group.

Hypothesis XXVI. There will be mean score differences among the scales of the L-Integrator Group.

Hypothesis XXVII. There will be mean score differences among the scales of the ML-Integrator Group.

Hypothesis XXVIII. There will be interactions among the means of the groups and scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

The .05 level of significance will be the minimum required to reject the null form of the research hypotheses.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Setting of the Study

The present study was conducted at the Helena State School for Boys. Each of the boys has been declared delinquent by the state courts of Oklahoma for offenses ranging from truancy and burglary to rape and murder. However, the boys admitted for the former offenses make up the great majority of the population. The average population of the school is about 160 boys but this number varies considerably throughout the year. At the present time there are nine cottage units which house a maximum of 24 boys. These units are administered by a cottage committee consisting of a co-ordinator, social worker, and a cottage supervisor who are responsible for most of the decisions affecting the The committee has frequent contacts with the boys both on boys. a group and individual level which allows each member to get to know the boys well. A large interdisciplinary staff comprised of psychologists, social workers, educators, and cottage supervisory personnel function as a team under the superintendent in carrying out the rehabilitative and therapeutic programs.

Selection of Subjects

Five groups of boys were selected as subjects on the basis of (1) peer group and (2) cottage committee nominations. Two sets of peer group rating forms were administered to all the boys in seven of the nine cottages. One rating form was designed to identify those who the boys felt were most like and least like a theoretical Maladaptive presented in a paragraph about a boy named Tony. The other rating form was designed to identify who the boys felt were most like and least like a theoretical Loser presented in a paragraph about a boy named Pete. The peer group rating forms were constructed to make the description congruent with the conception of the Maladaptive (See Appendix A) and Loser (See Appendix B) as discussed earlier in this study. Below the model paragraph was a list of names of the boys living in the rater's particular cottage. Therefore, the format was the same for all rating forms but a particular boy would rate only peers living in his own cottage.

Instructions for identifying the Maladaptive and Loser were identical for the two paragraphs. Instructions for the Maladaptive form required that the subject first read the model paragraph and from the list of names (1) circle the names of the five boys who were <u>most</u> like Tony and (2) underline the names of the five boys who were <u>least</u> like Tony. For the Loser form the instructions required that the subject first read the model paragraph and from the list of names (1) circle the names of the five

boys who were <u>most</u> like Pete and (2) underline the names of the five boys who were least like Pete.

The Loser paragraph was administered first and the Maladaptive paragraph was administered the following day. Each of the boys worked individually in his room to avoid discussion of the paragraphs during rating. Using the same form, ratings were also obtained from the three members of each cottage committee. All the ratings for each form were obtained simultaneously and in the presence of an examiner. Therefore, neither the boys nor the cottage committee were able to discuss any of their ratings with another person.

The rating forms from the boys and cottage committee were tabulated in terms of the number of votes each boy received as being <u>most</u> and <u>least</u> like the theoretical boy described. In order for a boy to qualify as a subject in the study, four criteria had to be met. First, each subject had to be among those boys who received the five highest number of votes as being either most or least like the boy described in the model paragraph. Second, each subject had to be among those boys who received a minimum of two of the possible three nominations from his cottage committee as being either most or least like the boy described in the model paragraph. In other words both the boys and the cottage committee had to be in high agreement as to who was most or least like a particular paragraph. Third, of the boys meeting the first two criteria five who were found to have the highest percentage of

peer nominations, regardless of cottage, as being <u>most</u> like a particular paragraph were selected as the <u>Maladaptives</u> or <u>Losers</u>.

The five boys who were found to have the highest percentage of peer nominations, regardless of cottage, as being least like one of the two paragraphs and were not found to be among those having the highest percentage of peer nominations for being least like both paragraphs were selected as Maladaptive or Loser Integrators. Of these two groups those having been selected as being least like the Maladaptive paragraph were designated as M-Integrators. Of these two groups those having been selected as being least like the Loser paragraph were designated as L-Integrators. The five boys who were found to have the highest percentage of peer nominations, regardless of cottage, as being least like both the Maladaptive and Loser paragraphs were selected and designated as ML-Integrators. Fourth, of the boys meeting the first three criteria all were required to have an "average" sixth grade reading level in order to qualify as a subject in the present study (Wise, 1968). Since the cottage with the youngest boys was found not to have a majority who could pass the sixth grade reading requirement, this cottage was eliminated as a possible source for selecting subjects. The reception cottage was also eliminated as a possible source for selecting subjects since the boys in this cottage had been in the school for less than three weeks. As a result, the boys which participated in the selection process ranged in age from 13 through 16 years.

Testing of Subjects

The subjects in all five groups were given the Tennessee Self Concept Scale: Clinical and Research Form (Fitts, 1965). This scale presents one hundred self concept statements which the subject may respond to by putting a circle around one of five numbers which indicate the statement is (1) completely false (2) mostly false (3) partly false and partly true (4) mostly true or (5) completely true of himself. They were tested in groups of five during the regular school hours so that each subject could be given individual attention and assistance if necessary. The subjects in these groups were randomized so the order of testing would not follow a regular pattern in terms of how they were nominated. The testing room was quiet and well equipped for working with pencil and paper. In addition to the instructions printed in the booklet the following instructions were given verbally.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. This is not a test and your answers will have no effect on your grades or how long you will stay here at the school.

Experimental Design

Twenty of the twenty-nine variables on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale were selected for study in the present research. This data were then analyzed in a 5 x 20 split-plot factorial design with non-repeated measures on one variable and repeated

measures on the other variable (Kirk, 1968, ch. 8). For a pictorial representation of the split-plot factorial design used in this study see Figure I.
			Cerric	451	Ĵ,	POS VCr	×1/1/c~ /	∕ ∿	რა	1	14.2	» (^ / /		11 °	Za.	NABILIT.	7				
	ندر . اندر ا	SELF		,0, ,	, v v v	PON.	PON,	PON I	٠ ک					5,0 2	200	Ъ,	25	Q 4	>	<u>م</u>	20,
1	4	4	4		4	4	4	<u>/.</u>	4	4			4				<u> </u>			4	Λ
	S ₁	S ₁	S,	S ₁	S	S ₁	S _I	S ₁	1												
	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	
GROUP	S₃	S ₃	S ₃	S ₃	S₃	S ₃	S₃	S ₃	S ₃	S₃	S ₃										
0.000	S ₄	S₄ S₄	S ₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S ₄	S₄	S ₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S ₄	S₄	S ₄	S ₄	S ₄	S₄ ≎	S ₄	S₄	
	S ₅	S ₅	S ₅	S ₅	S₅	S₅	S ₅	S ₅	S₅	S ₅	S ₅	S₅	S ₅	S ₅	Ş ₅	S ₅	1				
	S,	S,	S,	S,	S,	S,	S,	S,	S,	S,	S,	S	S	S	Sı	S ₁	S	S ₁	S ₁	S	1
	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	Λ
LUSER GROUP	S₃	S ₃	S3	S ₃	S ₃	S ₃	S₃	S₃	S ₃	S₃	S₃	S ₃	S₃	S3	S₃	S ₃	S₃	S ₃	S₃	S ₃	1
	S₄	S₄	S ₄	S₄																	
	S ₅	S ₅	S ₅	S₅	S ₅	/															
	S ₁	S ₁	S	S ₁	S ₁	S	S ₁	S ₁	S ₁	S ₁	S	S	Sı	S	S ₁	S ₁	S _I	S ₁	S _I	S	1
	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S2	S ₂	S₂	S2	S ₂	Λ						
M-INTEGRATOR	S₃	S₃	S ₃	S₃	S3	S3	S₃	S3	S3	S ₃	S3	S ₃	S3	S₃	S₃	S₃	S₃	S₃	S ₃	S ₃	1
GROOP	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S ₄	S₄	1						
	S ₅	S₅	S ₅	S₅	S₅	S ₅	S ₅	S ₅	S₅	S₅	S5	S₅	S₅	S5	S ₅	S ₅	S ₅	S₅	S₅	S ₅	Λ
	S ₁	S	Sı	Sı	S	Sı	S ₁	S,	S	Sı	S,	S	S	Sı	S,	Sı	Sı	S	S	S	И
	S ₂	S2	S ₂	S2	S₂	S ₂	S2	S ₂	S ₂	S ₂	S₂	S₂	S2	S₂	S₂	И					
	S₃	S3	S₃	S3	S3	S3	S ₃	S3	S₃	S₃	S3	S ₃	S₃	S3	S3	S3	S₃	S3	S₃	S ₃	И
GROUP	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	S₄	И
	S₅	S ₅	S ₅	S ₅	S₅	S5	S₅	S ₅	S5	S₅	S5	S ₅	S ₅	S5	S ₅	S ₅	S ₅	S_5	S_5	S ₅	И
	S ₁	S	S,	S	S ₁	S,	S	S	S	S	Sı	S	Sı	Sı	Sı	S	Sı	Sı	S,	Sı	И
	S2	S ₂	S2	S ₂	S2	S₂	S ₂	S₂	S ₂	И											
ML-INTEGRATOR	S3	S3	S3	S3	S3	S₃	S3	S3	S3	S₃	S3	S₃	S3	S₃	S3	S3	S3	S3	S3	S₃	И
GROUP	S₄	S,	S₄	S4	S4	S₄	S₄	S4	S₄	S4	S4	S4	S₄	S4	S₄	S4	S₄	S4	S₄	S₄	И
	S ₅	S ₅	S ₅	S ₅	S5	S5	S5	S ₅	S5	S ₅	S5	S ₅	S5	S₅	S ₅	S₅	S₅	S₅	S5	S ₅	

Figure 1. Pictorial Representation of Split-Plot Factoral Design: Type SPF 5.20.

29

.

.

•

.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The Tennessee Self Concept scores for the five experimental groups were transformed to T-scores (Fitts, 1965, p. 15) and the means and variances are presented in Table 1. The data were analyzed by an SPF 5.20 design (Kirk, 1968) and the significance of differences between means, following a significant F ratio, was obtained by applying Duncan's Test (Kirk, 1968). Tests for homogeneity of variance of error terms, required by the assumptions underlying the split-plot factorial design, were accomplished by means of the Hartley Fmax statistic (Winer, 1962). The assumption of homogeneity was upheld in the case of Fmax (5,4) = 5.17, for the subjects within group error terms, which is not significant at the .01 level. Since Fmax (5,76) for the scales X subjects within groups error terms is only .30 above the .01 critical value for •• df, but only has 76 df, the data are assumed to be homogeneous.

The Analysis of Variance Summary Table (Table 2) indicates that twenty-four of the twenty-eight research hypotheses were supported. The results are as follows:

Hypothesis I, which states there will be differences among the means of the groups in scores on the Tennessee Self

GROUP MEANS AND VARIANCES

Group	Se Criti x	lf cism var.	T X	/F var.	Co X	Total onflict var.	To Pos X	otal sitive var.
								·····
Maladaptives	47.0	17.50	63.6	562.30	67.6	267.80	27.2	11.70
Losers	51.6	16.80	50.2	292.70	60.6	88.80	30.2	11.70
M-Integrators	53.0	39.50	57.0	142.50	55.4	34.80	43.2	21.70
L-Integrators	46.8	47.20	70.0	41.00	62.2	96.50	46.8	44.70
ML-Integrators	48.6	114.80	52.0	303.50	53.0	96.50	47.2	43.70
(con't)								
Group	Row X	l var.	Ro X	w 2 var.	x	Row 3 var.	Col X	L. A var.
Maladaptives	22.6	22.80	32.4	33.80	27.6	43.30	31.8	77.20
Losers	35.8	129.20	32.2	3.70	28.0	53.50	39.8	156.70
M-Integrators	42.0	80.00	51.6	14.30	36.4	54.80	51.0	9.50
L-Integrators	46.0	24.00	51.6	45.80	43.4	65.80	50.4	39.30
ML-Integrators	49.8	51.20	48.2	136.70	44.2	27.20	51.2	39.70
(con't)		······································				4		···· •¥====== +==+
Group	Col X	. B var.	Co X	l. C var.	Co X	l. D var.	Col X	L. E var.
Maladaptives	25.0	54.00	30.6	49.30	25.2	33.70	30.4	62.30
Losers	25.4	60.80	31.6	25.30	28.2	48.70	37.4	155.30
M-Integrators	29.2	84.70	51.8	26.20	48.2	17.70	44.0	65.00
L-Integrators	42.4	33.30	55.8	68.70	44.8	49.70	45.4	112.80
ML-Integrators	35.8	65.20	50.8	137.20	49.0	30.00	51.4	50.80

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Group	To Varia X	tal bility var.	DF x	var.	GM x	var.	PS x	var.
Maladaptives	53.8	98.20	43.0	124.50	79.2	50.20	73.4	44.30
Losers	60.4	141.80	34.6	15.30	68.4	41.80	50.4	9.30
M-Integrators	56.4	53.80	48.4	81.30	56.6	80.80	48.8	41.70
L-Integrators	50.2	26.20	58.6	29.80	58.4	106.80	62.4	218.80
ML-Integrators	54.4	53.80	50.8	31.20	56.8	20.70	51.2	29.70
(con't)	<u></u>							
Group	F x	D var.	N X	var.	PI x	var.	NE x	S var.
 Maladaptives	73.6	28.80	67.0	7.50	35.4	21.80	81.8	94.70
Losers	74.2	45.70	65.4	38.80	32.4	36.30	76.0	12.50
M-Integrators	63.8	87.20	54.4	11.30	47.0	9.50	63.0	191.00
L-Integrators	59.8	30.70	51.0	47.00	48.4	16.80	64.4	59.30
ML-Integrators	52.8	107.30	51.4	49.30	50.8	27.20	54.4	131.30

TABLE	2
THDLL	

Sour Vari	ce of ation	SS	df	MS	F	P*
1.	Between Subj:	6027.412	24		~ ~	
2.	A (Groups)	3471.172	4	867.793	2 24 6.790	<.01
3.	A at Self- Criticism	154.800	ų	38.700	3 23 ⊲. 000	
4.	A at T/F	1358.160	4	339.540	23 4.859	<.01
5.	A at Total Conflic	ct 659.440	4	164.860	5 23 2.359	>. 05
6.	A at Total Positive Score	1811.840	4	452.96	6 23 6.482	~. 01
7.	A at Row l (Identity)	2267.760	4	566.94	7 23 8.113	<.01
8.	A at Row 2 (Self Satisfaction	2018.800 1)	4	504.70	8 23 7.222	<.01
9.	A at Row 3 (Behavior)	1283.440	ų	320.86	9 4.591	<.01
10.	A at Column A (Physical Self)	1523.760	ų	380,94	10 23 5.451	<.01
11.	A at Column B (Moral-Ethical Sel	1110.160 Lf)	4	277.54	11 23 3.971	<.01
12.	A at Column C (Personal Self)	2897.840	ų	724.46	12 2310.367	<.01
13.	A at Column D (Family Self)	2687.840	4	671.96	13 23 9.616	<.01
14.	A at Column E (Social Self)	1296.240	ų	324.06	14 23 4.637	<.01

.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY TABLE

•

.

.

۰.

.

Sourc Varia	e of tion	SS	df	MS	F P*
15.	A At Total Variability	279.760	4	69.94 23	1.001 >.05
16.	A at DP (Defensive Positive Scale)	1603.440	ц	400.86 ¹⁶ 23	5.736 < 01
17.	A at GM (General Maladjustment Scale)	1941.440	ц	485.36 <u>17</u> 23	6.946 <.01
18.	A at PSY (Psychosis Scale)	2211.360	4	552.84 <mark>18</mark> 23	7.911 <.01
19.	A at PD (Personality (Disorder Scale)	1045.200	4	261.30 19 23	3.739 <.01
20.	A at N (Neurosis Scale)	1205.760	4	301.44 <mark>20</mark> 23	4.313 <.01
21.	A at PI (Personality Integration Scale)	1379.600	ц	344.90 <mark>21</mark> 23	4.935 < .01
22.	A at NDS (Number of Deviant Signs)	2386.640	4	596.66 2 <u>3</u>	8.538 <.01
23.	Within Cell	27950.60	400	69.876	
24.	Subj: W/Groups	2556.240	20	127.812	
25.	Within Subj. 1	08043.500	475		
26.	B (Scales)	54992.032	19	2894.317 <mark>26</mark> 33	43.302 <.01
27.	B at Maladaptives	41303.390	19	2173.862 ²⁷	32.523 <.01
28.	B at Losers	26518.240	19	1395.696 <mark>33</mark>	20.881 <.01
29.	B at M-Integrators	6686.440	19	351.917 <mark>29</mark> 33	5.265 <.01
30.	B at L-Integrators	5923.160	19	311.745 <mark>30</mark> 331	4.664 < 01

.

Sour Varia	ce of ation	SS	df	MS	F	P*
31.	B at ML-Integrators	2212.910	19	116.468 <mark>51</mark> 33	1.742	>.05
32.	AB	27652.108	76	363.843 <mark>52</mark> 33	43.310	<.01
33,	BX Subj: W/Groups	25399.360	380	66.840		
34.	TOTAL	114070.912	499			
Crit	ical Values					
<u>F</u> .05 <u>F</u> .01	(4,20) = 3.51 (4,20) = 5.17					
<u>F</u> .05 <u>F</u> .01	(4,∞) = 2.79 (4,∞) = 3.72					
<u>F</u> .05 F.01	(19,∞) = 1.83 (Tabled (19,∞) = 2.19 (Tabled	d 15,∞) d 15,∞)				

*P = Two Tailed Test

- -

Concept Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis II, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Self Criticism Scale, is <u>not</u> significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis III, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the True-False Ratio (T/F) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis IV, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Total Conflict Scale, is <u>not</u> significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis V, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Total Positive Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis VI, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Identity (Row 1) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis VII, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Self Satisfaction (Row 2) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis VIII, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Behavior (Row 3) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis IX, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Physical Self (Column A) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis X, which states there will be mean score

differences among the groups on the Moral-Ethical Self (Column B) Scale, is significant at the .Ol level.

Hypothesis XI, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Personal Self (Column C) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XII, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Family Self (Column D) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XIII, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Social Self (Column E) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XIV, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Total Variability Score, is <u>not</u> significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis XV, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Defensive Positive (DP) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XVI, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the General Maladjustment (GM) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XVII, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Psychosis (Psy) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XVIII, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Personality Disorder (PD) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XIX, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Neurosis (N) Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XX, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Personality Integration (PI) Scale, is significant: at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XXI, which states there will be mean score differences among the groups on the Number of Deviant Signs (NDS) Score, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XXII, which states there will be mean score differences among the Scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XXIII, which states there will be mean score differences among the Scales of the Maladaptive Group, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XXIV, which states there will be mean score differences among the Scales of the Loser Group, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XXV, which states there will be mean score differences among the Scales of the M-Integrator Group is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XXVI, which states there will be mean score differences among the Scales of the L-Integrator Group, is significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis XXVII, which states there will be mean score differences among the Scales of the ML-Integrator Group, is <u>not</u>

significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis XXVIII, which states there will be interactions among the means of the groups and scales of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, is significant at the .01 level.

Differences in Mean Scale Scores Between Groups

The differences in the mean True/False (T/F) Ratio Scale scores between groups are presented in Table 3. The mean score of the Loser group is lower than the mean score of the L-Integrator (L-Int.) group at the .01 level. The mean score of the ML-Integrator (ML-Int.) group is lower than the mean score of the L-Int. group at the .01 level.

The differences in the mean Total Positive Scale scores between groups are presented in Table 4. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean scores of the M-Integrator (M-Int.), L-Int., and ML-Int. groups at the .01 level. The mean score of the loser group is lower than the mean scores of the M-Int. and ML-Int. groups at the .05 level and lower than the L-Int. group at the .01 level.

The differences in the mean Identity (Row 1) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 5. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean scores of the Loser group at the .05 level and lower than the M-Int., L-Int., ML-Int. groups at the .01 level.

The differences in the mean Self Satisfaction (Row 2)

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN TRUE/FALSE (T/F) SCALE

SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

				Critical	values	
	At At	<pre>level .05 = level .01 =</pre>	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Losers	ML-Int.	M-Int.	Mal.	L-Int.
50.2	Losers		2.0	6.8	13.4	19.8**
52.2	ML-Int.			5.0	11.6	18.0**
57.0	M-Int.				6.6	13.0
63.6	Mal.					6.4
70.0	L-Int.					

P **<.01

.

.

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN TOTAL POSITIVE SCALE

SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

					Critical	values	
	At At	level level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Mal.		Losers	M-Int.	L-Int.	ML-Int.
27.2	Mal.			3.0	16.0**	19.6**	20.0**
30.2	Losers				13.0*	16.6**	17.0*
43.2	M-Int.					3.6	4.0
46.8	L-Int.						.4
47.2	ML-Int.						

* P<.05 ** P<.01

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN IDENTITY (ROW 1) SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

					Critical	values	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Mal.		Losers	M-Int.	L-Int.	ML-Int.
22.6	Mal.			13.2*	19.4**	23.4**	27.2**
35.8	Loser	5			6.2	10.2	14.0
42.0	M-Int	•				4.0	7.8
46.0	L-Int	•					3.8
49.8	ML-In	t.					

_.-

* P<.05 ** P<.01

Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 6. The mean score of the Loser group is lower than the mean scores of the ML-Int., M-Int., and L-Int. groups at the .01 level. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean scores of the ML-Int., M-Int., and L-Int. groups at the .01 level.

The differences in the mean Behavior (Row 3) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 7. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean scores of the L-Int. and ML-Int. groups at the .05 level. The mean score of the Loser group is lower than the mean scores of the L-Int. and ML-Int. groups at the .05 level.

The differences in the mean Physical Self (Column A) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 8. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean scores of the L-Int., M-Int., and ML-Int. groups at the .01 level.

The differences in the mean Moral-Ethical Self (Column B) scores between the groups are presented in Table 9. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean score of the L-Int. group at the .05 level.

The differences in the mean Personal Self (Column C) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 10. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean scores of the ML-Int., M-Int., and L-Int. groups at the .01 level. The mean score of the Loser group is lower than the mean scores of the -ML-Int., M-Int., and L-Int. groups at the .01 level.

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN SELF SATISFACTION (ROW 2) SCALE

SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

				Critical	values	
	At At	level .05 = level .01 =	= 10.4 = 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Losers	Mal.	ML-Int.	M-Int.	L-Int.
32.2	Losers		.2	16.0**	19.4**	19.4**
32.4	Mal.			15.8**	19.2**	19.2**
48.2	ML-Int.				3.4	3.4
51.6	M-Int.					0
51.6	L-Int.					

**P<.01

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN BEHAVIOR (ROW 3) SCALE

SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

		<u>,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,</u>			Critical	values	
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Mal.		Losers	M-Int.	L-Int.	ML-Int.
27.6	Mal.			.4	8.8	15.8*	16.6*
28.0	Loser	S			8.4	15.4*	16.2*
36.4	M-Int	•				7.0	7.8
43.4	L-Int	•					.8
44.2	ML-In	t.					

* P<.05

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PHYSICAL SELF (COLUMN A) SCALE

SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

					Critical	l values	
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Mal.		Losers	L-Int.	M-Int.	ML-Int.
						<u> </u>	
31.8	Mal.			8.0	18.6**	19.2**	19.4**
39.8	Losers				10.6	11.2	11.4
50.4	L-Int.					.6	- 8
51.0	M-Int.						.2
51.2	ML-Int	•					

** P<.01

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN MORAL-ETHICAL SELF (COLUMN B)

SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

					Critical	values	
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Mal.		Losers	M-Int.	ML-Int.	L-Int.
25.0	Mal.			.4	4.2	10.8	17.4**
25.4	Loser	S			3.8	10.4	17.0*
29.2	M-Int	•				6.6	13.2
35.8	ML-In	t.					6.6
42.4	L-Int	•					

* P<.05 ** P<.01

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PERSONAL SELF (COLUMN C)

SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

					Critical	values _	
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Mal.		Losers	ML-Int.	M-Int.	L-Int.
30.6	Mal			1.0	20.2**	21.2**	25.2**
31.6	Loser	S			19.2**	20.2**	24.2**
50.8	ML-In	t.				1.0	5.0
51.8	M-Int	•					4.0
55.8	L-Int	•					

** P<.01

-

The differences in the mean Family Self (Column D) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 11. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean scores of the L-Int., M-Int., and ML-Int. groups at the .01 level. The mean score of the Loser group is lower than the mean scores of the L-Int., M-Int., and ML-Int. groups at the .01 level.

The differences in the mean Social Self (Column E) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 12. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean scores of the M-Int. and L-Int. groups at the .05 level and lower than the mean score of the ML-Int. group at the .01 level.

The differences in the mean Defensive Positive (DP) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 13. The mean score of the Loser group is lower than the mean scores of the M-Int. and ML-Int. groups at the .05 level and lower than the mean score of the L-Int. group at the .01 level. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean score of the L-Int. group at the .05 level.

The differences in the mean General Maladjustment (GM) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 14. The mean scores of the M-Int., ML-Int., and L-Int. groups are lower than the mean score of the Maladaptive group at the .01 level.

The differences in the mean Psychosis (PSY) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 15. The mean score of the M-Int.group is lower than the mean score of the L-Int. group at the .05 level. The mean scores of the M-Int., Loser, and

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN FAMILY SELF (COLUMN D)

SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

	<u></u>				Critical	values	
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Mal.		Losers	L-Int.	M-Int.	ML-Int.
25.2	Mal.	******		3.0	20.6**	23.0**	23.8**
28.2	Loser	3			17.6**	20.0**	20.8**
45.8	L-Int					2.4	3.2
48.2	M-Int	•					.8
49.0	ML-In	t.					

** P <.01

•

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN SOCIAL SELF (COLUMN E)

SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

				м а т алан докула то туруу колур ал	Critical	values	
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Mal.		Losers	M-Int.	L-Int.	ML-Int.
30.4	Mal.			7.0	14.0*	15.0*	21.0**
37.4	Loser	S			6.6	8.0	14.0
44.0	M-Int	•				1.4	7.4
45.4	L-Int	•					6.0
51.4	ML-In	t.					

* P<.05 ** P<.01

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN DEFENSIVE POSITIVE (DP)

SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

						Critical values			
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6		12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2	
Means	Group	Loser	?s	Mal.		M-Int.	ML-Int.	L-Int.	
34.6	Losers	3	<u></u>	8.4		13.8*	16.2*	24.0**	
43.0	Mal.					5.4	7.8	15.6*	
48.4	M-Int.						2.4	10.2	
50.8	ML-Int	t.			·			7.8	
58.6	L-Int.								

* P <:05 ** P <:01

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN GENERAL MALADJUSTMENT (GM)

SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

						Critical	values	
		At le At le	evel evel	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	1	M-Int	•	ML-Int.	L-Int.	Losers	Mal.
56.6	M-Int.	4			.2	1.8	11.8	22.6**
56.8	ML-Int	t.				1.6	11.6	22.4**
58.4	L-Int.	•					10.0	20.8**
68.4	Losers	5		•				10.8
79.2	Mal.							

** P <.01

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PSYCHOSIS (PSY) SCALE

SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

							Critical	values	
	i i	At l At l	evel evel	.05 .01	8	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group		M-Int	•		Losers	ML-Int.	L-Int.	Mal.
48.8	M-Int.					1.6	2.4	13.6*	24.6**
50.4	Losers						.8	12.0	23.0**
51.2	ML-Int	•						11.2	22.2**
62.4	L-Int.								11.0
73.4	Mal.								

* P 05 ** P 01

-

ML-Int. groups are lower than the mean score of the Maladaptive group at the .01 level.

The differences in the mean Personality Disorder (PD) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 16. The mean score of the ML-Int. group is lower than the mean scores of the Maladaptive and Loser groups at the .05 level. The mean score of the L-Int. group is lower than the means of the Maladaptive and Loser groups at the .05 level.

The differences in the mean Neurosis (N) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 17. The mean score of the L-Int. group is lower than the mean scores of the Loser and Maladaptive groups at the .05 level. The mean score of the ML-Int. group is lower than the mean scores of the Loser and Maladaptive groups at the .05 level.

The differences in the mean Personality Integration (PI) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 18. The mean score of the Loser group is lower than the mean scores of the M-Int. and L-Int. groups at the .05 level and lower than the mean score of the ML-Int. group at the .01 level. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is lower than the mean score of the ML-Int. group at the .05 level.

The differences in the mean Number of Deviant Signs (NDS) Scale scores between the groups are presented in Table 19. The mean scores of the ML-Int., M-Int., and L-Int. groups are lower than the Maladaptive group at the .01 level. The mean score of the ML-Int. group is lower than the Loser group at the .01 level.

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PERSONALITY DISORDER (PD)

SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

					Critical	values	
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	ML-II	nt.	L-Int.	M-Int.	Mal.	Losers
57.8	ML-Int	t.		2.0	6.0	15.8*	16.4*
59.8	L-Int.	•			4.0	13.8*	14.4*
63.8	M-Int.	•				9.8	10.4
73.6	Mal.						.6
74.2	Losers	3					

* P<.05

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN NEUROSIS (N) SCALE

SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

				Critical	values	
	A A	t level .05 = t level .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	L-Int.	ML-Int.	M-Int.	Losers	Mal.
51.0	L-Int.		.4	3.4	14.4*	16.0*
51.4	ML-Int.			3.0	14.0*	15.6*
54.4	M-Int.				11.0	12.6
65.4	Losers					1.6
67.0	Mal.					

* P**<.**05

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN PERSONALITY INTEGRATION (PI)

SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

				Critical	values	
	At At	<pre>level .05 = level .01 =</pre>	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2
Means	Group	Losers	Mal.	M-Int.	L-Int.	ML-Int.
32.4	Losers		3.0	14.6*	16.0*	18.4**
35.4	Mal.			11.6	13.0	15.4*
47.0	M-Int.				1.4	3.8
48.4	L-Int.					2.4
50.8	ML-Int.					

* P<.05 ** P<.01

DIFFERENCES IN MEAN NUMBER OF DEVIANT SIGNS (NDS)

SCALE SCORES BETWEEN GROUPS

					Critical values			
		At level At level	.05 = .01 =	10.4 13.6	12.4 15.4	13.6 16.5	14.4 17.2	
Means	Group	ML-Ir	nt.	M-Int.	L-Int.	Losers	Mal.	
54.4	ML-In	t.		8.6	10.0	21.6**	27.4**	
63.0	M-Int	•			1.4	13.0	18.8**	
64.ų	L-Int	•				11.6	17.4**	
76.0	Loser	S					5.8	
81.8	Mal.							

** P <.01

Differences Between the Mean Scale Scores of the Maladaptive Group

The differences between the means of the scale scores of the Maladaptive Group are presented in Table 20. The mean score of the Identity (Row 1) Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Defensive Positive (DP), Self Criticism (Self Crit.), Total Variability (Tot. Var.), True/False Ratio (T/F), Neurosis (N), Total Conflict (Tot. Con.), Psychosis (PSY), Personality Disorder (PD), General Maladjustment (GM), and Number of Deviant Signs (NDS) Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Moral-Ethical Self (Column B)</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the DP Scale at the .05 level and lower than the mean scores of the Self Crit., Tot. Var., T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY., PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Family Self (Column D)</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the DP Scale at the .05 level and lower than the mean scores of the Self Crit., Tot. Var., T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY., PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Total Positive</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the Self Crit., Tot. Var., T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY, PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .Ol level.

The mean score of the <u>Behavior (Row 3)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Self Crit., Tot. Var., T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY, PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .Ol level.

								Cri	itical	Value	5										
	At le At le	vel .05 = vel .01 =	= 10.1 = 13.2	12.1 15.1	13.3 16.1	14.1 16.8	14.8 17.4	15.3 17.9	15.7 18.3	16.1 18.6	16.4 18.9	16.7 19.1	16.9 19.4	17.1 19.6	17.3 19.8	17.6 20.0	17.8 20.1	17.9 20.3	18.0 20.4	18.2 20.5	18.3 20.7
leans		Row 1 Ident	Col B M-E	Col D Fam	Total Pos	Row 3 Beh	Col E Social	Col C Per	Col A Phy	Row 2 Satis	PI	DP	Self Crit	Tot Var	T/F	N	Tot Con	PSY	PD	GM	NDS
22.6	Row 1 - Ident		2.4	2.6	4.6	5.0	7.8	8.0	9.2	9.8	12.8	20.4*	*24.4**	31.2**	41.0**	եր ՌՈԴ ՌՈԴ ՌՈԴ ՌՈԴ ՌՈԴ ՌՈԴ ՌՈԴ ՌՈԴ ՌՈԴ ՌՈԴ	45.0**	50.8**	51.0**	56.6**	59.8
25.0	Col B - ME			.2	2.2	2.6	5.4	5.6	5.8	7.4	10.4	18.0*	22.0**	28.8**	38.6**	42,0**	42,6**	48,4**	48.6**	54.2**	56.8
25.2	Col D - Fam				2.0	2.4	5.2	5.4	6.6	7.2	10.2	17.8*	21.8**	28.6**	38.4**	41.8**	42_4**	48.2**	48.4**	54.0**	56.6
27.2	Tot Positive					.4	3.2	3.4	4,6	5.2	8.2	15.8	19.8**	26.6**	36.4**	39.8**	40,4**	46.2**	46.4 * *	52.0**	54.6
27.6	Row 3 - Beh						2.8	3.0	4.2	4.8	7.8	15.4	19.4**	26.2**	36.0**	39.4**	40.0**	45.8**	46.4**	51.8**	54.2
30.4	Col E - Social							.2	1.4	2.0	5.0	13.6	16.6	23.4**	33.2**	36.6**	37.2**	43.0**	43.2**	48.8**	51.4
30.6	Col C - Per								1.2	1.8	4.8	13.4	16.4	23.2**	33.0**	36.4**	37.0**	42.8**	43.0**	48.6**	51.2
31.8	Col A - Phy									.6	3.6	11.2	15.2	22.0**	31.8**	35.2**	3\$.8**	41.6**	41.8**	47.4**	50.2
32.4	Row 2 - Satis										3.0	10.6	14.6	21.4**	31.2**	34.6**	3\$.2**	41.0**	41.2**	46.8**	49.4
35.4	PI											7.6	11.5	18,4*	28.2**	31.6**	32.2**	38.0**	38.2**	43.8**	46.44
43.0	DP												4.0	10.8	20.6**	24.0**	24.6**	30.4**	30.6**	36.2**	38.8
47.0	Self Criticism													6.8	16.6	20.0**	20.6**	26.4**	26.6**	32.2**	34.8*
53.8	Tot Var														9.8	13.2	13.8	19.6*	19.8*	25.4**	28.0
53.6	T/F															3.4	4.0	9.8	10.0	15.6	18.2
57.0	N																.6	6.4	6.6	12.2	14.8
67.6	Total Conflict																	5.8	6.0	11.6	14.2
73.4	PSY																		.2	5.8	8.4
73.6	PD																			5.6	8.2
79.2	GM																				2.6
81.8	NDS																				

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEAN SCALE SCORES OF MALADAPTIVE GROUP

** P <.01

• •

61

• •

TABLE 20

• •

The mean score of the <u>Social Self (Column E)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Var., T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY, PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Personal Self (Column C)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Var., T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY, PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Physical Self (Column A)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Var., T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY, PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Self Satisfaction (Row 2)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Var., T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY, PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .Ol level.

The mean score of the <u>Personality Integration (PI)</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the Tot. Var. Scale at the .05 level and lower than the mean scores of the T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY, PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Defensive Positive (DP)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the T/F, N, Tot. Con., PSY, PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Self Criticism</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the N, Tot. Con., PSY, PD, GM, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Total Variability</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the PSY and PD Scales at the .05 level and lower than the mean scores of the GM and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

Differences Between the Mean Scale Scores of the Loser Group

The differences between the means of the scale scores of the Loser Group are presented in Table 21. The mean score of the Moral-Ethical Self (Column B) Scale is lower than the mean scores of the T/F, PSY, Self Crit., Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Behavior (Row 3)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the T/F, PSY, Self Crit, Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .Ol level.

The mean score of the <u>Total Positive</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the T/F, PSY, Self Crit., Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Personal Self (Column C)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the T/F and PSY Scales at the .05 level and lower than the Self Crit., Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Self Satisfaction(Row 2)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the T/F, PSY, and Self Crit. Scales at the .05 level and lower than the Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Personality Integration (PI)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the T/F, PSY, and Self Crit. Scales at the .05 level and lower than the Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the Defensive Positive (DP) Scale

TABLE	21
-------	----

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEAN SCALE SCORES OF LOSER GROUP

.

-

j.

• •

ţ.

								Cri	tical	Value	6										
	At leve At leve	1 .05 = 1 .01 =	10.1 13.2	12.1 15.1	13.3 16.1	14 .1 16.8	14.8 17.4	15.3 17.9	15.7 18.3	16.1 18.6	16.4 18.9	16.7 19.1	16.9 19.4	17.1 19.6	17.3 19.8	17.6 20.0	17.8 20.1	17.9 20.3	18.0 20.4	18.2 20.5	18.3 20.7
Means		Col B	Row 3 Beh	Col D Fam	Total Pos	Col C Per	Row 2 Satis	PI	DP	Row 1 Ident	Col E Soc	Col A Phy	T/F	FSY	Self Crit	Tot Var	Tot Con	N	GM	PD	NDS
25.4	Col B - M/E		2.6	2.8	4.8	6.2	6.8	7.0	9.2	10.4	12.0	14.4	24.8**	25.0**	26.2**	35.0**	35.2**	40.0**	43.0**	48.8**	50.8*
28.0	Row 3 Beh			.2	2.2	3.6	4.2	4.4	6.6	7.8	9.4	11.8	22.2**	22.4**	23.6**	32.4**	32_6**	37.4**	40.4**	46.2**	48.0**
28.2	Col D - Fam				2.0	3.4	4.0	4.2	5.4	7.6	9.2	11.6	22.0**	22.2**	23.4**	32.2**	32_4**	37.2**	40,2**	46.0**	47.8**
30.2	Total Positive					1.4	2.0	2.2	4.4	5.6	7.2	9.6	20.0**	20.2**	21.4**	30.2**	30.4**	35.2**	38.2**	44.0**	45.8**
31.6	Col C - Ler						.6	.8	3.0	4.2	6.8	8.2	18.6*	18.8*	20.0**	28.8**	30.0**	33.8**	36.8**	42.6**	44.4**
32.2	Row 2 - Satis							.2	2.4	3.6	6.2	7.6	18.0*	18.2*	19.4*	28.2**	29.4**	33.2**	36.2**	42.0**	43.8**
32.4	PI								2.2	3.4	5.0	7.4	17.8*	18.0*	19.2*	28.0**	29.2**	33.0**	36.0**	41.8**	43.6**
34.6	DP									1.2	2.8	5.2	15.6	16.8	17.0	25.8**	27.0**	30.8**	33.8**	39.6**	41.4**
35.8	Row 1 - Ident										1.6	4.0	14.4	15.6	15.8	24.6**	24.8**	29.6**	32.6**	38.4**	40.2**
37.4	Col E - Social											2.4	12.8	14.0	14.2	23.0**	23.2**	28.0**	31.0**	36.8**	38.6**
39.8	Col A - Phy												10.4	10.6	11.8	20.6**	20.8**	25.6**	28.6**	34.4**	36.2**
50.2	T/F													.2	1.4	10.2	10.4	15.2	18.2*	24.0**	25.8**
50.4	PSY														1.2	10.0	10.2	15.0	18.0*	23.8**	25.6**
51.6	Self Criticism															8.8	9.0	13.8	16.8	22.6**	24.4**
60.4	Total Var																.2	5.0	8.0	13.8	15.6
60.6	Total Conflict																	4.8	7.8	13.6	15.4
65.4	N																		3.0	8.8	10.6
68.4	GM																			5.8	7.6
74.2	PD																				1.8
76.0	NDS	_	_																		

(i) a second second second second as the method gravity of the second s second se second s second s second se

- ----

** P <.01

مستانه، ومحموليات ومريس على بين ويراسيان بين بين ان والرجوات من ويود الاخرار من المريب المريب المريب المريب ال المستانة المحموليات ومريبا إلى المريب ويراسيان بين بين الرواب من الي وياد الاخرار من المريب المريب المريب المريب
is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .01 level

The mean score of the <u>Identity (Row 1)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Social Self (Column E)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Physical Self (Column A)</u> is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Var., Tot. Con., N, GM, PD, and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>True-False Ratio (T/F)</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the GM Scale at the .05 level and lower than the PD and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Psychosis (PSY)</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the GM Scale at the .05 level and lower than the PD and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Self Criticism</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the PD and NDS Scales at the .01 level.

Differences Between the Mean Scale Scores of the M-Integrator Group

The differences between the means of the scale scores of the M-Integrator Group are presented in Table 22. The mean score of the <u>Moral-Ethical Self (Column B)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Identity (Row 1), Total Positive, and Social Self (Column E) Scales at the .05 level and lower than the

TABLE 22

· ·

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEAN SCALE SCORES OF M-INTEGRATOR GROUP

								Cri	itical	Value	8										
	At At At A	level .05 Level .01	≠1 0.1 =13.2	12.1 15.1	13.3 16.1	14.1 16.8	14.8 17.4	15.3 17.9	15.7 18.3	16.1 18.6	16.4 18.9	16.7 19.1	16.9 19.4	17.1 19.6	17.3 19.8	17.6 20.0	17.8 20.1	17.9 20.3	18.0 20.4	18.2 20.5	18.3 20.7
Меаль		Col B M/E	Row 3 Beh	Row l Ident	Total Pos	Col E Social	PI	Col D Fam	DP	PSY	Col A Phy	Row 2 Satis	Col C Per	Self Crit	N	Tot Con	Tot Var	GM	T/F	NDS	PD
29.2	Col B - M/E		7.2	12.8*	14.0*	14.8*	17.8**	19.0**	19.2*	*19.6*	*21.8*	*22.4*	*22.5**	23.8**	* 25.2**	26.2**	27,2**	27_4**	27.8**	33.8**	34.6**
36.4	Row 3 - Beh			5.6	6.8	7.6	10.6	11.8	12.0	12.4	14.6	15.2	15.4	16.6	18.0*	19.0*	20.0*	20.2*	20.6**	26.6**	27.4**
42.0	Row 1 - Ident				1.2	2.0	5.0	6.2	6.4	6.8	9.0	9.6	9.8	11.0	12.4	13.4	14.4	14.6	15.0	21.0**	21.8**
43.2	Total Pos					.8	3.8	5.0	5.2	5.6	7.8	8.4	8.6	9.8	11.2	12.2	13.2	13,4	13.8	19.8*	20.6*
44.0	Col E - Social						3.0	4.2	4.4	4.8	7.0	7.6	7.8	9.0	10.4	11.4	12.4	12.6	13.0	19.0*	19.8*
47.0	PI							1.2	1.4	1.8	4.0	4.6	4.8	6.0	7.4	8.4	9.4	9.6	10.0	16.0	16.8
48.2	Col D - Fam								.2	.6	2.8	3.4	3.6	4.8	6.2	7.2	8.2	8.4	8.8	14.8	15.6
48.4	DP									.4	2.6	3.2	3.4	4.6	6.0	7.0	8.0	8.2	8.6	14.6	15.4
48.8	PSY										2.2	2.8	3.0	4.2	5.6	6.6	7.6	7.8	8.2	14.2	15.0
\$1.0	Col A - Phy											.6	.8	2.0	3.4	4.4	5.4	5.6	6.0	12.0	12.8
51.6	Row 2 - Satis												.2	1.4	2.8	3.8	4.8	5.0	5.4	11.4	12.2
51.8	Col C - Per													1.2	2.6	3.6	4.6	4.8	5,2	11.2	12.0
53.0	Self Criticis	n													1.4	2.4	3.4	3.6	4.0	10.0	10.8
54.4	N															1.0	2.0	2.2	2.6	8.6	9.4
55.4	Total Conflic	t															1.0	1.2	1.6	7.6	8.4
56.4	Total Var																	.2	.6	6.6	7.4
56.6	GM																		.4	6.4	7.2
57.0	T∕F																			6.0	6.8
63.0	NDS																				.8
63.8	PD																				

* P <.05 ** P <.01

• •

-

.

PI, Family Self (Column D), DP, PSY, Physical Self (Column A), Self Satisfaction (Row 2), Personal Self (Column C), Self Crit., N, Tot. Con., Tot. Var., GM, T/F, NDS, and PD Scales at the .Ol level.

The mean score of the <u>Behavior (Row 3)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the N, Tot. Con., Tot. Var., and GM Scales at the .05 level and lower than the T/F, NDS, and PD Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Identity (Row 1)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the NDS and PD Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the Total Positive Scale is lower than the mean scores of the NDS and PD Scales at the .05 level.

The mean score of the Social Self (Column E) Scale is lower than the mean scores of the NDS and PD Scales at the .05 level.

Differences Between the Mean Scale Scores of the L-Integrator Group

The differences between the means of the scale scores of the L-Integrator Group are presented in Table 23. The mean score of the <u>Moral-Ethical Self (Column B)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Con., and PSY Scales at the .05 level and lower than the NDS and T/F Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Behavior (Row 3)</u> Scale is lower than the mean scores of the Tot. Con. and PSY Scales at the .05 level and lower than the NDS and T/F Scales at the .01 level.

The mean score of the Social Self (Column E) Scale is

								Cr	itical	Value	25										
	At 1 At 1	evel .05 = evel .01 =	= 10.1 = 13.2	12.1 15.1	13.3 16.1	14.1 16.8	14.8 17.4	15.3 17.9	15.7 18.3	16.1 18.6	16.4 18.9	16.7 19.1	16.9 19.4	17.1 19.6	17.3 19.8	17.6 20.0	17.8 20.1	17.9 20.3	18.0 20.4	18.2 20.5	18.3 20.7
leans		Col B M/E	Row 3 Beh	Col E Social	Col D Fam	Row l Ident	Self Crit	Total Pos	PI	Tot Var	Col A Phy	N	Row 2 Satis	Col C Per	GM	DP	PD	Tot Con	PSY	NDS	T/F
42.4	Col B - M/E		1.0	3.0	3.4	3.6	4.4	4.8	6.0	7.8	8.0	8.6	9.2	13.4	16.0	16.2	17.4	19.8*	20.0*	22.0**	+ 27.6+
43.4	Row 3 - Beh			2.0	2.4	2.6	3.4	3.8	5.0	6.8	7.0	7.6	8.2	12.4	15.0	15.2	16.4	18.8*	19.0*	21.0**	26.6*
45.4	Col E - Socia	L			.4	.6	1.4	1.8	3.0	4.8	5.0	5.6	6.2	10.4	13.0	13.2	14.4	16.8	17.0	19.0*	24.6*
45.8	Col D - Fam					.2	1.0	1.4	2.6	4.4	4.6	5.2	5.8	10.0	12.6	12.8	14.0	16.4	16.6	18.6*	24.2*
46.0	Row 1 - Ident						.8	.8	2.4	4.2	4.4	5.0	5.6	9.8	12.4	12.6	13.8	16.2	16.4	18.4*	24.0*
46.8	Self Criticis	n							1.6	3.4	3.6	4.2	4.8	9.0	11.6	11.8	13.0	15.4	15.6	17.6	23.2*
46.8	Total Positiv	2							1.6	3.4	3.6	4.2	4.8	9.0	11.6	11.8	13.0	15.4	15.6	17.6	23.2*
48.4	PI									1.8	2.0	2.6	3.2	7.4	10.0	10.2	11.4	13.8	14.0	16.0	20.6*
50.2	Total Var										.2	.8	1.4	5.6	8.2	8.4	9.6	12.0	12.2	14.2	18.8*
50.9	Col A - Phy											.6	1.2	5.4	8.0	8.2	9.4	11.8	12.0	14.0	18.6*
51.0	N												.6	4.8	7.4	7.6	8.8	11.2	11.4	13.4	18.0
51.6	Row 2 - Satis													4.2	6.8	7.0	8.2	10.6	10.8	12.8	17.4
55.8	Col C - Per														2.6	2.8	4.0	6.4	6.6	8.6	13.2
58.4	GM															.2	1.4	3.8	4.0	6.0	10.6
58.6	DP																1.2	3.6	3.8	5.8	10.4
59.8	PD																	2.4	2.6	4.6	9.2
62.2	Total Conflic	:																	.2	2.2	6.8
52.4	PSY																			2.0	6.6
54.4	NDS																				5.6
70.0	T/F																				

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEAN SCALE SCORES OF L-INTEGRATOR GROUP

TABLE 23

.

•

* P <.05 ** P <.01

A DAMAGE AND A DAMA AND A DAMAGE AND A

.

•

.

89

•

-

والمعار ستوري والمعادية المراجب المراجب المراجب

lower than the mean score of the NDS Scale at the .05 level and lower than the T/F Scale at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Family Self (Column D)</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the NDS Scale at the .05 level and lower than the T/F Scale at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Identity (Row 1)</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the NDS Scale at the .05 level and lower than the T/F Scale at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Self Criticism</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the T/F Scale at the .01 level.

The mean score of the Total Positive Scale is lower than the mean score of the T/F Scale at the .01 level.

The mean score of the <u>Personality Integration (PI)</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the T/F Scale at the .05 level.

The mean score of the <u>Total Variability</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the T/F Scale at the .05 level.

The mean score of the <u>Physical Self (Column A)</u> Scale is lower than the mean score of the T/F Scale at the .05 level.

Self Concept Patterns of Sub-Groups

The self concept pattern of the Maladaptive group is presented in Figure 2 and that of the Loser group is presented in Figure 3. The self concept patterns of the M-Integrator, L-Integrator and ML-Integrator groups are presented in Figures 4, 5 and 6 respectively. For comparison of self concept patterns among the groups see Figure 7.

NAME		·	-							-				SCHOOL GRADE SEX	н г	AGE	DATE												TOTAL TI	ME	
 			CONE	167	· _															CTOIR			1						·	·	
Т.	SELF CRITI-	TE			o T		ROW	PUSI	IVE	C		N		PERCENTILE	I	COL	POW					- - -			EMI			LES		NDS	т
SCORE	¢15M		NET	TOTAL	ĉ	1	2	з	A	в	с	D	Е	SCORES	Ĭ	TOT.	TOT.	D	5	4	3	2	1	DP	GM	PSY	PD	N	ΡI		SCORE
=		3.00	_			Î .																			Ţ		Ŧ	¥			F]
=		2.75	80 -									90 -								•• -	_	55 -	60 — •					· 1		80 -	E
-90		-2.50	70-i		450	150		-150	90		% –							-200	•3 -		75 -		-:	•	50	- 80 -		30	-25_	75	- 90 -
[=	50	2.25~	60 -	-70 -						90	•			- 99.99 -					60	55 -			55 -	35	55 -		30-	35 -	1	70 -	Ē
			:			•									110 -	70	45 -	:	55 -	:	40 -	45 ÷	:	» .	60 -	75 -	35 -	40		60	Ē]
80-		2 (0			-430-	<u> </u>	140	145 -			85 -		•	- 99.9 -	105 -	-65	40 -	190 -	50-1	50 ~		;	50 -			70 -	40				-80-
	<u></u>	1.90	50 ÷	55 ·	•			:			•	-			100-	60 -		185 -	43	43	50 -	40 -	:	85	P o 5	65	:	50~		P ⁰	Ē I
=		1.70	30-		· ·	:	135 -	140-					85 -	~ 99 ~	90 -	55 -	35 -	175 ~~	:	•	-45-	:	-45	:			45	55 -	-20-	40 -	E
70 -	Ŀ	1.60	•	50	410 -	145-		i			80 -	-85-	•		85 - - 80 -	50			40-	- 40	40 -	35 -	40 -	80 -	75	60 _	٩. ۲			35	E-70-
=	•	1.50	20 -	, i	400		130	135 -	85-	85	:	•		05	75		•	165 -	35 -		35 ÷	:		75 -	60	:	55-	~		30 -	FI
	45	1,40 ~~)5 	1:	-390	140-	-125	130	-:	 :	75 -		80 -	- 35 -	-70-	45 -	-30-	155 -		35 -		30	-35-		85 -	- 55 —	60 -	- 9 -	1	25 20	E
	:	10-	10	44	380 ~	:	120 -		80-	80 -		_80		- 90 -	65	40 -		150 -	:	:		•		<i>1</i> 0	90 -				15-	15	F
=	:	20 -	5-	F	•	135-	115	125 -	:		•		75 -	- 80 ~	60	35		140 -	25 -	30 -	25	25	:	65 -		:	:	75			E
	-40	1.10 -			370 -		110 -	120		75 -	70	75	<u> </u>	70	55 -			135		· ·			25		-95-	50	- 70	80 ⁸	i	<u> </u>	E
	;				350 -	130	105 -		:	:		:	70 -	- 60 -	50 -	30 -		125 -	20 -	25 -	고한	20	:	55	:	:	25	1	i	5 -	E _
	"]	1.60 -	:	-10		125	:	:	•	70 -		70	:	- 40 -	:			-120	:	:	:	•	20 -		100 -	45 -	:	85 ;	19		
	: 	90	-10 -				100 -	-110	70	<u> :</u>		:	63		45 -			-110-	15	•				- 52		·	80 -	<u> </u>	i		F
-	30-	1	-15		1	120 -	95 -				60 -	63 .		- 20	40 -			105 -		20 .	:		:	45 -	105 -		45	. :	11	•	E
40 -	:			:	B10 -		90	105	:				60 -		15			95 -				10-	 10 -	40 -		•• •	ئە 90		1		<u>-40</u> -
	<u> </u>	İ	·20 -	- 05	00	115	65-	100 -	60-	60 -	- 55	60		- 10 -		20 -	•	90	_ 5 -	13 -	;			:	110~	:	:		6-		Ē
1 3	25 -	.70	-25	•	200 -	110-	∧ ≟] :	:	:	58 -	- 5 -	30 :	:		% -	-		•	5				•	95 -	¹⁰⁰ -		•-	Εļ
-30				- = =	280	-105-	-7 <u>a</u> -	95 – 190 –	55	55		55-	1		25 -	15 -	. 10 -	70 -	—		<u> </u>	—		30 -		•		105 -			_ 30 _
] =	1.1.1				200-	100	63 -	85 -	:	1	45 7	\	50 -		- 20 -		•	65		:		·	:	25 -	- 115 ~		100				Εl
=		.50 -	. 35.	:	240		60 -			-10~-		:	45		15 -	_10		60		-°-		0		20 -	:	30 -		110 -			
-20	<u> </u>	.40	_ 40	10 -	220	80 -	55 -	25		-45-		45				;		50 -		•							105 -	;			-20-
). E	•	.30 _	:	:	200 -	85 -	50-	70		:	35 -	40-	=	- 0.1 -	s	s ∸ •	:	40					·		120		110	:			Ēl
	· ·	.20 -	50	5 -	190	80	45 -	65		40	30		35 -			<u> </u>		-30								25 -		115 -			<u> </u>
-10-	ŀ				180	75	40 -	60-	40-	L.,:	25 -	-5-		- 0.01 -			_ <u>.</u>		L				°-		•		:	·	0-		E
	10-	.10	-63	•	160 -	60	35 -	- 55	35-	1 :	20:	30.	30			1	-							5 -	125 -						ē "]
-				•	"~~~]	30 -	1		30 -								l											1		F 1
	A	<u> </u>				L	1			1	1	L	L		1	L		t						!		. 1		-			

• •

• •

۰ ،

Figure 2. Self Concept Pattern of Maladaptive Group.

70

.

• •

NAME									_					SCHOOL GRADE SEX		AGE	DATE						_						TOTAL T	Mz	
		CONFLICT T POSITIVE SCORES													'nŕ																
	SELF CONFLICT T POSITIVE SCORES CANTI- T/F 0 ROW COLU												<u></u>						STRIB	UTION				FM	PIRICA		LES		- 1		
т	SELF		NET TOTAL A 1 2 3 A B C										PERCENTILE	7						<u> </u>	y								NDS	т	
SCORE	CISH	1/1-	NET	TOTAL	Ā		ROW	-				<u> </u>		SCORES	Ŷ	COL. TOT.	ROW TOT.	D	5	4	3	2	1	qq	GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	1105	SCORE
					<u> </u>		~	3	A	- 12	<u> </u>		E		<u> </u>											\vdash		~			
{ =		3.00																							¥		+	*			Ξ
] =	1	2.75 _	∞-									90 -								60		55 -	••						· ·	60 -	- 1
	1	-z.50		80 <u>-</u>		- 150-		- 150 -			90							-200-	65 -	•	75 -			<u> </u>	50	-80-			_25_	75	90
=			•	-	450 -									- 99.99 -						:	70 -	50-	:	95 -		:	30 -	10 -		70	Ξ
	50-		60 -	70 -	440													-195		55 -	-05		55 .		55	•		35 -		-65-	
=	1		:		1.	•		1			•				110 -	70	45 -		55	-		45 -		» -	60	75 -	35 :	40	i	60	-
- 00-		z 00 —	:	<u>ः</u>	430_			145 -			85 -	•	<u> </u>	- 99.9 -		-63	:	190 -	:	50 -		:	50 -			70 -	-40-		•	55 -	
		1 90 -	50	55 -		•	140 ÷	1 :	•		·		•		105	60	40 -	185 -	50-	:	55	:		85 ÷	⁶⁵ :		:	45 -	•	50 -	= 1
L =		1.80	_40_	:	420-						·		•		95 -		:	-100-	45 -	45 -	_45			•	70 -	85		_ 50	_20_	1 5 -	=
		1.70	30 -	•	<u> </u>	:	135 -		•	•			a5 -	- 99 -	90 -	55 -	35 -	175 -		•	:			:	:	:	A I	55 -		0 -	=
20 =		1.60		50 -	410	145-	:				80 -	•	•		85			170	40 -		40 -	35	40 -	⁶⁰ -	75 -	60 <u>-</u>	R			55 -	=
	<u> </u>	1.55	20 -		400		130 -	135			:		•			:		165 -	:		:	•		:	80		T. 3	60		30 -	= 10
= =	1.	1.40	:	45 -	· ·						:	•	:	- 95 -		45		160 -	35	$-\dot{-}i$	35 ÷	:	:	75 -	A :			\ s		25	=
-	45		15 7	:	j ³⁹⁰ .	140-	125	130 -			75	٠	80 -		70-		-30	155 -	:	25	30 :	-30	35	20	83 -	55 -	60 -			20 -	
	1 :	1.30 -	10	49-	380	:	120 -	: :	80	80 -		80 —		- 90 -		40 -	بنط	150		:		·	:		90			-1-	15-	15	-
-60	t ÷	1.20	:	1:	· ·	•		125 -	•			:	75	- 80 ~	60 ÷	:	-25	-145					-30-	65			-65-	7			
1 3	•	-	5 ÷	, <u> </u> :	370 -	135-	115	1 :	:	75	70		•		55	35 -		135	<i>"</i> :		* :	25 -	:		:	L.				:	Ξ Ι
		1.10 -		-ŀ	360 -		110	120 -	75-		:	75	:	70				130		•	•		25 -	60 -	95	\mathbf{V}	-70-1				
	•			F	350 -	130-	105				:		70 -	- 60 -	50 -	30-	20	125 -	20	25	20 ÷	20	:		:	V:		- 1		5-	Ξ
- 60 -	35-	1.00		- 30-	· ·			-115		70	-65	70	•	50				-120	•	•			20 -		100 -	45 -		63 -	10		- 50
=	:	-	-10	3	340	125	100] :	70-		•	:	:	- 40 -	45 -	:		115 -		:	15 -		:				ao -		ŀ		-
<u> </u>	1 :	90		25 -	330 -			-110-					-65-			25 -		-110		•		- 15	15 -	~			:		H		
=	30-	1	-15	:		120-	95	1 :			60 -	65 -	•	20	40 -	:	·	105 -	:	20 -	:		:	4	105 -		85 :	:			=
40_		- 80 -				A	-90-	105-	A :									95			10 -	:	:	-			90 ±	95-4	H	•	-40-
=	<u> </u>		. :	20-	- °°	115	- 85 -		Æ	60	:		60 -	- 10 -	35÷	20 -	:	90 -	:	15		10 -	10 -		110	•	· ·	1	ΠΠ		=
<u> </u>	25-		.20-	•	~ -/	\vdash			-			- 00	\vdash	<u> </u>				85	5					_ k _;	•	—'			- P-		
=	1 :	.70	-25		17.	110	- ۴			! :			55 -	- 5 -	30 -	:	'	80 - 75 -	•	· ·	•		· · 1		•	35	95 -			1	-
-30-	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	200-	-105÷	- 75			55		1-	:			15 -							·	- 30			:	1		<u> </u>	
=	20-	- 60	:	<u>.</u>	260 -	1 :		•			45 -		50 -			:		63 -			•	•		25 -	۲		100-	1			Ξ Ι
	<u> </u>	-		•	-250-	100 -	- 65 T	85 -		- 50 -	:	50		- 1 -	20	· ·				_ s -	•			i	115-						
1 Ξ	15-		:] :	230	95 🕂	60 -	80 -	50-		40 ÷	:	45 -		15 -	- 10 -	•	55 -					•	20 -		30 -	105	110-	•	ł	E
-20-	· ·	.40 -	-40.	10 -	-220-		55 -			-45-		45 -	:		-10	l:		50						:	·	·	;	;			-20-
1 3	1.	.30		:	210	90	50	75 -			35 -		40 ÷	- 0.1 -		s -	•	40 -						15 :		:		•			-
<u>i</u>	1	ļ	50	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	Ļ		45-	40-		:	<u> </u>			•	<u> </u>	-30		<u> </u>				10 -	120	· ·					
ł E	· ·	.20 -		5-	100-	75-	45	65			30 -		35 ÷	- 001 -	•-	:	·			ÍÍ		ĺ	. 1	:	•	25 -		115		ļ	=
-+o	∔	 	<u> :</u>	<u> </u>	-170-	- 70-	40 -	60 -	40-	-15-	25 -					<u> </u>			L							L!	·				ا مو
1 -]	.10	-60	1.	160 -	65-	35	55 -	35-4		. :	30-	30 -											5	125 -					ļ	= ``
1 3	1			•	150 -	1	30-			30-													ļ							ł	=
L			L				L								1																

• ,

• ·

Figure 3. Self Concept Pattern of Loser Group.

71

. .

NAME														SCHOOL GRADE SE		AGE	DATE	:											TOTAL TI	ME	
			_	_											٦Ľ																
-	SELF	SELF CONFLICT T POSITIVE SCORES												VAI	RIABIL	ITY		DI	STRIB	UTION	4			EMI	RICA	L SCA	LES			-	
SCORE	CRITI-	T/F	NET	TOTIL	T		ROW			C		N		SCORES	ş	COL	ROW	D	5	4	3	2	1	DP	GМ	PSY	PD	N	PI	NDS	SCORE
					L.	1	2	3	A	в	- C	D	E		<u> </u>													·			
] =		3 00 - 1]]	ļ		ļ															¥		+	+			Ξ
1 =	1 '	2.75 -	••-	80 -				1	1		.	90-			1	{			65 _	° -	75 -	55 -	°° -	•						₽0 -	Ξ (
-90		-2.50	-70-		450			- 150	90				90					-200			70					-80	10 -	30 -	-25	-75	- 90-
{ =	50	2.25-	60 -	70 -	۰ ۱		1			96	·			33.33				:	60 -	55 .			55 .	:	55÷	:		35	j	70 -	=]
=			:			•	150			1	•				110 -	70 -	45 -	:	55	:		45 -	:	8	60	75 -	35-1	40 -	•	-03	=
80 -	1	2.00 -	:	60	430_			145 -			85 -			- 99.9	-	-65	<u>:</u>	190 -		50-		· ·	50 -			70 -	_40		· · · ·		-80-
=	<u></u>	1.90	50	55 -	L_ •	•	140 -	1 :	•		:		•		105 -	÷۵.	40 -	185 -	50	:	55	40:	:	85 -	65	63	:	45 -	-	50 -	Ξ
<u> </u>	1	1.60	40-	:	420			\vdash	====			<u> </u>			95 -	<u> </u>	<u></u>	180-	45 -	45	-45	:	-45		70 -		45	50 -	-20-	45 -	
1 3	<u>i</u> .		30					140	1			•	85 -	55	85 -	55 -	35 -	175 -					40	80 -	75 -	60 -	50 -	55	1	35 -	Ξ
70	<u> </u> -		20-				130 -			85 -		- 85-				- 50				40 -	:				80 -			60 -		30 -	70
3] .	1.40	:	45 -		:				1 :		•	:	- 95	- 75 -	45 -		160 -	35 -	—i	35 +	:	:	75 -	:	:		63 -		25	E
	45 -		15 -		F "~-	140-	-125	130 -		•	75 -		80 -	80	70		-30	155	30:	35 -	30 -	-30		70 -	85 -	55	Å ° −	70		20 -	=
60-	1.:	1.30	10 -	40 -	380	•	120 -		5 0	80 -		80 -	:		P 2 -	40 -	- 25-	150		:	:	:			90 -		T		15-	13 -	=
1 3	1:	1.20 -	s -		·	135-	115	125 -	:	:	•	:	75 -	- 80	- • -	1 35		140 -	23	30 -	25 +	25 -	:	65				"	1	10-	Ξ [
<u> </u>		1.10		- 33 -	370 -		110	120	75-	75	70			70		┼──;		135	<u> </u> :		:	:	25 -		À	50	70	80 -			
1 3	1 :				150 -	130 -				:			70 -	- 60	- 1 :	1.0		125 -	20-	. ·	20 -					. /:				5 -	-
50	35-	1.00	.,	- 30 -	N		A	+-115	1	70 -	-	- 96			 F			-120		• •	:	<u> </u>	20 -	-7-	100 -	X	<u></u>	85 -			- 50-
	1 :		-10	:	1 ⁰ -		100	1	7.0	•	1:		.:	- 40		· ·	•	115 -	15	:	15 -	:	:	50 -	•		60 ÷	90	•	•	Ξ]
	30-	Γ.,		25 -	- 36		95	X i	1		•					25 -		105 -	:	20-	:	15 -	15 -	:		:	as :	:		•	-
40	Ŀ		• • •		320	120			65-	65	• • • -	65 -	<u> </u>	20		<u> </u>	15 -	100 -	10 -		10 -	:		45	105	40 -	:	95 -	•		-40
				20	310-	115			\vdash			—	60 -	10		20 -	•	95 -	1 :		:	10-	10 -	40 -	::	:	»°÷	-		Ē	Ξ Ι
	25 -	+	·20-	· ·	-300			100 -	60-	1.7	- 55	60			+•		<u> </u>	F 85	3	<u> </u>	si			-35		·	:				
	1 :	.70 -	-25 -		290 -	110	80-		:	L.			55	- 5			:	% -	1		·		•	:	•	35 —	95 -		4	1	Ξ
30	10-		:		270 -	-105-	-70-	90 -	55-					······································			10 -	70					5	30 -		•		105			- 30-
	:	-			260	100	65 -	85 -] :		45 -	50-		- 1			j ·	65 -				•	:	25	115		100 -				Ξ
=	:	.50 ~-	-35-		240 -	95 -	60 -	:		:	:	:	45 -			_ <u> </u>		60				0		20 -	:	30 -	:	110.			=
20	<u>"-</u>	.40 -	- 40	10 -	230 -		55 -		50-	45	40 -	45 -			b		<u></u>	50 -		·						•	105 -				= 20
	1.	.30 =	:	:	210 -	90 85	50-	75 -	1 3	1 :	35 -	40	40 -	- 0.1	- ! <u>.</u>	5-	•	45 -	•	'	1			15 -	•	:		•			= ~
<u> </u>	1	.20	50	·	190-	80-	45 -	65 -	45-	+••÷	30		:		┼╌╂╴	<u> </u> :	· ·	- 30	<u> </u>					10				•			
	1.	-		⁵	180	75 -	40-		:	:		35	35 -	- 0.01	╡╏╴	1 :	:]					° –		•	· ~]	•	""- '	<u> </u>		Ξ
1 0	<u></u>	10-	-60	<u> </u>	170-	70- 65-	+		35	-33 -			30 -		┼┈╇╌	⊢ ⊶	<u> </u>	 	-0					5	125						- 10
	1 "-			.	150 -	60	1] "-]	20-	20-	30 -				1															=
	<u> </u>							<u> </u>										Ĺ	Í			_							.		-

• •

• •

.

Figure 4. Self Concept Pattern of M-Integrator Group.

72

.

.

NAME														SCHOOL GRADE	SEX		AGE	DATE												TOTAL T	INE	
L																	1	<u> </u>														
т	SELF		CONFI	LICT	ŏ			POSI	TIVE	SCORE	<u>s</u>			PERCENTIL	=		RIABIL	ITY			STRIB					EM		L SCA	LES			_т
SCORE	CRITI-	1/1-	NET	TOTAL	Å	1	2	3	A	B	C		E	SCORES		Ŷ,	COL. TOT.	ROW TOT.	D	5	4	з	2	1	DP	GМ	PSY	PD	N	PI	NUS	SCORE
	5	3.00																								Ţ		Ţ	Ţ			E
		2.75	80									-00									80 <u>-</u>		55 ~	60 -							30 -	ΕI
-90-	_	-2.50-	70	- 00	450 -	-150-		-150			90		90						-200	65 - ·		75 -				- 50			30 -	-25	-75	<u>-90-</u>
3	- - 	2.25 -	60-	~- ~	•					90 <u>-</u>	•			- 99.99	_					60 ÷	55 -	70	50 -	55 -	⁹⁵ -	55 -	:	30-	35 -	·	70 -	E
	-~				-440	•	-150-									110 -	70 -	45 -	-195	55	:	-65-	45 ~	;	- so -	60	75 -	35 -	40 -		60	=
- 80 -	1	2 00 -		⁶⁰ .	430			145 -			85 -	•	•	- 99.9			-65		190 -		50 -	60 -		50 -	:		70 -	40-			55 -	E-80-
=	<u> </u>	1.90	50-	55 -			140 -		•		:					105 -	60 -	40 -	185 ~	50	:	55 50	40 -	:	as -	65 -	65	:	45 -	٠	50 ~	E
]	1.80	10-1		420 -		135 -		F=-			•		- 99		95			-180	•3	43 <u>-</u>	-45-		-45-		70 -		45		-20-	45 -	
70	·	1.60		50 -	410 -	145-	:				80	- 45 -				85		3.9	1/3	40-		40 -	35 -	40 -	80 -	75	60 <u>-</u>	50 -	55 -		35 ~	E_
1 3	j.	160	20	:	400	:	130 -	135 -	85-	83 — •		•	:		-	75		•	165 -	15 1		35		:	75 -	± 08		55 -	60 -		30 -	E
	45	1640	-15-7	45 -	-390	140	-125-	130 -	· · ·	\vdash	• 75	•		- 95		-70-	45 -	30	160 -								<u>.</u> :		- 65 -		25 -	<u>E</u>
	1:	1.30	10	40-	380 —	•	120 -		80-	80 -		80 -		- 90	-	65 -	40 -	<u> </u>	150	30 -		30		:	70 -	20 -			70 -	15-	15	E I
- 60 -		1.20 -		Ĩ	· ·			125	:			:	75 -	- 80	-	60	:	25	145	25 -	30 -	25 -		30	• 00 -	•••		-65	75 -			E-60-
	40-			35 -	370		115 -		:	75 -	20	:	·	70		55 -	- 35	•	135 -	:			25 ~	•	:	-95-	50 -	- 70-	80-		:	E
=						130	005					:	70	- 60	~	50	10	20	125 ~	20-		20 -		23 -		:	:	. :			5 -	E I
50	35	1.00	.,,,	- 30		125		-115		70 -	-65	70 -							-120	:				20 -		100	45 -	75 -	85	•Jo-		50 -
<u> </u>			-10 -	:	3401-	•••	100 -		70					- 40 		49	<u> </u>		-110	·15		15 -			50 -			80 ÷	<u></u>	·	•	Ε
	30-	-	-15	25 -	330 -	120-	95 -			••••	60	۰ 65 –	:			40	25 -	•	105 -	:	20 -		15	15	45	105 -		85	:	•	-	E
40	1	80		•	320 -		- 90 -	-105	65-	<u>•3 -</u>				20			<u>}</u>	15 -	100	<u>י</u> 0-		10 -		;]	40	<u> </u>	40	90 -	95	· · ·		40-
-	\div	+ +	-zo	20 -	310 -	"" ÷	85 -	100 -	60-	60	55	60 -	- <u>**</u>	- 10		3.	20 -		<u> </u>	<u>, :</u>	15 -		10	10 -		110 -		:	1	5-		E I
1 3	25	.70 -		•	290 -	110 -	80 -		:	:	:	:	55 -	- 5	-	38-	:	•	80 -	•		<u> </u>	5-	:				95 -	100 -		0-	E
-30-	<u></u>	\vdash		15 -	280	-105	- 75	95 -		55 -	50 ~	55 -				2	15 -	-	70						30 -							E-30-
	1°-	<u> </u>	;		260	100	65 -	55 -] ::] :	45 -	50-	50-	L ,				•	65 -						25 -			100 -		-		ΕI
:	:	.50	-35-2	-	240 -	95	60 -			50	:	:	45 -				- م ا		60 ~		- • -	•			20 -		30 -	:	110			E1
-20] <u>"</u> :	.40 -	40-	10 -	230 -		55	80	50-	-43	40	45 -				10	<u> </u>	_ <u>.</u> -	50 -		•					:	•	105 -	;			E_20
	- I	.30			200 -	45 -	50~	70 -			35	40	40 -	- 0.1			5 -		40 -					•	15	120	:	110	:			E
	<u>†</u>	20 -		5-	190 -	80-	45	65		40-	30 -						<u> </u>	<u> </u>	30			┣──			10 -		25		115			<u> </u>
	<u> </u> .	<u> </u>	:		180	/ 75 - - 70 -	40	e0	40-		25	35 ÷		- 0.01								[]		°-				:	•	0-		E , I
	10-	.10 -	-60	•	160 -	60-	35 -	55 -	35	1	20	30-	30 -												5	125 -						E
-	1				150	1	30	{		- oc		l				:		l	ł													FI
L	4		L		J	L	L	1	L	1			L				L .	L			L	1					1	1				i

.

•

Figure 5. Self Concept Pattern of L-Integrator Group.

HANE														SCHOOL GRADE SEX	·	AGE	DATE										·····		TOTAL T	ME	
]															Ċг	5												1			
	· · · ·		cout												<u> </u>	11							—								
Т	SELF				ŏ			POS	TIVE	SCORE				PERCENTILE		T					0110				EMI		L SCA	LES			- T
SCORE	CRITI-	17F	NET	TOTAL	I		ROW			<u> </u>	DLUM	N		SCORES	Ý	COL.	ROW	D	5	4	з	2	1	DP	GМ	PSY	PD	N	PI	NDS	SCORE
<u> </u>	L				<u> </u>	1	2	3	<u> </u>	в	c	<u>D</u>	E		L.C.	101.	101.									[]					
1 =	4	3.00 -													1	ļ															= 1
=	1	2.75	80-		1										[í			()	60 -		55	60			1 1			i I		=
0.00	1		_ ·	8Q	1 1						90 <u>–</u>	·ю			ļ				65 -	:	75 -	:	•						20	<u></u>	=
		-2.50-	· ``		450			F '~-						- 00.00				: "	:	•	70 -	50	•		- 20			30	-23-	_/31	
=	50-	2.25	÷0-	70 -	•					×0	•			35.55		ļ			60÷	55 -			55 -		35 -			35 -	1	~~	= [
	1		:		440	•	-150-	:										-195			65		:	•		75 -	35-			-63-	
1 3	3	2.00-	÷	60	· ·			1 145				•		999	_ ' ¹⁰ -	1 "-	43 -	1 100 -) "T		60	• -		× -	60 :	1 1		40		•• –	Ξ
80 -	1				430		140								105 -	1-03-	40 2		50		05 -			•	65 -		-40-	45 -	<u> </u>		-80-
=	;	1.90	<u>"</u> •	55 -				·				•			100 -	60 -	:	185 -	:		50-	40-1	:	85 -		65 -	:		1	30 -	-
<u> </u>]——	1.80	•0		420	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	Ē	!		<u> </u>			95-	1:	<u>├</u> •	180-	45	45-	-45	:	-45-		70 -	:	-45-	50	-20-	45 -	
=	1.	-	30	•	-	•	:	140 -	ĺ	:	.		85	- 33	85 -	55 -	35 -	175 -	1 3	:	:	;		80 -	75	60 -	50	55 -	1		Ξ Ι
-70-	1	1.60 -		50 -	410 -	143-		 ;	··	·	80 -	85	<u> </u>		eo	50	ļ		40-	40-	40 -	35	40 -							35 -	-70
1 -		1.50		:	400		:	135 -	85-		:	•	:		75	:	•	165 -	19.4			:	:			:	\$5 .	** ~		30 -	Ξĺ
<u> </u>	1 <u>.</u> .	1.40 -		45 -	390.	<u>.</u>	-125	1		<u> </u>	•	<u> </u>	·	- 95 -	-70-	45 -	-30	160 -				30	-35			·	:	65 -		25 -	-
	1 **		_ <u>15</u>	<u> </u>		140-		130 -		:	75 -		80 - •	90 -		├		(55 -	30-	35-	30	•	:	70	85	55 -	60 ·	70 -		20 1	= i
L-60-	1	1.20	10 -	40 -		•	120 -	<u>.</u>	80-	BO		<u>80 –</u>				40 -		145-					:		90 -			:	15-	15 👬	
	1 :	1.20			· ·			125		(:	•	:	75 -	- 80 -	60-	1 . :	•	140 -	25	30-	25 -		:	65 ÷		· ·		75			= 00
<u> </u>	40			35 -	370 -			:	:	75 -	70		<u> </u>	70	55 -		··	135 -		:	:	25 -			15	50	:	- 00 ÷	•	. :	-
[=	1 :	1.10	:		360	:	110-	1 120 -	75-	1 :	(·	75-	1	60 -	1 F	1 :		130 -	1 :	-		:	25 -	60 y				:			=]
50			., .		350	- 30-	103 -	1:					<i>•</i> •	50	_ 50	30 -	20	125 -	20 -	25 -	20 -	20 -	:	61			75	i		• - 	=
1	3 *	1.00 -	:		5-1	125-	•	1	~ \ ·	70 -	1.	· ~ ·	•	40					:	•	:		20 -		100 ÷	45 -	:	83 -	10-		
-	1.		-10	:	340 -	:	100		70	· ·			:		45	•	•		15-		15 -	:	:	50 -	•		80 -	80	· ·]	•	=
[]	1	_		25 -	330	:	95		3		•		· •		I	25 -		[•	:	15	15			•		:			-
	1		-15 -		320 -	120-		:	65-	X 65 🖡	60 <u>-</u>	63 .	:	- 20 -	40	1 :	15 -	105 -	1 10	20-	10 -		:	45 -	105 -	40-	••••			E	.
	1:	:	:	:	310 -			1	:	MT.	:		. ·					P5 -			•			40 -			90 -				40
=	<u>+</u>	1 1	-20-	20		115-	85 -	100	60-	V-	- 35	60-	<u> </u>	- 10 -		20 -	•	90 -	1 .	15 -	:				110-	:	:	1	5_	E	Ξ Ι
	25-	<u></u>	:	•	290													- 85	<u> </u>		5	s -		-35				100 -			
	1 :		-52-		280	:	75 -] <u></u>	:	53 -	50		· · · ·	Γ * Τ] "	1		75 -		:			•		•	35 -	95	- 1	4	ļ	-
30-	1			15 -	270 -	-105	-70-	80 -	55-	<u> </u>			-:	<u>├</u> ─────	23	<u> </u>	10	70 -	-			├ ~~~		30 -				105 -		{	30
1 3	1 ¹⁰ :		<u> </u>	÷	260 -	100			:	:	45 -	:	50-	I ,				63 -		:		•	:	25 -			100 -	1		ţ	= (
<u> </u>	<u>-</u>	.50 -	.35-	<u> </u>	250				—	<u>+</u> ₅o÷				F	20					- • -	·			1							
1 3	115-		:		230 -	25 ÷	60-		50-	:	40 -		44 -		15	•	•	35 -	ł	:			•		•	30 -	105	110	· · [f	Ξ (
20]		-40-		220	80	- 25	73 -	<u>├</u> :	<u></u> +-45÷	\vdash	45-		L 01 -	-10	:	5	50	1	<u> </u>	0				•	<u> </u>		;			20
	- E	.30 _	:	•	200 -	85 -	50 -	70		:	33 -	40-	40 -	- -	ļ ,	_ s.∸	•	40 -					·		120 -		110	· ·		E	Ξľ
\vdash	<u>+</u>	.20 -		<u> </u> :	190-	- 00-	45	63	<u> *⁵</u> =	╞┈	30		⊢-:	<u> </u>	╞╌╴╢	+-	· · ·	- 30		⊢ °−				10 -	<u> </u>	<u> </u>					
=	E	- 1	:	5-	180 -	75 -			:	:	1	35 -	38 -	- 0.01 -	•	1 •	1.	[。		· ·	25 -	· ·			Ě	E 1
<u>⊢ю</u> -	<u>}</u>	<u> </u>	-60	<u> </u>	+™÷	- 70-	40-	- 60 -	1	<u>}-38÷</u>	25				_	⊢ ⊶∹		 	-								·				
=	10-	.10		· ·	180 -	60-	35 -	55 -			20	30 -	1	ļ	[1	1	[, , ,	125 -					Ē	Ξ Ι
=	7		1	l .	¹⁵⁰ –	1	30	4		30-	1	1	ļ	1			ł	1							ľ						= l
L		L	L	L	L	L	L	L	í	<u> </u>	L		L	L		L	ł	L								}			. 1		

· •

• •

Figure 6. Self Concept Pattern of ML-Integrator Group.

74

•

•



Mal.--- Loser ---- M-Int.---- L-Int..... ML-Int.----

:

:

.

.

٩

Figure 7. Comparison of Self Concept Patterns Among Groups.

t

.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine whether the delinquent population is an aggregate group or whether it is actually a composite of sub-groups which have differing characteristics. The study was designed to identify delinquent sub-groups and to describe some of the variables which contribute to individuals being classified into these groups. More specifically, it represented an attempt to identify and describe the salient characteristics of Maladaptives, Losers, and three groups of Integrators through the use of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. The results not only suggest that the delinquent population is actually a composite of sub-groups which differ from each other but also suggest that a multi-dimensional approach to the self concept is a technique that yields valuable psychological data about the individuals which make up the diverse groups.

The results indicate that on three dimensions all five experimental groups are alike. There are no differences found among the groups on the Self Criticism, Total Conflict, and Total Variability Scales. Figure 7 shows that all five groups fall within the 30th to 60th percentile range on the Self Criticism Scale which indicates the delinquent has a normal healthy capacity

for self-criticism. Since no individual subject was found to score low on the Self Criticism Scale there is little reason to suspect the Positive scores as being the result of defensive distortion. In other words, there is a high probability that the Positive scores are a true representation of the delinquent's view of himself.

The second dimension on which delinquents do not differ is on the Total Conflict Scale. All the scores of the sub-groups are above the mean of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale norm group. The delinquent groups scores range from the 60th to the 96th percentile suggesting that the delinquent population shows greater confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self perception than do non-delinquents. Although the difference in scores of the various groups failed to achieve significance at the .05 level, the trend is in the expected direction. For example, the ML-Integrator group scored near the 60th percentile on the Total Conflict Scale while the Maladaptive group scored at the 96th percentile.

The third dimension on which delinquents do not differ is the Total Variability Scale. From Figure 7 it becomes apparent that the mean Total Variability Scores of all the experimental groups are higher than for the general population. This higher variability is also reflected in the profiles of the Positive scores where there are marked differences in the level of selfesteem between the different components of the self. These findings suggest that delinquents typically reveal less consistent,

or more variable, self concepts than do non-delinquents.

Interpretation of Differences in Scores Between Sub-Groups

One of the differences found on the True/False (T/F) Scale is that the Loser group scored lower than the L-Integrator group. Considered from the framework of self theory, this difference suggests that the L-Integrator achieves self-definition by focusing more on what he <u>is</u> (rather than what he is not) than does the Loser. The Loser seems to achieve self definition from the basic idea that he is "born to lose" whereas, the L-Integrator appears to consider more areas from which he achieves self definition.

The differences obtained on the Positive Scales (Row and Column) suggest that the three Integrator groups have more positive self concepts than do the Maladaptives or Losers. The Total Positive Scale suggests that the Maladaptives and Losers are more doubtful about their own worth, see themselves as more undesirable, and have less confidence in themselves than do the Integrators. The Maladaptive and Loser groups scored significantly lower than the three Integrator groups on the Self Satisfaction, Personal Self, and Family Self Scales. Specifically, the Maladaptives and Losers appear to be less accepting of themselves, have a lower sense of personal worth, and feel more inadequate in relation to their peers than do the Integrators. The Maladaptives and Losers also scored lower than the L-Integrators and ML-Integrators on the Behavior Scale. This suggests that the Maladaptives

and Losers view their behavior as being less adequate than do the L-Integrators and ML-Integrators.

One of the Positive Scales which differentiates the Maladaptive group from all other groups is the Identity Scale (Row 1). The Maladaptive group scored lower than any of the other four experimental groups (see Table 5). Figure 7 shows that this is the low point on the profile for the Maladaptive group but is not the low point for the other four experimental groups. This suggests that the Maladaptive's lack of basic identity is an important psychological factor which sets him apart from the rest of his peers. Another distinction between the Maladaptive group and the three Integrator groups can be made on the Physical Self (Column A) Scale. The Maladaptive group has a much lower opinion of their physical body than do the Integrator groups. In comparison to the three groups of Integrators the Maladaptive group views their state of health, physical appearance, skills and sexuality less favorably. The Maladaptive group also scored lower than the three Integrator groups on the Social Self (Column E) Scale. The Maladaptive's sense of adequacy and worth in his social interaction with other people is less than that of the Integrators.

Differences on the <u>Empirical Scales</u> are as revealing as those on the Positive Scales. On the Defensive Positive (DP) Scale the Loser group scored lower than the three Integrator groups and the Maladaptive group scored lower than the L-Integrator

group. This suggests that the Losers and Maladaptives are not as well defended as the Integrators. Therefore, in an emotionally charged situation one might expect the Losers and Maladaptives to show less control than the Integrators. By observation, this is what seems to happen but as was mentioned earlier the Maladaptive's response is more apt to be name calling or crying and the Loser's response is more typically expressed in physical aggression. The Maladaptive and Loser groups also score higher than the L-Integrator and ML-Integrator groups on the Personality Disorder (PD) and Neurosis (N) Scales. In addition, the differences between the means of the groups on the Personality Integration (PI) Scale shows that the Loser group scored lower than the three Integrator groups and that the Maladaptive group scored lower than the ML-Integrator group. These scores once again point to greater pathology in the Maladaptive and Loser groups than in the Integrator groups.

The Empirical Scales which best differentiate the Maladaptive group from the Loser and Integrator groups are the General Maladjustment (GM) and Psychosis (PSY) Scales. The Maladaptive Group scored higher than the three Integrator groups on the General Maladjustment Scale but the Loser group failed to show a difference when compared with any one of the Integrator groups. On the Psychosis Scale the Maladaptive group not only scored higher than the M-Integrator and ML-Integrator groups but also scored higher than the Loser group. The Empirical Scales suggests that there is a definite order as to the degree of psychopathology

found among the various groups. The Maladaptive group appears to possess the greatest degree of psychopathology, the Loser group shows less than the Maladaptive group, and the Integrator groups show even less than the Loser group.

The Number of Deviant Signs (NDS) scale scores support the data which suggests the degree of psychopathology is most severe in the Maladaptive group and least severe in the Integrator groups. The mean score of the Maladaptive group is higher than all three Integrator groups while the mean score of the Loser group is only higher than the ML-Integrator group. As was mentioned before, Fitts (1965) considers the NDS Score to be the "Scale's best index of psychological disturbance" \sqrt{p} . 57.

Self Concept Patterns of Delinquent Sub-Groups and Delinquent Aggregate Groups

Earlier in this study it was stated Hamner (1968) reports that Self Concept Profiles for delinquents have shown an extremely similar and consistent pattern both in form as well as level. He reports that the Total Positive Scores for the five aggregate groups all fall within one to one and a half standard deviations below the mean of the normative group on which the Tennessee Self Concept Scale was standardized. He states "The dimensions of self concept (Row P scores) show significant deviation in the negative direction in every group. Self Satisfaction (Row 2) is less deviant than are Identity (Row 1) and Behavior (Row 3), forming the inverted 'V' common to each of the samples"

 \sqrt{p} . 77. He also states that the Column P scores reveal the same negative self concept. He says "In no area does the delinquent see himself positively, but he has a much less negative SC when using the Physical Self (Column A) as his frame of reference" /p. 77. In terms of form the Moral-Ethical Self (Column B) and the Family Self (Column D) are the low points on the profiles while the Social Self (Column E) is much higher than the Family Self. Hamner (1968) continues by saying "The Personal Self (Column C) is also moderately well defended. Thus, the mean P scores on the five column scores form the 'W' profile which appears to be characteristic of the delinquent population" $/\overline{p}$. 97. In terms of the Empirical Scales both the GM and PD scores are high and on the latter the mean score of every group is outside the normal limits. Hamner (1968) states

All groups fall between one-half and one SD above the mean on the Psy Scale and only slightly higher on the N Scale. The scores on the DP Scale are uniformly below the mean but are not considered low enough to have interpretive significance. The degree of personality integration is rather poor. PI Scale mean scores for all groups are below the 30th percentile /p. 12/.

All five aggregate groups are found to score high on the Number of Deviant Signs (NDS) Scale and above the normal limits.

Hamner (1968) describes some of the scores of the aggregate groups in terms of standard deviations from the mean of the norm group of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. These scores can easily be compared to the scores of the sub-groups in the present study by looking at the T-Scores on the profile sheets

(Figures 2 through 7) for the various sub-groups. These T-Scores are "McCall's T-Scores...and thus involve his special system for forcing all raw score distributions into a grid of normally distributed standard scores with a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10" (Fitts, 1965, p. 15). Therefore, every 10 T-Score units from the mean equals one standard deviation from that mean. The level of significance of the differences between the aggregate groups and the sub-groups can not be determined from the profile sheets but reporting the trends which seem to exist is useful in conceptualizing the self concept patterns of the various groups.

Maladaptive Groups vs. Aggregate Groups. Although none of the five aggregate groups fall below one and one half standard deviations below the mean of the normative group on the Total Positive Scale, Figure 2 shows that the Maladaptive group falls over two standard deviations below the mean. The inverted "V" of the Row scores for the Maladaptive group is distorted somewhat by the very low score obtained on the Identity (Row 1) Scale. The "W" pattern of the Column scores for the Maladaptive group is similar to that common of the aggregate groups except the former pattern does not show as strong of fluctuations as reported for the aggregate groups. Therefore, the Positive Scores for the Maladaptive group appear to be more negative but less variable than the Positive Scores of the aggregate groups. In other words, the self concept is more negative but the level of self-esteem remains more constant across the various levels and areas of self-

perception for the Maladaptive group than it does for the aggregate groups.

On the Empirical Scales, the pattern for the Maladaptive group appears to differ from that of the aggregate groups on the GM, Psy, and N Scales. Although these scales are high for the aggregate groups they are even higher for the Maladaptive group. Both the GM and Psy Scales for the Maladaptive group are about one and one half standard deviations above the GM and Psy Scales of the highest scoring aggregate group. This suggests that the Maladaptive group possess more psychopathology than the delinquent aggregate groups.

Loser Group vs. Aggregate Groups. In comparison with the aggregate groups which do not fall below one and one half standard deviations below the mean of the normative group on the Total Positive Score, Figure 3 shows that the Loser group falls almost two standard deviations below the mean. The inverted "V" common to the aggregate groups on the Row scores is not present on the Loser profile. This is because the high point, for the positive scores, on the Loser profile is the Identity (Row 1) score which is within one standard deviation below the mean of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale norm group. Self Satisfaction (Row 2) is more deviant than Identity (Row 1), but is less deviant than Behavior (Row 3). Although the Loser group appears to be like the aggregate groups in saying their behavior is not much good and that they are not really dissatisfied with this, the Loser

group seems to differ by achieving his basic identity through this negative behavior. The "W" pattern (Column Scores) for the Loser Group is almost identical to that of the aggregate groups in both form and level.

The pattern of Empirical Scales for the Loser Group is also similar to those of the aggregate groups.

M-Integrator Group vs. Aggregate Groups. Unlike the aggregate groups the M-Integrator group shows a positive Total Positive Score. The inverted "V" of the M-Integrator group is similar to those of the aggregate groups except the inverted "V" of the former group is slightly higher than those of the latter groups. In addition the Self Satisfaction (Row 2) Scale for the M-Integrator group is within one half a standard deviation above the mean of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale Norm group. The "W" pattern found in the aggregate groups is somewhat distorted . in the M-Integrator group by the Family Self (Column D) Scale being well defended. Thus, the M-Integrator group seems to view themselves as being more adequate in reference to their closest and most immediate circle of associates than do the aggregate In addition, the M-Integrator group scored within one groups. half a standard deviation above the mean of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale norm group on Physical Self (Column A) and Personal Self (Column C). These positive scores are not found in any of the aggregate groups.

On the Empirical Scales, the M-Integrator group shows the same general pattern in form as the aggregate groups but the

peaks of the pattern for the M-Integrator group are closer to the mean of the norm group than are the peaks of the pattern for the aggregate groups. This suggests that there is less psychopathology in the M-Integrator group than in the aggregate groups.

L-Integrator Group vs. Aggregate Groups. The Positive Scales (Row and Column) for the L-Integrator group (see Figure 5) are similar in pattern to the M-Integrator group except the low points on the profile of the former are not as negative as on the latter. Therefore, the self concept in these areas appear to be better defended by the L-Integrator group than the M-Int. group. However, the comments made about the differences between the M-Int. group and aggregate groups can also be applied to the differences between the L-Int. group and aggregate groups. The same holds true for the Empirical Scales.

<u>ML-Integrator Group vs. Aggregate Groups</u>. With the exception of the Moral-Ethical (Column B) Scale the self concept pattern of the ML-Integrator group (Figure 6) shows little resemblance to the patterns of the aggregate groups. With the exception of Column B, most of the scores for the M-Integrator group fall within one half standard deviation of the mean of the norm group. With the exception of Column B, all the scores fall within one standard deviation of the mean of the norm group on both the positive scores and the Empirical Scales. The Moral-Ethical Self (Column B) for the ML-Integrator group remains negative and at about the same level as for the aggregate groups. Thus, both the ML-Integrator group and the aggregate groups view themselves as

being "bad." Where the aggregate groups show considerable pathology the ML-Integrator groups shows a healthy adaptive self concept pattern.

Hypotheses Not Supported

As stated above four of the Twenty-eight research hypotheses were not supported. These Hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis II. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Self Criticism Scale.

Hypothesis IV. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Total Conflict Scale.

Hypothesis XIV. There will be mean score differences among the groups on the Total Variability Score.

Hypothesis XXVII. There will be mean score differences among the scales of the ML-Integrator Group.

As a result of observing the delinquents it was felt that the Maladaptive group might score differently on the Self Criticism Scale because this was the only group which appeared to be pathologically undefended. However, the data do not support this observation but instead suggest the Maladaptive group has as good a capacity for self-criticism as does the other groups.

Since scores on the Total Conflict Scale indicate the degree of confusion, contradiction, and general conflict in self perception it was felt the Maladaptive and Loser groups might score differently on this scale than would the Integrator groups. The data do not support this hypothesis but rather suggests that the Maladaptive and Loser groups are as certain about their characteristics as the Integrator groups.

Since scores on the Total Variability Scale indicate the degree of variability of the person's self concept from one area to another it was felt the Maladaptive and Loser groups might differ from the Integrator groups on this variable. The data do not support this hypothesis but rather suggest that among the areas of the self concept there is as much variance within the Integrator groups as there is within the Maladaptive and Loser groups. The difference among the Maladaptive, Loser, and Integrator groups are found to be in the level of self esteem for each area of the self rather than in the variability from one area of the selfperception to another.

The fact that hypothesis XXVII was not supported suggests that the ML-Integrator group scores more consistently than do any of the other groups. Although this hypothesis was not supported the results suggest that the ML-Integrator group exhibits more integration within the sub-systems than do the other four groups. This data, in view of the fact that the ML-Integrator was found to have the most positive self concept, suggest the existence of an Integrated delinquent.

Traits of Delinquent Sub-Groups

It now seems appropriate to characterize each of the sub-groups by relating their self concept patterns to their observed behavior. Since there were only two differences found at

the .05 level among the Integrator groups on the scales, all three of these groups will be discussed as one.

The Maladaptive Syndrome. The most salient characteristic of the Maladaptive appears to be his emotional disturbance. Not only does he rate high when compared to other pathological groups but his peers also see him as being "crazy." His behavior appears to be self-destructive but there is little evidence to suggest that it is in pursuit of a particular goal. By observation he does not appear to have the psychological capacity to relate himself to the values or goals of any individual or group--delinquent or non-delinquent. He moves about in a group without regard to the conduct code established by the group and as a result he is often on the receiving end of a good deal of hostility. He is the most disliked of the delinguents and his peers often refer to him in derogatory terms. When hostility is directed toward him his response is often name calling and/or crying. His self concept is extremely negative and this level of self esteem remains relatively constant across the various areas of selfperception. An analysis of the responses on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale suggests that the Maladaptive's behavior stems from a lack of basic identity.

The Loser Syndrome. The most salient characteristic of the Loser appears to be his strong identification with being "born to lose." He gains recognition from his peers by displaying the behavior of a Loser and therefore is often found to "rate" with them. He views, and others view, his behavior as being "bad" but

the Loser appears to be relatively satisfied with this conduct. His self concept is negative in every area but much less so when using the Physical Self and Social Self as a frame of reference. The most negative view of himself is found when he uses the Moral-Ethical Self and Family Self as a frame of reference. He is found to rank rather high when compared to General Maladjustment and Personality Disorder groups but, unlike the Maladaptive, the Loser is not found to be like the Psychotic Group of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

The Delinquent Integrators. As a rule the dimensions of the self concept for the delinquent Integrators fall within the normal limits established by the norm group of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. They demonstrate a positive Total Positive Self Concept Score which is generally the result of the Self Satisfaction, Physical Self, and Personal Self Scales being well defended. Thus, the Integrator is relatively satisfied with himself; he views his physical appearance, skills, and sexuality as being adequate and has a moderate sense of personal worth. However, he is likely to view himself negatively when using his Behavior and Moral-Ethical Self as a frame of reference. He looks more like the norm group than any of the pathological groups of the Tennessee Self Concept Scale and scores near the mean of the norm group on the Personality Integration Scale. Thus, there is evidence to suggest that the Integrator is an adaptive person who not only sees himself as being adequate but is viewed by others as being adequate.

Limitations of the Study

This study was designed to determine whether sub-grour exist, in a delinquent population, that could be differentiated on the basis of the self concept. The results of the study suppose that the combination of peer and staff nominations is an effective selection procedure. However, this procedure leaves several questions unanswered. Are peer nominations as effective as the combination technique? Are staff nominations as effective as the combination technique? What differences would be obtained between the single techniques? The combination technique was used because it was felt the subjects who were selected would be more likely to possess the traits described in the theoretical paragraphs than would subjects selected by the single technique. Although the combination technique is believed to be more likely to yield -"pure" subjects it produces fewer in number than the single Since this was an exploratory study, the technique technique. more likely to yield pure subjects was felt to be the more appropriate. In addition, this study used only the dimensions of the self concept to differentiate the various sub-groups. Therefore, it leaves unanswered the question of how the dimensions of the self concept correlate with the delinquents actual behavior and other psychological data.

Need for Further Study

Since this study was conducted in only one school for delinquent boys there is an apparent need for the investigation

to be expanded to other schools and institutions for both boys and girls. Hamner (1968) has shown that the self concept profiles of delinquent aggregate groups are extremely consistent from one study to another. Perhaps studies in the future will show consistency among the various sub-groups and if so would point to the need for a molecular approach to the study of delinquency. It should be pointed out that research utilizing the Tennessee Self Concept Scale has typically selected only a few variables to study and thus have ignored a wealth of other data (Fitts, 1969). Even though this is a complex instrument, the results of the present study suggest that the use of several variables is worth the effort.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

A review of the literature revealed that delinquents have traditionally been viewed as an aggregate group to be compared to the "norm" group. Both the aggregate group and norm comparison techniques were questioned in the present study and consequently it was felt the most fruitful approach to the study of delinquency might be found in a detailed study identifying, describing, and comparing delinquent groups to each other rather than to non-delinquent groups. Considerable attention was given to the complexity of delinquency and several questions were raised concerning the sub-structure of the delinquent group.

This study represented an attempt to determine whether juvenile delinquents constitute an aggregate group or whether they are actually a composite of sub-groups which differ from each other. More specifically, it attempted to identify and describe some of the variables which differentiate delinquent sub-groups by using the Tennessee Self Concept Scale for analyzing the self concept of the individuals which make up the various subgroups.

Five groups of boys at a state training school were selected as subjects on the basis of (1) peer group and (2) cottage

committee nominations. Two sets of rating forms were administered to the boys and cottage committees. The rating forms were designed to identify those boys who are most like and least like two theoretical psychopathological boys referred to in the study as being a Maladaptive and a Loser. The subjects selected as being most like one of the theoretical boys were designated as Maladaptives or Losers. The subjects selected as being least like the theoretical boys were designated as M-Integrators, L-Integrators, or ML-Integrators. Each of the five experimental groups were given the Tennessee Self Concept Scale: Clinical and Research Form. Twenty dimensions of the self concept were selected for study and from these twenty dimensions twentyeight research hypotheses were formulated about differences expected to be found among the groups. The Twenty dimensions of the self concept were analyzed in a 5 x 20 split-plot factorial design with non-repeated measures on one variable and repeated measures on the other variable.

Twenty-four of the twenty-eight research hypotheses were supported. The results not only suggest that the delinquent population is a composite of sub-groups which differ from each other but also suggest that a multi-dimensional approach to the self concept is a technique that yields valuable psychological data about the individuals which make up the diverse groups.

REFERENCES

- Angelino, H. (Univer. of Oklahoma) Unpublished data shared with W. H. Fitts, 1956. In Hamner, William T. The self concept of delinquents. <u>Nashville Mental Health</u> Center Research Bulletin No. 3, 1968.
- Butler, J. M., & Haigh, G. V. Changes in the relation between self-concepts and ideal concepts consequent upon clientcentered counseling, In C. R. Rogers & R. F. Dymond (Eds.), <u>Psychotherapy and Personality Change</u>. Chicago, Ill.: Univ. Chicago Press, 1954, 55-75.
- Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (Eds.) <u>Group dynamics: Research</u> and theory. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1960.
- Deitche, J. H. The performance of delinquent and non-delinquent boys on the Tennessee Department of Mental Health Self-Concept Scale. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana Univer., 1959. Univ. Microfilms Card No. 59-3998. In Hamner, William T. The self concept of delinquents. <u>Nashville Mental Health Center Research Bulletin No. 3</u>, 1968.
- Duncan, C. B. A reputation test of personality integration. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 516-524.
- Dymond, R. F. Adjustment changes over therapy from self sorts. In C. R. Rogers & R. F. Dymond (Eds.), <u>Psychotherapy and</u> <u>Personality Change</u>. Chicago, Ill.: Univ. Chicago Press, 1954. Pp. 76-84.
- Epstein, E. M. The self concept of the delinquent female. Smith College Studies of Social Work, 1962, 32, 220-224.
- Fannin, L. F. & Clinard, M. B. Differences in the conception of self as a male among lower and middle-class delinquents. <u>Social Problems</u>, 1965, <u>13</u>, 205-214.
- Fitts, W. H. (Nashville Mental Health Center) Personal communication Feb., 1969.

- Fitts, W. H. <u>Manual for the Tennessee Self Concept Scale</u>. Nashville, Tennessee: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.
- Halleck, S. <u>Psychiatry and the dilemmas of crime</u>. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Hamner, W. T. The self concept of delinquents. <u>Nashville</u> <u>Mental Center Research Bulletin No. 3, 1969</u>.
- Hare, A. P. <u>Handbook of small group research</u>. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
- Hare, A. P., Borgatta, E. F., & Bales, R. F. (Eds.) <u>Small</u> groups. New York: Knopf, 1955.
- Jahoda, M. <u>Current concepts of positive mental health</u>. New York: Basic Books, 1958.
- Jenkins, R. L. Adaptive and maladaptive delinquency. <u>Nerv</u>. <u>Child</u>, 1955, 11, 9-11.
- Joplin, G. H. (Highfields Residential Group Center, New Jersey)
 Unpublished data shared with W. H. Fitts, 1967. In Hamner,
 William T. The self concept of delinquents. Nashville
 Mental Health Center Research Bulletin No. 3, 1968.
- Kirk, R. E. <u>Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral</u> sciences. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1968.
- Lefeber, J. A. The delinquent's self-concept. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, univer. of Southern California, 1965. In Hamner, William T. The self concept of delinquents. <u>Nashville Mental Health Center Research Bulletin No. 3</u>, 1968.
- Lewis, W. W. The construction validation of a reputation test. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1959. In Duncan, C. B. A reputation test of personality integration. <u>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</u>, 1966, <u>3</u>, 516-524.
- Lipkin, S. The client evaluates nondirective psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1948, 12, 137-146.
- Lively, E. L., Dinitz, S., & Reckless, W. C. Self concept as a predictor of juvenile delinquency. <u>American Journal of</u> Orthopsychiatry, 1962, <u>32</u>, 159-168.
- Motoori, T. A study of juvenile delinquents by the self-concept analysis method. <u>Family Court Probation</u>, 1963, <u>2</u>, 44-49.

Raimy, V. C. Self reference in counseling interviews. <u>Journal</u> of Consulting Psychology, 1948, 12, 153-163.

- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S. & Kay, B. The self component in potential delinquency and potential non-delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 566-570.
- Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S. & Murray, E. Self concept as an insulator against delinquency. <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 1956, 21, 744-746.
- Richard, W. C., Mates, C. G. & Whitten, L. (George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee) Personality traits and attitudes of adolescent girls with behavior disorders. Paper presented at Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, April, 1967. (In addition, unpublished data shared by Richard with W. H. Fitts, 1967) In Hamner, William T. The self concept of delinquents. <u>Nashville Mental Health</u> Center Research Bulletin No. 3, 1968.
- Rogers, C. R. <u>On becoming a person</u>. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Rogers, C. R. & Dymond, R. F. (Eds.) <u>Psychotherapy and personality</u> change. Chicago: Univer. of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Seeman, J. A study of the process of nondirective therapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1949, 13, 157-168.
- Seeman, J. Toward a concept of personality integration. <u>American Psychologist</u>, 1959, <u>14</u>, 633-637.
- Seeman, J. Teacher judments of high and low adjustment. Journal of Educational Research, 1963, 57, 213-216.
- Sheerer, E. T. An analysis of the relationship between acceptance of a respect for self and acceptance of and respect for others in counseling cases. <u>Journal of Consulting Psychology</u>, 1949, <u>13</u>, 169-176.
- Sheldon, W. <u>Varieties of delinquent youth: An introduction to</u> constitutional psychiatry. New York: Harper, 1949.
- Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. W. (Eds.) <u>An outline of social psychology</u>. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.
- Shoben, E. J. Toward a concept of the normal personality. <u>American Psychologist</u>, 1957, <u>12</u>, 183-189.

Smith, M. B. Research strategies toward a conception of positive mental health. <u>American Psychologist</u>, 1959, <u>14</u>, 673-681.

- Snyder, W. U. An investigation of the nature of non-directive psychotherapy. <u>Journal of General Psychology</u>, 1945, <u>33</u>, 193-223.
- Spiva, P. G. The loser syndrome in juxenile delinquents. <u>Unpublished doctoral dissertation</u>, University of Oklahoma, 1968.
- Thorp, V. M. & McCune, D. M. An investigative study using the Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory at the Helena state school for boys. <u>Unpublished masters thesis</u>, Northwestern State College, Alva, Oklahoma, 1967.
- Vargas, M. J. Changes in self-awareness during client-centered therapy. In C. R. Rogers & R. R. Dymond (Eds.) <u>Psychotherapy</u> and <u>Personality Change</u>. Chicago, Ill.: Univ. Chicago Press, 1954, 145-166.
- Wiggins, H. S. & Winder, C. L. The peer nomination inventory: An empirically derived sociometric measure of adjustment in preadolescent boys. Psychological Reports, 1961, 9, 643-677.
- Winder, C. L. & Wiggins, J. S. Social reputation and social behavior: A further validation of the peer nomination inventory. <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, 1964, 68, 681-684.
- Winer, B. J. <u>Statistical principles in experimental design</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Wise, H. L. Weekly Reader Diagnostic Silent Reading Test--Form 6k. Weekly Reader 6: Teacher's Edition, 1968, 22, 1-3.

APPENDIX A

1

PEER RATING FORM DEPICTING A MALADAPTIVE

MUSTANG COTTAGE

Name

Instructions

Read the following paragraph:

Tony is not liked by most of the boys in the cottage. He does things which make the other boys mad at him. He often calls the other boys names they do not like but cannot take it when they do the same to him. Most of the time he is not able to keep his nose out of other people's business. Sometimes he takes cigarette butts from ash trays and smokes them. When other boys make fun of him, he usually cries. No one really understands him; and he does not seem to know who he is, what he is doing or why he is doing it.

Below is a list of the boys in your cottage. Think about the above paragraph and the list of the names below and follow these three instructions:

- 1. <u>Put a circle</u> around the names of the 5 boys from this list who are most like Tony.
- 2. <u>Underline</u> the names of the 5 boys from this list who are least like Tony.
- 3. Do not rate on who you would like as a friend but who acts and feels most or least like Tony. Include yourself in these ratings. Your ratings will not be seen by any other boys.

Larry A.	Danny K.	Dale P.
Robert B.	Doug K.	Doug S.
Dean C.	Ricky M.	George S.
Larry C.	Lee M.	James S.
Henry C.	Roger N.	Richard T.
Ricky H.	Bill N.	Clint W.
Fred J.	Bill P.	Sam W.
APPENDIX. B

.

.

.

PEER RATING FORM DEPICTING A LOSER

CORVETTE COTTAGE

Name

Instructions

Read the following paragraph:

Pete feels like he is a born loser. Nothing good ever happens to him and he feels like the world is against him. Everything he plans turns out bad and he feels that life is unfair to him. He thinks that he is not able to do much about what is going to happen to him and is afraid that no matter what he does, he will get into a lot more trouble with the law.

Below is a list of the boys in your cottage. Think about the above paragraph and the list of the names below and follow these three instructions:

- 1. <u>Put a circle</u> around the names of the 5 boys from this list who are most like Pete.
- 2. <u>Underline</u> the names of the 5 boys from this list who are <u>least</u> like Pete.
- 3. Do not rate on who you would like as a friend but who acts and feels most or least like Pete. Include yourself in these ratings. Your ratings will not be seen by any other boys.

Mike A.	Johnny F.	Luke Q.
Bill B.	Randy G.	Billy R.
Tate B.	Delbert G.	Jack R.
Richard B.	Jimmy J.	Eddie S.
Ricky J.	Donald K.	Glen W.
Frank C.	Lynn M.	Dennis W.
Jarrold D.	Larry Q.	Mike W.

100

APPENDIX C

.

.

.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE: CLINICAL AND RESEARCH FORM

¢.

INSTRUCTIONS

On the top line of the separate answer sheet fill in your name and the other information except for the time information in the last three boxes. You will fill these boxes in later. Write only on the answer sheet. Do not put any marks in this booklet.

The statements in this booklet are to help you describe yourself as you see yourself. Please respond to them as if you were describing yourself to yourself. Do not omit any item! Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses listed below. On your answer sheet, put a <u>circle</u> around the response you chose. If you want to change an answer after you have circled it, do not erase it but put an <u>X</u> mark through the response and then circle the response you want.

When you are ready to start, find the box on your answer sheet marked <u>time</u> <u>started</u> and record the time. When you are finished, record the time finished in the box on your answer sheet marked <u>time</u> <u>finished</u>.

As you start, be sure that your answer sheet and this booklet are lined up evenly so that the item numbers match each other.

Remember, put a <u>circle</u> around the response number you have chosen for each statement.

Responses-	Completely false	Mostly false	Partly false and partly true	Mostly true	Completely true
	1	2	3	4	5

You will find these response numbers repeated at the bottom of each page to help you remember them.

APPENDIX D

SELF CONCEPT STATEMENTS FROM TENNESSEE SELF CONCEPT SCALE:

CLINICAL AND RESEARCH FORM

1.	I have a healthy body
3.	I am an attractive person
5.	I consider myself a sloppy person
19.	I am a decent sort of person
21.	I am an honest person
23.	I am a bad person
37.	I am a cheerful person
39.	I am a calm and easy going person
41.	I am a nobody
55.	I have a family that would always help me in any kind of
	trouble
57.	I am a member of a happy family
59.	My friends have no confidence in me
73.	I am a friendly person
75.	I am popular with men
77.	I am not interested in what other people do
91.	I do not always tell the truth
93.	I get angry sometimes
2.	I like to look nice and neat all the time
4.	I am full of aches and pains
6.	I am a sick person
20.	I am a religious person
22.	I am a moral failure
24.	I am a morally weak person
38.	I have a lot of self-control

40. I am a hateful person 42. I am losing my mind 56. I am an important person to my friends and family...... 58. I am not loved by my family..... 60. I feel that my family doesn't trust me..... 74. I am popular with women..... 76. I am mad at the whole world..... 78. I am hard to be friendly with 92. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about 94. Sometimes, when I am not feeling well, I am cross..... I am neither too fat nor too thin..... 7. 9. I like my looks just the way they are I would like to change some parts of my body..... 11. I am satisfied with my moral behavior 25. I am satisfied with my relationship to God 27. 29. I ought to go to church more 43. I am satisfied to be just what I am 45. I am just as nice as I should be 47. I despise myself I am satisfied with my family relationships 61. I understand my family as well as I should 63. 65. I should trust my family more I am as sociable as I want to be 79. I try to please others, but I don't overdo it 81. 83. I am no good at all from a social standpoint

I do not like everyone I know

Once in a while, I laugh at a dirty joke 97. 8. I am neither too tall nor too short..... 10. I don't feel as well as I should 12. I should have more sex appeal..... 26. I am as religious as I want to be..... 28. I wish I could be more trustworthy..... 30. I shouldn't tell so many lies 44. I am as smart as I want to be..... 46. I am not the person I would like to be 48. I wish I didn't give up as easily as I do 62. I treat my parents as well as I should (Use past tense if parents are not living)..... 64. I am too sensitive to things my family say..... I should love my family more 66. I am satisfied with the way I treat other people..... 80. 82. I should be more polite to others 84. I ought to get along better with other people 96. I gossip a little at times 98. At times I feel like swearing I take good care of myself physically 13. 15. I try to be careful about my appearance I often act like I am "all thumbs"..... 17. I am true to my religion in my everyday life 31. 33. I try to change when I know I'm doing things that are wrong. I sometimes do very bad things 35. I can always take care of myself in any situation 49.

51. I take the blame for things without getting mad..... I do things without thinking about them first..... 53. I try to play fair with my friends and family 67. I take a real interest in my family 69. I give in to my parents. (Use past tense if parents 71. are not living)..... I try to understand the other fellow's point of view 85. I get along well with other people..... 87. I do not forgive others easily 89. 99. I would rather win than lose in a game 14. I feel good most of the time 16. I do poorly in sports and games 18. I am a poor sleeper 32. I do what is right most of the time I sometimes use unfair means to get ahead 34. I have trouble doing the things that are right 36. 50. I solve my problems quite easily 52. I change my mind a lot 54. I try to run away from my problems 68. I do my share of work at home I quarrel with my family 70. 72. I do not act like my family thinks I should..... I see good points in all the people I meet 86. I do not feel at ease with other people..... 88. I find it hard to talk with strangers 90. Once in a while I put off until tomorrow what I 100. ought to do today APPENDIX E

.

RAW DATA OF MALADAPTIVE GROUP

Subject	······································	Self Criticism	T/F	Total Conflict	Total Positive	Row 1	Row 2	Row 3
1		41	48	83	23	19	33	16
2		5 2	83	70	28	17	37	30
3		45	34	43	25	23	26	29
4		49	62	61	28	29	27	31
5		48	91	81	32	25	39	32
(con't)								
Subject		Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col E	Tot Variab	al ility
1		30	26	26	19	20	56	
2		28	28	27	32	32	3	7
3		40	23	29	20	26	54	
4		41	14	28	25	33	6	0
5		20	34	43	30	41	62	
(con't)								
Subject	DP	GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	ND	S
1	30	89	70	73	70	32	8	8
2	52	79	79	73	69	32	8	9
3	39	83	69	81	67	41	7	5
ų	37	72	67	75	63	32	6	8
5	57	73	82	66	66	40	89	

RAW DATA OF MALADAPTIVE GROUP (T-Score Units)

RAW DATA OF LOSER GROUP

APPENDIX F

.

,

.

·

Subject	Self Criticism	n T/F	Total Conflict	Total Positive	Row 1	Row 2	Row 3
1	53	31	46	25	25	31	19
2	53	43	57	29	28	35	32
3	47	44	64	32	54	30	24
4	48	76	70	34	34	33	38
5	57	57	66	31	38	32	27
(con't)							
Subject	Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col E	Tot a l Variability	
1.	25	15	26	30	33	51	
2	36	25	29	23	45	54	
3	56	25	34	34	24	81	
4	49	37	30	19	55	57	
5	33	25	39	35	30	59	
(con't)							
Subject	DP GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	NI)S
1	29 73	49	84	74	36	7	6
2	38 75	48	65	69	39	7	6
3	32 65	55	74	58	23	8	31
4	37 59	48	73	62	32	7	6
5	37 70	52	75	64	32	71	

RAW DATA OF LOSER GROUP (T-Score Units) APPENDIX G

RAW DATA OF M-INTEGRATOR GROUP

٠

•

.

-

Subject		Self Criticism	T/F	Total Conflict	Total Positive	Row 1	Row 2	Row 3
1		55	60	63	46	33	56	46
2		57	61	50	46	53	46	38
3		45	42	54	36	33	51	28
4		48	49	50	47	48	54	40
5		60	73	60	41	43	51	30.
(con't)							······	
Subject		Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col E	Tota Variabi	l lity
1		54	30	60	51	41	47	<u></u>
2		51	34	52	50	44	55	
3		53	17	50	41	35	54	
4		51	41	46	48	57	59	
5		46	24	51	51	43	67	
(con't)								
Subject	DP	GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	NDS	
1	62	61	56	56	52	44	72	
2	40	57	48	68	52	49	60	
3	43	69	53	76	59	4 7	72	
4	53	49	48	53	52	51	40	
5	ԱԱ	47	39	66	57	44	71	

.

٠

RAW DATA OF M-INTEGRATOR GROUP (T-Score Units) APPENDIX H

•

.

.

٩

1

RAW DATA OF L-INTEGRATOR GROUP

Self Criticism	T/F	Total Conflict	Total Positive	Row 1	Row Row 2 3	W
47	67	47	40	43	41 4	2
52	67	62	48	45	57 4	0
39	65	60	55	51	57 5	6
41	10	68	51	51	54 4	5
55	81	73	40	40	49 3	4
······································			······································			
Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col E	Total Variability	
55	37	42	40	37	56	
49	43	55	49	45	ЦЦ	
54	48	63	54	57	46	
54	-8	61	37	55	54	
40	36	58	49	33	51	
GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	NDS	
73	38	63	56	49	62	
61	64	56	56	55	58	
47	68	55	43	47	59	
50	78	57	44	47	66	
61	64	68	56	44	77	
	Self Criticism 47 52 39 41 55 61 55 49 54 54 54 40 54 54 40 6M 73 61 47 50 61	Self Criticism T/F 47 67 52 67 39 65 41 70 55 81 Coll S5 37 49 43 54 48 54 48 54 48 54 48 54 58 40 36 GM 73 38 61 64 47 68 50 78 61 64	Self Total Uriticism T/F Conflict 47 67 47 52 67 62 39 65 60 41 70 68 55 81 73 Col Col Col A B Col 55 37 42 49 43 55 54 48 63 54 .8 61 40 36 58 GM PSY PD 73 38 63 61 64 56 47 68 55 50 78 57 61 64 68	Self Criticism Total T/F Total Conflict Total Positive 47 67 47 40 52 67 62 48 39 65 60 55 41 70 68 51 55 81 73 40 Col A Col B Col Col Col D Col D Col D 55 37 42 40 49 43 55 49 54 48 63 54 54 48 61 37 40 36 58 49 54 48 63 54 54 48 63 54 54 58 49 9 54 58 61 37 40 36 58 49 61 64 56 56 47 68 55 43 50 78 57 <	Self Criticism Total T/F Total Conflict Total Positive Row 1 47 67 47 40 43 52 67 62 48 45 39 65 60 55 51 41 70 68 51 51 55 81 73 40 40 Coll Col Col Col D Col Col A 55 37 42 40 37 49 43 55 49 45 54 78 61 37 55 40 36 58 49 33 54 48 63 54 57 54 58 61 37 55 40 36 58 49 33 61 64 56 56 55 47 68 55 43 47 50 78 57 44 47	Self Total Total Total Row Row

RAW DATA OF L-INTEGRATOR GROUP (I-Score Units)

APPENDIX I

RAW DATA OF ML-INTEGRATOR GROUP

Subject		Self Criticism	T/F	Total Conflict	Total Positive	Row 1	Row 2	Row 3
1		48	44	39	54	51	57	50
2		66	77	65	39	52	37	36
3		44	44	59	53	42	64	47
ц		48	33	5 2	42	44	40	44
5		37	62	50	48	60	ų3	44
(con't)		·····						
Subject		Col A	Col B	Col C	Col D	Col E	Total Variability	
1	<u></u>	55	38	60	54	59	<u>ц</u>	+9
2		54	26	38	48	41	e	55
3		54	48	66	40	. 57	Ļ	8
4		40	33	44	51	49	5	51
5		53	34	46	52	51	5	59
(con't)				<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
Subject	DP	GM	PSY	PD	N	PI	NI	S
1	51	50	54	47	45	44	ų	FO
2	48	61	42	74	60	49	. 7	0
3	57	56	51	53	47	49	5	8
4	43	56	53	64	58	55	ц	7
5	55	61	56	60	47	57	5	7

.

RAW DATA OF ML-INTEGRATOR GROUP (T-Score Units)

ţ