

FACTORS RELATED TO THE SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSES  
OF JUVENILE LAW VIOLATORS

By

JAMES EVERT LUNSFORD

Bachelor of Science in Education  
Central State University  
Edmond, Oklahoma  
1963

Master of Teaching in Guidance  
Central State University  
Edmond, Oklahoma  
1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
May, 1976

Thesis  
1976 D  
L 963 f  
cop. 2



FACTORS RELATED TO THE SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSES  
OF JUVENILE LAW VIOLATORS

Thesis Approved:

*James M. Sears*  
\_\_\_\_\_

Thesis Adviser

*Judith E. Dobson*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*David W. Perrin*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Robert A. Schlatter*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*D. D. Doster*  
\_\_\_\_\_

Dean of the Graduate College

964206

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mountain climbers would seldom attempt to scale a peak if they could, at the outset, see all the crevices they must traverse to reach the summit. Likewise, few students would embark on a doctoral program if they could foresee at a single glance the total obstacles which must be overcome. Dr. James Seals, my major adviser, was a master at unvailing the totality of my program one step at a time so that I was not completely overwhelmed by the magnitude of the task. Only with his guidance, wisdom, and friendship could I have completed this task. To my committee members, Dr. Judith Dobson, Dr. Robert Schlottmann, and Dr. David Perrin, who have been supportive, helpful, and patient, I express my appreciation.

Special thanks go to Dr. Don Fromme who provided the idea which was the nucleus of this study. I will always be grateful to two men, Dr. Marvin Peterson and Dr. Glenn Wallace, who are probably not aware of their influence on my decision to continue my education.

Lastly, without the assistance and support of my wife, Jo, and the patience of my sons, Bob and Mike, this study could never have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Significance of the Study . . . . .	3
Assumptions and Limitations . . . . .	4
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	5
Nature of the Problem . . . . .	5
Definition of Terms . . . . .	6
Hypotheses . . . . .	9
Organization of the Study . . . . .	10
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	11
Environmental Factors . . . . .	12
Inherent Factors . . . . .	22
Educational Factors . . . . .	25
Life Position: Concept of Self and Others . . . . .	27
Summary . . . . .	34
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	36
Subjects . . . . .	36
Data Gathering Procedure . . . . .	36
Instrumentation . . . . .	37
Statistical Analysis . . . . .	43
Summary . . . . .	44
IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	45
Results Related to Hypothesis I . . . . .	45
Results Related to Hypothesis II . . . . .	45
Results Related to Hypothesis III . . . . .	47
Results Related to Hypothesis IV . . . . .	48
Results Related to Hypothesis V . . . . .	49
Results Related to Hypothesis VI . . . . .	50
Results Related to Hypothesis VII . . . . .	51
Results Related to Hypothesis VIII . . . . .	53
Results Related to Hypothesis IX . . . . .	54
Relationship Between Predictor Variables . . . . .	55
Summary of the Findings . . . . .	58

Chapter	Page
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	59
Church Attendance . . . . .	60
Family Income . . . . .	60
Grade Average . . . . .	61
Life Position . . . . .	62
Marital Status of Parents . . . . .	63
Sibling Order . . . . .	64
Summary . . . . .	64
VI. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	66
Summary . . . . .	66
Recommendations . . . . .	67
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	70
APPENDIX A - DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS . . . . .	81
APPENDIX B - SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES . . . . .	101

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. I.Q. Correlations Between the Stanford-Binet, L-M, and SIT . . . . .	39
II. Correlations Between Emotions and Existential Position Inventory Scores . . . . .	43
III. Observed Distribution of Church Attendance for Seriousness of Offense Categories . . . . .	46
IV. Observed Distribution of Family Income for Seriousness of Offense Categories . . . . .	47
V. Observed Distribution of Grade Average for Seriousness of Offense Categories . . . . .	48
VI. Observed Distribution of Intelligence Test Scores for Seriousness of Offense Categories . . . . .	49
VII. Observed Distribution of Life Positions for Seriousness of Offense Categories . . . . .	50
VIII. Observed Marital Status of Parents for Seriousness of Offense Categories . . . . .	51
IX. Observed Distribution of Reading Grade Level For Seriousness of Offense Categories . . . . .	52
X. Observed Distribution of Sex for Seriousness of Offense Categories . . . . .	53
XI. Observed Distribution of Birth Order for Seriousness of Offense Categories . . . . .	54
XII. Means and Standard Deviations for Variables . . . . .	56
XIII. Chi-Square Summary Table . . . . .	57
XIV. Observed Distribution of I.Q. Scores for Family Income Categories . . . . .	102
XV. Observed Distribution of Reading Level Scores for Family Income Categories . . . . .	102

Table	Page
XVI. Observed Distribution of Grades for Family Income Categories . . . . .	103
XVII. Observed Distribution of Church Attendance for Family Income Categories . . . . .	103
XVIII. Observed Distribution of Reading Level for I.Q. Score Categories . . . . .	104
XIX. Observed Distribution of Grades for I.Q. Score Categories . . . . .	104
XX. Observed Distribution of Grade Average for Reading Level Categories . . . . .	105
XXI. Observed Distribution of Grade Average for Church Attendance Categories . . . . .	105
XXII. Observed Distribution of I.Q. Scores for Sibling Order Categories . . . . .	106
XXIII. Observed Distribution of I.Q. Scores for Regularity of Church Attendance Categories . . . . .	106
XXIV. Observed Distribution of Church Attendance for Males and Females . . . . .	107
XXV. Observed Distribution of Life Position for Grade Average Categories . . . . .	107
XXVI. Observed Distribution of Life Position for Reading Level Categories . . . . .	108

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

When one looks at the statistics, it might appear that society is losing the war on crime. For example, in Oklahoma the crime rate has increased 18 per cent in the past year, and if the present trend continues, Oklahoma will see its crime rate increase by 100 per cent over the next three years. Juvenile crime increased by 1600 per cent from 1951 to 1972. It is estimated presently that 50 per cent of all crimes are committed by youth under 18 years of age (CO EDD, 1975). The Uniform Crime Reports of the Oklahoma Bureau of Investigation report that 6,069 juveniles were arrested during the first three months of 1975 (Oklahoma Bureau of Investigation, 1975).

While only a small portion of juvenile offenders later become adult criminals, many adult criminals have previously been juvenile offenders. Glueck and Glueck (1968), in a follow-up study of delinquents through ages twenty-five and thirty-one, found that 20.3 per cent of the former delinquents in their twenty-fifth year were institutionalized, as were 11.2 per cent in their thirty-first year. At both times only 0.5 per cent of the non-delinquent control group shared this fate. Robins (1958) compared 100 subjects without childhood behavior problems to 194 subjects who had been before juvenile court. Thirty years later 60 per cent of the juvenile delinquents had adult arrests not including traffic violations, and 28 per cent of

these served time in prison. Of the control group, 11 per cent had non-traffic arrests, and only one served time in prison. At this time it is estimated that 74 per cent to 85 per cent of the juveniles committed to lock up type training schools continue to commit crimes after their release (CO EDD, 1975). This appears to cast grave doubts on the effectiveness of our present juvenile treatment methods. Still, treatment and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders is accomplished far more effectively and economically than waiting until the juvenile becomes an adult who must be dealt with by the penal system (Oklahoma Council on Juvenile Delinquency Planning, 1971).

In developing more applicable treatment methods and techniques, it appears that it would be helpful to become more aware of certain sociological and psychological traits of young offenders and observe what patterns are established when these traits are compared to the seriousness of their offenses.

The corrective methods used with these youngsters vary widely according to facilities available, parents' social standing in the community, the stability of the home, or the number of previous offenses. Often little consideration is given to the seriousness of the offense; for example, recently a 14 year old girl was sent to a state training school for girls because she ran away from home, while a 17 year old boy who committed three felony burglaries was assigned to a social worker and allowed to live at home (Payne County Juvenile Court Records, 1975).

Persons in the youth counseling professions need to take a closer look at the form of treatment offered to juveniles once they become entangled in the juvenile justice system. A number of studies

(Fannin and Clinard, 1965; Reckless, 1957; Schwartz and Tangri, 1965; Dinitz, 1962) indicate that there appears to be a relationship between a person's self-concept and his tendency to act out socially. The state juvenile delinquency treatment program largely ignores the self-concept theory. Incarceration in jails and detention centers, or assignment to state training schools or group homes often tends to lower self-esteem (Oklahoma Council on Juvenile Delinquency Planning, 1971) and does not facilitate the acceptance of others (Wheeler and Inskip, 1972).

Berne (1962, 1964, 1972), Harris (1969) and other scholars of Transactional Analysis (TA), contend that certain "life positions" are related to deviant behavior. Transactional Analysis, a method of viewing our communications and actions, embraces the idea that a person's self-concept, when paired with his concept of others, accounts for many of his behavior patterns. This study sought to confirm the proposition that a relationship does exist between the type of crime committed by the juvenile and his life position, as well as other sociological factors.

#### Significance of the Study

The results of this study should have utility to the wide range of workers in juvenile corrections. It can lead to increased sensitivity to individual needs in counseling juvenile offenders. Factors which correlate highly with serious offenses can receive prime concern in the counseling sessions. While it is true that many of the social factors are unalterable, such as family income or sibling order, the counselor who is aware can assist the child in accepting the things

he can not change and finding areas in which he can excel to compensate for unchangeable factors. Youth whose test profiles correlate highly with profiles of those who commit serious offenses may receive special attention.

#### Assumptions and Limitations

Due to the informal method of handling juvenile offenders by the court and the lack of consistency in following one procedure, it was impossible to obtain a random sample of all offenders apprehended by the police. Therefore, the subjects of this study were juvenile offenders, age 14 through 17, who were referred to Payne County Youth Services from September 15, 1975 to February 15, 1976. There are no known reasons for believing that the offenders during this period of time are not typical of a much larger population of juvenile offenders. However, generalization of the results of this study to other populations should be done with caution.

No control was placed on the number of offenses a juvenile had committed; thus, two burglaries were ranked as no more serious than one. The offender was classified by the most serious offense he had committed.

In determining sibling order, no provision was made for families in which a long period of time elapsed between sibling births. For example, a boy whose next older sibling was 12 years older may function as an only child, while in reality he is the youngest child. It was assumed that this occurrence was so infrequent that it did not significantly affect the results of this study.

A limitation of the study is the small sample size resulting in small expected frequencies in the cells of the chi-square cross classification tables. Larger expected frequencies in the cells would have resulted in more dependable chi-square values.

#### Statement of the Problem

This study was directed to the problem of the inadequacy of information on which to build improved treatment models for juvenile law violators. The problem was to determine if relationships exist between the seriousness of the offense committed by a juvenile and nine environmental and psychological factors, including life position.

#### Nature of the Problem

Harris (1969) and others quoted in the review of the literature suggest that criminal behavior is more apt to occur in persons taking certain life positions than other life positions. Questions which may be raised are: are the more serious offenses against persons and property committed by those who take the life position "I'm OK--you're not OK?" Are the lesser offenses committed by those who have taken the "I'm not OK--you're OK" or the "I'm not OK--you're not OK" positions? Are offenses only rarely committed by those persons who accept the "I'm OK--you're OK" life position?

Several factors are thought to contribute to the life position of an individual. Exactly which of these factors are predictors of the seriousness of offenses is unclear. In addition to life position, the following variables will be examined in an attempt to determine how each factor correlates with the seriousness of the offenses:

committed by juveniles: Family income, marital status of parents, sibling order, age, I.Q., church attendance, reading level, and grade average.

### Definition of Terms

#### Seriousness of Offenses

For the purpose of this study, offenses will be arranged into four categories according to their seriousness:

1. Status offenses--those law violations which are offenses only because the person is under the age of 18, such as school truancy, beyond control of parents, or curfew violations.
2. Victimless crimes--those crimes such as gambling, possession of controlled drugs, concealed weapon, or driving under the influence of drugs.
3. Minor crimes against property--damage under \$20.
4. Serious crimes--damage to property or theft in excess of \$20 or crimes against persons such as robbery or assault.

#### Church Attendance

Attendance at any worship or church school service is considered church attendance. Four times per year is considered to be rare attendance; five through eleven times a year is occasional attendance; 12 or more times per year will be considered regular attendance.

### Family Income

Family income is the combined gross income of parents living in the home. Income of working children is not included.

### I.Q. Score

I.Q. score is the range of present intellectual functioning as determined by the score earned on the Slosson Intelligence Test (Slosson, 1963a). For our purposes the ranges used are: Scores less than 90 = below normal; 90 to 110 = normal; above 110 = above normal.

### Juvenile Offender

For the purpose of this study, any person of the ages 14 through 17 who has violated a law and has been apprehended by the police. This shall not include traffic offenses.

### Life Positions

In this study, life position will be determined by scores earned on the Existential Position Inventory (Allen, 1973). Harris (1969) separates all concepts of self into two categories at opposite extremes of the continuum:

1. I am OK.
2. I am not OK.

People also perceive others as persons of worth, whom they can accept and trust, or as persons without worth who are not to be trusted. Children are assumed to generalize a few early interpersonal experiences to all persons:

1. You (all) are OK.
2. You (all) are not OK.

The combination of these convictions about self and others yield the four basic life positions that indicate whether or not an individual accepts himself and others. These four life positions are:

- Position 1 - I'm not OK . . . . . You're OK  
 Position 2 - I'm OK . . . . . You're not OK  
 Position 3 - I'm not OK . . . . . You're not OK  
 Position 4 - I'm OK . . . . . You're OK

#### Marital Status of Parents

For the purpose of determining role model in the home, separated parents shall be considered as divorced.

#### Reading Level

Reading level will be determined by the reading score earned on the Slosson Reading Test (Slosson, 1963b). Scores will be divided into four ranges. Scores of third grade and below will be considered defective; scores of grade levels four and five will be considered functional; scores of grade levels six and seven will be considered adequate; scores of grade eight and above will be considered good.

#### Sibling Order

In this study sibling order will be divided into four categories: (1) youngest child, (2) middle child, (3) oldest child, and (4) only child.

## Hypotheses

From the literature reviewed, the following hypotheses were formulated for testing:

1. Juvenile law violators who seldom attend church will commit offenses which are more serious than those who attend church regularly.
2. Juvenile law violators from low-income families will commit offenses which are more serious than those from high-income families.
3. Juvenile law violators who make low grades in school will commit offenses which are more serious than those who make higher grades in school.
4. Juvenile law violators who earn low scores on the Slosson Intelligence Test will commit offenses which are more serious than those who earn higher I.Q. scores.
5. Juvenile law violators' life positions, as measured by the EPI, will be significantly related to the seriousness of their offenses.
6. Juvenile law violators living with both natural parents will commit offenses which are less serious than those living in broken homes.
7. Juvenile law violators who earn low scores on the Slosson Oral Reading Test will commit offenses which are more serious than those who earn high reading scores.
8. Juvenile law violators who are male will commit offenses which are more serious than those committed by female law violators.

9. Juvenile law violators who are middle children in sibling order will commit offenses which are more serious than those who are oldest or only children.

#### Organization of the Study

This chapter served to introduce the reader to the topic being investigated. In it we explored the significance of the study, assumptions and limitations, the statement of the problem, the definition of terms, and the hypotheses. A review of related literature and research is contained in Chapter II. Chapter III, Design and Methodology, identifies the subjects, the data gathering procedure, the variables, and the analysis of the data. In Chapter IV, the findings and results of the study are presented. Chapter V is a discussion of the meaning of the results of the study. Chapter VI contains the summary and recommendations.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the current literature related to this study is organized into four categories: (1) environmental factors, especially family income, marital status, sibling order and church attendance; (2) inherent factors of I.Q. and sex; (3) educational factors of school grades and reading level; and (4) self concept and life position. The review of the literature of the life position variable will encompass the historical development of the concept of self-esteem and the Transactional Analysis theory of life position. This treatment is necessary in order for the reader to familiarize himself with these concepts as they are dealt with later in the study.

Perhaps the most extensive studies of juvenile delinquents with the emphasis on prediction have been done by Glueck and Glueck (1950, 1952, 1959, 1962, 1966, 1968, 1970). Their early studies focused on the effectiveness of various forms of peno-correctional treatment. In 1939 they turned their attention to the study of causation, with a view to determining the basis for crime preventive programs and effective therapy. The Gluecks (1950) explored over 400 factors in their attempt to isolate variables which were highly correlated with delinquency. They report an extensive study done in Boston in the late 1940's with a population of 500 seriously delinquent boys who had been committed to correctional schools. A control group of 500

non-delinquent boys matched for type of neighborhood, age, general intelligence, and ethnic origin was used for comparison. While the age of these studies might cause one to question their value, the extensiveness (over 400 traits and factors explored) and a follow-up study (Glueck and Glueck, 1970) conducted twenty years later contribute to its relevance.

Cavan (1969, p. 11) criticized the Gluecks' study in that the control group of 500 non-delinquent boys were "fully as deviant as the delinquent group, but in the opposite direction." These boys were chosen because of their exemplary behavior and are the type often referred to by society in general as "teacher's pets, brains, wet blankets, or squares." These overconforming boys tended to be neurotic, fearful of defeat, and submissive to authority. Perhaps, as Cavan suggests, a comparison of traits of delinquents and non-delinquents would be more productive with a control group of boys with normal conformity.

Nevertheless, the Gluecks isolated many factors which were related to juvenile delinquency and developed the "Glueck Social Prediction Table" which has been validated by other studies (Craig and Glick, 1965; Trevvett, 1965). As each of the variables of this study are discussed in the review of the literature, the Gluecks' findings will be included.

#### Environmental Factors

The Gluecks' (1950) investigation reveals slightly better economic conditions in families of non-delinquents. In their sample, by far the largest proportion of both groups of families were in marginal

circumstances, and none of the families, either among the delinquents or non-delinquents could maintain its standard of living beyond six months in the event of loss of income. They found the average weekly income per person was lower in families of delinquents (\$7.60: \$9.88). Twice as many families of delinquents (21.1%: 11.6%) received assistance from public or private agencies.

Craig and Glick (1965) were successful in validating the Glueck Social Prediction Table on a sample of 301 boys. An analysis of factors associated with delinquency revealed that among families of delinquents there were more families receiving financial assistance for longer periods of time.

Wheeler (1971) contends that economic stress is a major factor in child neglect and delinquency. He found that 78 per cent of the dependent and neglected children in the Los Angeles Juvenile Court were associated with low-income families. The facts suggest that although child neglect and delinquency may not be characteristic of welfare recipients or the economically disadvantaged, a disproportionately large number of families who come to the attention of the juvenile court because of neglect or delinquency are poor. Several studies were found which examined the relationship between delinquency and social status or geographic location of the family. While they did not consider family income per se, it is assumed that these variables are related.

Tribble (1972) studied sixty households selected from four socio-economic areas in a Canadian city in an effort to determine whether law-violating behavior by juveniles is distributed randomly throughout socio-economic strata. A self reporting questionnaire was employed to

measure delinquency. The higher the socio-economic status of the juvenile, the lower the probability that he will admit law violation.

However, several investigators have found that there is little relationship between socio-economic status and delinquency. Kratcoski (1975), using a self-report delinquency questionnaire administered to 11th and 12th grade students in public high schools, found that delinquent behavior and unruly behavior show virtually no difference between "upper and middle class" and "lower and working class" categories. Stephenson (1973) also found poverty as a cause of delinquency to be an "unsubstantiated myth." When the homes of 500 children referred to Family and Children's Court in Vancouver, B.C. in 1966 were plotted on a map, they were found to be scattered diffusely throughout the city in both middle and lower class areas.

Other researchers report that low economic delinquency and middle or high income delinquency can be distinguished by the types of delinquent acts which may suggest two different sets of causitive factors. In a survey of 4,000 adolescent students (Lake City Study) plus data from The 1967 National Survey of Youth for 847 youth, Faine (1975) found that social class status was not strongly related to delinquent behavior; however, in the Lake City Study, delinquent behavior increased in frequency with social status for less serious activities.

Tobias (1970) conducted a study in a midwestern suburban community to determine the predominant types of misconduct in which the affluent suburban delinquent involves himself. He classified offenses into two categories according to seriousness. "Very serious" offenses were those such as criminal homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft. "Less serious" offenses were those

such as other assaults, buying stolen property, carrying a weapon, sex offenses, possession of drugs, disorderly conduct, traffic violations, vandalism, joy riding and running away. Tobias found that middle and upper-middle class delinquents were more involved in less serious types of offenses. Eighty per cent of the offenses of the suburban delinquents were "less serious;" 20 per cent were "very serious." Conversely, among lower-class urban delinquents, 72 per cent of their offenses were "very serious" and 28 per cent were "less serious."

Fannin and Clinard (1965) compared a group of lower-class and a group of middle-class institutionalized delinquents in regard to physical violence; i.e., assaults and robberies. Eighty-four per cent of all lower-class delinquents had committed at least one such violent offense compared to 28 per cent of the middle-class delinquents.

Rather than viewing the problem of poverty and income level as primary predictors of delinquency, Gold (1963) studied the link of social status as it influences occupational aspiration and delinquency. He explored the hypothesis that membership in lower class and working class groups is causally linked to greater vulnerability to delinquency through (1) low prestige value of the father's occupation which has a direct effect on family cohesiveness, and (2) the anticipation of occupational failure or status deprivation. Gold's study was conducted in Flint, Michigan and compared a sample of recidivist delinquents with a control group of non-delinquents. The two groups were matched for age, sex, race, I.Q., and father's occupation.

Gold assumes that in families in which the father has a low prestige occupation, family capacity to control the child's behavior

is reduced. In comparison with non-delinquents, repeated delinquents significantly less often reported doing things with their parents, taking their personal problems to adults, agreeing with their parents about standards of behavior, accepting parental advice in the choice of friends and regarding their fathers as adult role models. There was no significant difference between the delinquents and the non-delinquents in their perceived chances of getting the kind of job they desired. Gold's studies seem to indicate that family cohesiveness is a primary factor in delinquency.

A major element of the closeness of the family is the parental make up of the home. Numerous studies have been conducted on the effects of broken homes and single parent homes on the conduct of children. The Gluecks' early studies (1950) indicated that a lower proportion of delinquent boys than non-delinquents are making their homes with both their natural parents.

Later studies by Craig and Click (1965) and Stephenson (1973) confirmed that the broken home is a factor in juvenile delinquency. Gerrish (1975) found that of 100 boys in a state training school, 78 were from broken homes.

A study by Silverman and Dinitz (1974) investigated the thesis that mother-based homes generate problems of compulsive masculinity. A population of 284 boys aged 14 to 19 who had been placed in a state juvenile correctional facility were tested. Findings indicated that boys from homes in which the mother was head of the household had the most exaggerated perceptions of their own manliness and toughness. They placed great emphasis on tough behavior such as carrying weapons, kicking a fallen opponent, drinking, and maintaining a reputation as a

tough guy. They were more compulsive, more hostile, and more apt to engage in excitement oriented, high risk activities. This study could be criticized for the lack of control over racial-cultural pressures on minority youth to act out in the manner described.

Datesman and Scarpitti (1975) explored the detrimental effects of broken homes on females. It was found that females referred to the juvenile court for ungovernability and running away were more likely to come from broken homes than were males. The authors contend that ungovernability and running away are primary reactions to a confused home situation. Females are more accustomed to supervision and management by parents than are males. Therefore, they suggest the effects of family disorganization are more acute for females.

In the late 19th century, researchers noted the phenomenon of birth order (Galton, 1874), and Adler (1945) argued that a child's birth order might well make a deep imprint on his personality. Since then numerous theories have been advanced to explain repeated findings (many of which are contradictory) that sibling order effects a wide array of behaviors from thumb sucking (Johnson, 1975) to schizophrenia (Schooler, 1964). This review of the literature will, therefore, be limited to studies with a possible link to delinquency.

Some factors which may account for sibling order behavior differences are (1) physiological factors, such as intrauterine and perinatal influences (Weller, 1965) and the mother's age; and (2) family interactions that differ for different children in the same family. Theoretically, first children may receive more adult attention and have only adult role models. On the other hand, the attitude of the mother tends to be less anxious with later born children (Lasko,

1954; Sears, 1950) and they have older siblings as role models.

Because the first born child acquires sex-role expectation primarily through interaction with parents, first borns may be oriented toward adults (McDonald, 1969). The later born child interacts with older siblings because he identifies more easily with them. Consequently, the later borns should be oriented toward peers (Schacter, 1964). Therefore, Bragg and Allen (1970) hypothesize that social pressure from peers should be greater for later borns than for first borns. They examined sex-roles, birth order, and conformity to a same-sex peer group. They found highest conformity in later born females with a same-sex sibling, and least conformity for later born males with a same-sex sibling. They explained this as follows:

We posit that the effect of birth order on conforming behavior is mediated by sex-role expectations: in our society, conformity is viewed as appropriate sex-role behavior for females, and independence is seen as more appropriate sex-role behavior for males (p. 372).

Schwartz (1976) investigated the relationship between birth order, sex of sibling, and the stage of moral development in a sample of college males. It was found that moral judgment was enhanced when subjects were either second born or had a sister for a sibling. The experimental group which scored lowest on moral judgment was the older brothers of a brother.

Gilmore and Zigler (1964) conducted a study in which first borns and later borns played a simple marble game in both support and non-support conditions. They found that first borns had less need for social reinforcers when such reinforcers were readily available, supporting the hypothesis that first born children are more satiated on social reinforcers than later born children. They state:

The social reinforcement satiation view of first borns appears capable of explaining the heightened dependency of such individuals upon the contact and opinions of others when placed in stressful situations. As noted earlier, the caretaking experiences of the child continuously satiated on social reinforcers are such that the learning of more mature mechanisms for handling stress is hindered (p. 199).

These findings confirmed those of Staples and Walters (1961) and Becker and Carroll (1962) that first borns were more susceptible to social influence and responsive to the suggestions of others. Similarly, Schacter (1959) had found a dependency for first born and only children expressed by their being considerably more likely to want to be with other people during conditions of experimentally induced anxiety than were later borns.

Hypothesizing from earlier studies that first borns would be more concerned about behaving in a socially desirable manner, P. Johnson (1973) administered the Crowne and Marlowe's Social Desirability Scale to 80 college students. Results indicated that first borns did score significantly higher in social desirability than later borns.

Smart (1965) found a greater need for affiliation among first born males which was reflected in a greater number of club memberships. However, there was no birth order difference in females' club memberships. Schacter (1964) found that first borns, more than later borns, preferred to associate with popular peers and chose their friends more in conformity with normative choices. Interestingly, first borns were found to be considerably less popular than later borns.

After reviewing the research, Schacter (1963) concluded that eminent people are far more likely to have been eldest or only children. Possibly related to this, and also the subject of several

studies, is the finding that first borns have higher needs for achievement than later borns. Sampson (1962) found a higher achievement need among first borns and Schacter (1963) discovered that first borns are over represented in graduate schools. Montgomery, Puetz and Montgomery (1975) found that at the University of Missouri, 88.1 per cent of all graduate students were first born.

In recent years, little research has been done in the area of sibling order and delinquency or problem behavior. Sletto (1934) investigated this relationship. Seven hundred eighty-six delinquent boys were matched with 786 non-delinquent boys with respect to age and number of siblings. There was no significant difference in the number of first born and later born children (only children were excluded) among the delinquents.

Rosenow and Whyte (1931) studied ordinal position of problem children at child guidance clinics. They found that first borns in two-child families were over represented and last borns in three-child families were under represented. McCord, McCord and Zola (1959) found a greater per cent of boys who were middle children were convicted of crimes than in any other sibling order position.

Schacter (1959) presented data to support his hypothesis that more later born children would become alcoholics, since alcoholism may be considered a withdrawal response to stress. However, Smart (1963) examined the birth order of 242 alcoholics and found no over representation of any birth order position.

Finally, although the sibling order variable has been the subject of a great deal of research, Unruh (1971) calls for a word of caution:

. . . many investigators do not appear sufficiently cognizant of the fact that birth order is not in and of itself a psychological variable . . . . Differences in performance between first and later borns are not finally attributed to birth order per se, but rather to differences in social-psychological events experienced by the two types of children (p. 1162).

Religious affiliation, according to the data reviewed, appears to be related to family characteristics which are not conducive to delinquency of the children. The Gluecks (1950), without exploring reasons for the differences, found that non-delinquent boys attended church more regularly than did delinquent boys. Sixty-seven per cent of the non-delinquent boys attended church regularly compared to 39 per cent of the delinquent boys. Their data is twenty-five years old and may or may not be valid today; however, it is included here as an example of previous research with this variable.

The question which appears to need clarification is: are families who participate regularly in a religious community happier and more closely knit, or is the more actively religious family true to the common stereotype of the dogmatic, authoritarian father which would not facilitate the rearing of warm, responsible, nonrebellious children?

In a study by Landis (1960) of 3,000 students at Berkeley, California, findings indicated a positive relationship between the student's self-concept and a devoutly religious home. This finding was more true for females than for males. Landis also found that "family religiousness is positively associated with reporting that religious belief is a reason for refraining from having premarital sexual relations" (p. 346). This finding did not hold true for Jews, but only for Catholics and Protestants.

Stark (1971) reported that psychiatric patients are five times more likely to claim no religious affiliation than is the general population. He also presented evidence that refutes the popular belief that people from conservative protestant backgrounds are authoritarian.

A study by M. Johnson (1973) reinforced Landis' (1960) findings. Johnson found that students from religious families viewed their families as happier, close knit, accepting and communicative, and they had more respect for parental values than did non-religious students. It is assumed that all these virtues contribute to non-delinquent behavior.

#### Inherent Factors

Haskell and Yablonsky (1970) state that girls' and boys' offenses differ in both number and type of offenses. According to Uniform Crime Reports (F.B.I., 1967), boys were referred to juvenile courts four times more often than girls.

Similarly, Faine (1975) surveyed 847 youths who were asked to self-report their misconduct and found that males participated in delinquent behavior nearly twice as frequently as females. He also found that delinquency among boys tended to increase with age while female delinquency tended to decrease with age.

Kratcoski and Kratcoski (1975) contend that the high percentage of boys who break into buildings, engage in fist fights, destroy property and have premarital sex relations is a result of the male's effort to prove his masculinity.

The type of offenses with which boys are charged tend to be overt, aggressive in form, and harmful to others. Girls, on the other hand, are brought to court principally on the basis of petitions alleging incorrigible behavior, running away, petty larceny, and sex offenses (Haskell and Yablonsky, 1970, p. 279).

Morris (1964) and Dahl (1972) suggest that girls are effected to a greater extent than boys by broken homes as a predisposing factor in delinquent conduct, since the interests of girls are more closely linked to family life. It is believed that boys resort to delinquency when they encounter obstacles to economic power status. Girls are more likely to become involved in delinquent activity when positive affected relationships are not available in the home. Morris' hypothesis was confirmed by Datesman and Scarpitti (1975, pp. 37, 39):

The effects of family disorganization are more acute for females than for males, who are accustomed to less supervision and management by parents. . . .

Present-day sex differentiation practices may contribute to the seemingly more deleterious effects of broken homes on females in the case of ungovernability and running away. . . . A parental request for court intervention is likely to occur in the case of a daughter who engages in overt sexual activity . . . or staying away from home. Similar behavior on the part of their male children is more likely to be regarded by parents as mere boyish foolery.

Therefore, the differences in the ratio of male and female offenders may be partly due to the more docile, dependent role traditionally taken by females in our society. Further, a portion of the difference may be attributed to differential treatment by the community, enforcement persons, and courts (Clark and Haurek, 1966).

Using self-report anonymous questionnaires, Clark and Haurek (1966) found that of 1116 public school students, the sex ratio of admitted offenses was not so much higher<sup>2</sup> for boys than for girls. For example, the sex ratio for major theft was only 1.4:1. They suggest

that sex ratios based on official statistics considerably exaggerate the greater male propensity for occasional misconduct. However, it is probable that official statistics accurately reflect the sex ratio for chronic offenders, since these cases are most often dealt with by the courts.

The findings regarding the relationship between intelligence scores and acting out behavior are conflicting. Weiss and Sampliner (1944) studied 189 adolescent first offenders. They found a distribution of intelligence scores closely approximating that of the general population. Also, Stephenson (1973) reported her findings failed to support an association between delinquency and low intelligence scores.

In contrast, Wolfgang, Figlio and Sellin (1972) found that recidivists experienced the greatest school and residential mobility, attained the lowest I.Q. scores and achievement levels, and completed the smallest number of school years when compared with non-offenders. However, the relationships of all these variables to delinquency could possibly be explained by their relationship to the variable of race or socio-economic status.

Wilgosh and Paitich (1974) concluded that there were no great differences between I.Q. scores of juveniles who committed serious crimes and those who were charged with non-serious offenses. Contradicting this is a study by Dalh (1972) of serious and minor offenses in which she found that the type of offense did vary with intelligence test scores. Children who committed the minor offenses tended to score higher on an intelligence test. Gerrish (1975) found that delinquents with lower I.Q. scores committed more violent crimes, while those with higher I.Q. scores were more attracted to alcohol.

An interesting relationship was found by Pierce (1975) between self-acceptance and intelligence scores.

Delinquents with above average intelligence were as self-accepting as non-delinquents of above-average intelligence. But delinquents with lower intelligence levels were not as self-accepting as non-delinquents of the same intelligence (p. 713).

#### Educational Factors

While researchers disagree as to the relationship between intelligence scores and delinquency, a study by Freeman and Savastano (1970) examined affluent youthful offenders from middle class intact homes and found them to be under achievers in school. Of 18 boys tested, 10 had I.Q. scores over 119, three were in the 100-109 range, three were between 95 and 99, and two ranged from 90 to 94. Their school achievement did not correspond with their measured intellectual ability. Over half of the boys had difficulty in grade school, and only one boy was not considered a school problem. It is interesting that they began to show difficulties in school at an early age. Phillips (1975) also reported that school status is positively related to attitude toward school, negatively related to involvement in an anti-school sub-group, and negatively related to deviant behavior.

The findings of Senna, Rathus, and Seigel (1974) conflict with the above conclusions. They found that poor academic performance per se explains less than five per cent of the delinquent variance in suburbia.

The early studies of the Gluecks (1950) indicated school difficulties for delinquents. On the average, the grade level attained by non-delinquents was one year higher, considering age, than that of the

delinquent. Of the delinquents, 41 per cent made poor grades (D and below) during the last full school year compared to only eight per cent of the non-delinquents.

The Gluecks' (1950) study also revealed that delinquents had a significantly lower reading achievement than did non-delinquents. This view was supported by King (1975) in his study of nine youths who had committed homicide. King attributed these violent acts to the youths' difficulty in mastering reading and language skills, which resulted in their over-reliance on feelings in dealing with life. Violence was seen as the coping behavior of the frustrated, alienated youth. King suggests re-education in communication skills as rehabilitative treatment.

Hogenson (1974) also found a significant relationship between reading under achievement and aggression. His study of 96 boys in state training schools was unable to correlate aggression with age, family size, number of parents in the home, rural versus urban environment, socio-economic status, minority group membership or religious preference. Only reading failure was found to correlate with aggression.

Fein et al. (1975) had similar findings in their study of 307 urban children in the second through the sixth grades. A relationship was found between reading achievement and self-esteem for boys at each grade level, but no such relationship existed for girls.

## Life Position: Concept of Self and Others

### Self-Concept Theory

At this point it seems appropriate to review briefly a few theories of self-concept. It is not intended that this will be an exhaustive study, but rather that it will present a few viewpoints on the subject.

Carl Rogers was one of the earliest writers to be concerned extensively with the self-concept as it relates to mental health. He defines concept of self as:

The organized consistent conceptual Gestalt composed of perceptions of the characteristics of the 'I' or 'me' and the perceptions of the relationships of the 'I' or 'me' to others and the various aspects of life, together with the values attached to these perceptions (Patterson, 1966, p. 407).

Sullivan (1947) uses the term "personification" to mean an image that an individual has of himself. It includes a complex of feelings, attitudes and conceptions that grows out of experiences with need satisfaction and anxiety. According to Sullivan, a person's self image may not be accurate since it is used to protect him from criticism and anxiety. In this instance, although reducing anxiety, it may prevent the person from making objective judgments of his behavior and interfere with his ability to live constructively with others.

Sullivan's theory of self-system also encompasses one's concept of those around him. A satisfying relationship with another person tends to build up a favorable picture of that person and may be generalized to others like that person. Likewise, unpleasant or anxiety producing experiences one has in his contacts with another person will cause one to avoid that person and personify that person

as a bad or "not OK" person.

These pictures that we carry around in our heads are rarely accurate descriptions of the people to whom they refer. They are formed in the first place in order to cope with people in fairly isolated interpersonal situations, but once formed they usually persist and influence our attitudes towards other people (Hall and Lindzey, 1970, p. 143).

Thus, a person who sees authority figures, such as teachers, employers, and policemen, as a threat may be projecting to them his personification of his father as mean and dictatorial.

Combs and Snygg (1959) suggest that an individual has countless concepts of self or ways of viewing himself. The organization of all the ways an individual has of seeing himself we call the phenomenal self, also referred to by Combs as the perceived self. It is himself, from his own point of view.

#### Self-Concept and Delinquency

A study done by Fannin and Clinard (1965) states that a person has many self-conceptions, not simple one. "A person conceives of himself as a male . . . as a son, an engineer, attractive, likeable, and so on" (p. 206). In their study, the conception of self as a male, held by lower class compared to middle class delinquents, was probed by informal depth interviewing and by forced choice scales. While self-conceptions were found to be quite similar between the two groups, other implications were noteworthy. The data suggested that a significant proportion of offenses involving physical violence may be committed by delinquents who stress certain "masculine" traits in their self-conceptions as males, which helps channel and legitimize such violence.

Reckless and his associates conducted several studies dealing with the prediction of delinquency. Early studies (Reckless, 1956, 1957) suggested that insulation against delinquency is a function of acquisition of an acceptable self-concept. The proposition that adverse concepts of self and others might set the trend toward delinquency was tested among 6th grade white boys in the highest delinquency area of Columbus, Ohio. Boys nominated by teachers as headed for contact with police and courts were compared with classmates nominated as likely to avoid such contacts ("insulated boys"). All boys and their mothers were interviewed with questionnaires containing: (1) delinquency vulnerability and social responsibility scales from Gough California Inventory; (2) items on self-concept with regard to legal behavior; (3) evaluation of family affectional pattern; (4) friendship and leisure patterns; and (5) (boys only) occupational preference scale of Gough California Inventory. Findings include: (1) 8.3 per cent of insulated boys and 23 per cent of boys headed for contact with courts had had some law enforcement contact; (2) fewer insulated than predicted delinquent boys were from broken homes, but otherwise social characteristics of the two groups did not differ significantly; (3) insulated boys had significantly lower delinquency vulnerability scores and significantly higher social responsibility scores; and (4) insulated boys had more acceptable self-concept as evidenced by lesser expectation of jail or court contact, desire to avoid trouble, conceptions of selves as obedient sons, etc. It was proposed that a socially appropriate or inappropriate concept of self and others is the basic component that steers youth from or toward delinquency.

Four years later 70 of the original 101 "bad" boys and 103 of the 125 "good" boys were relocated and reassessed (Dinitz, Scarpitti, and Reckless, 1962). Only four of the "good" boys had had one minor complaint for delinquency each; 27 of the "bad" boys could be called seriously delinquent. They draw the following conclusion:

In our quest to discover what insulates a boy against delinquency in a high delinquency area, we believe we have some tangible evidence that a good self-concept . . . veers slum boys away from delinquency, while a poor self-concept, a product of unfavorable socialization, gives the slum boy no resistance to deviancy, delinquent companions, or delinquent sub-culture (p. 162).

Schwartz and Tangri (1965) conducted a similar study to answer, among other things, whether a group of nominated "good boys" and a group of nominated "bad boys" can be distinguished in terms of quality of self-concept. All 6th grade boys in an all black school in the highest delinquency area in Detroit were nominated by their teachers and principals as either "good" or "bad," i.e., to distinguish which boys they felt would never have police or court contacts, and which they felt would have such contacts. Groups were compared with the use of semantic differential form and the "good boys" were found to have a more positive self-concept than the "bad boys."

Balester (1956) compared a delinquent group and a non-delinquent group in regard to self-concept. He found that the scores of most individuals were positive, but that maladjusted individuals had positive scores of lesser magnitude than adjusted individuals.

Amos (1963) investigated to determine whether the delinquent boy's self-estimate was as realistic as the self-estimate of the non-delinquent boy. He found that there was no difference between delinquent and non-delinquent boys in the accuracy in which they estimated

their academic and social ability, but there was a difference in the accuracy in which they estimated their physical ability. Delinquents tended to over estimate their physical ability. It was theorized that a realistic self-concept might help insulate against delinquency while an unreal concept of self might assist in the development of delinquency. However, there was conflicting evidence in regard to the effect of the number of delinquent offenses on the accuracy of a boy's self-concept.

Haskell and Yablonsky (1970) feel that a youngster's self-concept is influenced to a large extent by the labels society places on him:

To attribute certain abstract characteristics and predictions of delinquency to certain individuals or groups could possibly influence these persons to accept the ascribed roles, a self-fulfilling prophecy. Applying labels and epithets such as 'juvenile delinquent' and 'young criminal' does not help anyone to think well of himself. Active, aggressive, impetuous, sometimes violent and irrational behavior does not automatically mean that a child is a junior public enemy. Equating healthy defiance with delinquency may encourage a child to think of himself as a delinquent (p. 289).

Peek (1975) attempted to determine if it were possible to change the self-concept of delinquents. Forty-eight non-institutionalized, but adjudicated delinquents attended eight ninety minute sessions in which trained counselors used Transactional Analysis as a treatment strategy to modify self-concept. It was concluded that the treatment was effective in changing the self-concept in a positive direction, as measured by certain self-concept scales. However, the experimental group was not significantly different from the control group on a thirty-day follow-up post test, indicating that the changes were generally short term.

### Transactional Analysis Life Positions

Each of the four transactional analysis life positions has been described by various theorists according to the characteristics of persons taking each life position. While there is not complete agreement as to the characteristics of each life position, the following discussion includes the most important ideas.

I'm not OK--You're OK. Berne (1964) describes this position as the psychologically depressive position of losers. Tamm (1972) found subjects who held this position had higher social class backgrounds and moved less often. They had poor perceptions of their parents, were not as active sexually, and had a tendency to become depressed. James and Jongeward (1971) explain that this is a common position of persons who feel powerless when they compare themselves with others. This leads them to withdraw, to experience depression, and in severe cases, to become suicidal. Similarly, Allen (1973) reported his subjects in this position reported more anxiety and depression, and less positive emotion.

I'm OK--You're not OK. Berne (1964) describes this as the "arrogant" position. These are persons who sneer at their spouses, send their children to juvenile hall, and sit in groups and find fault. According to Harris (1969) this position is a result of cruel and abusive treatment at a very early age. Harris has stated:

As he grows older he begins to strike back. He has seen toughness and knows how to be tough. He also has permission (in his parent) to be tough and to be cruel. Hatred sustains him although he may learn to conceal it with a mask of politeness. . . . He is unable to be objective about his own complicity in what happens to him. It is always 'their fault.' It's 'all them.' Incurable criminals occupy this position. They are persons 'without a conscience' who are convinced that

they are OK no matter what they do and that the total fault in every situation lies in others (p. 49).

Tamm (1972) found these subjects to be more intellectual, more liberal and less active in institutional participation. They tended to come from low income families and broken homes. James and Jongeward (1971) explain that these persons feel victimized and persecuted and blame others for their miseries. Criminals and delinquents often have this position. Paranoid behavior would be common for this position and in extreme cases may lead to homicide.

I'm not OK--You're not OK. According to Berne (1964) this is the position of the schizophrenic; the futility position. James and Jongeward (1971) say that these persons lose interest in living and may commit suicide or homicide. Tamm (1972) found that these subjects tended to have higher residential mobility, came from broken homes, and had fathers with high education and mothers with low education. They saw their parents as unappreciative, unaffectionate, inconsistent and permissive. Allen (1973) found persons in this position were most poorly adjusted.

I'm OK--You're OK. Berne (1964) describes this as a healthy position. Persons either grow into this position early in life or must consciously strive to attain it in later life. Allen (1973) found these subjects best adjusted with more positive emotion and less anxiety and depression. These subjects in Tamm's (1972) study seemed to have come from family environments that were more religious, peaceful, consistent, accepting, affectionate, non-authoritarian, and non-materialistic. They were quite sexually active and, interestingly, tended to have a higher arrest frequency. They saw themselves as

being more fun loving, care-free, empathetic and emotionally stable. Findings of James and Jongeward (1971) support this as the healthy position of a person who accepts the significance of other people and can solve his problems constructively.

It is Harris' (1969) belief that early in childhood, the child decides on one of the first three positions. He is then governed by these concepts of himself and others for the rest of his life unless he later consciously changes to the fourth life position, I'm OK-- You're OK.

#### Summary

The review of current literature and research contained in Chapter II explores four categories of variables as they relate to behavior, especially delinquent behavior.

Of the environmental factors, socio-economic status received much attention. Most researchers established that there was more delinquency among low-income families; some recent research concludes that the type of offense varies with social status. It was further suggested that the status of the father's occupation contributed to deviant behavior. Broken homes were generally found to contribute to delinquency, being a larger factor in female delinquency than in male delinquency. Conflicting conclusions were reached as to the relationship of birth order to various personality characteristics and behavior. Church affiliation was found to contribute to the stability of the home; however, one could not conclude from the literature that there is a direct relationship between church attendance and delinquency.

Research involving the inherent factors of sex and intelligence test scores contained contradictory findings. Boys were referred to courts more than girls, and most researchers found that type of offense varies with sex. Most studies found little relationship between intelligence scores and delinquency, but three studies indicated a relationship between I.Q. scores and type of offense. Previous research of educational factors confirmed that more delinquents than non-delinquents had poor school achievement and low reading levels.

Self-concept research indicated that children with a positive self-concept were less likely to get into trouble with law enforcement agencies. A review of the theory about life positions indicates that the most serious crimes might be committed by persons taking the "I'm OK--You're not OK" life position.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine if relationships exist between the criterion variable, seriousness of offense committed by the juvenile, and nine psychological and environmental predictor variables. This chapter will provide a thorough description of all procedures used in this investigation.

#### Subjects

The subjects for this study were juveniles, aged 14 through 17, who were arrested for law violations other than traffic offenses and who were referred to Payne County Youth Services by the Payne County Juvenile Court or Law Enforcement Agencies during the period between September 15, 1975 and February 15, 1976. This consisted of a total of 53 juveniles. Because of parental opposition to testing, or fear of jeopardizing the counseling relationship, or removal of the child from the community, five of the youths were omitted from the study. The subjects in the present investigation consists of 38 boys and 10 girls.

#### Data Gathering Procedure

In the case of offenders below the age of 18, the established procedure for the juvenile justice system in Payne County is to

request an investigation of home and circumstances by Youth Services. A home study is completed, and Youth Services reports back to the referring agency with a recommendation for treatment. It was during the investigation period after the initial court appearance that the testing for this study was accomplished. In most cases, testing was completed within 30 days after the referral; testing was never done on the day of a court appearance when the subject was possibly under emotional stress.

Subjects were divided into four categories according to the seriousness of their offense. Data concerning regularity of church attendance, family income, sibling order, grade average, sex, and marital status of parents was gathered verbally from each subject and recorded on the "Juvenile Court Questionnaire" (see Appendix A). Additionally, the Slosson Intelligence Test (Slosson, 1963a), the Slosson Oral Reading Test (Slosson, 1963b), and the Existential Position Inventory (O.K. Questionnaire) (Allen, 1973) were individually administered in the order listed to each subject as measures of intelligence, reading level, and life position.

#### Instrumentation

The three test instruments used in this study were selected on the basis of their applicability to the variables of intelligence, reading level, and life-position; their ease of administration and their promise to limit the total testing time to 90 minutes per subject.

### Slosson Intelligence Test

The Slosson Intelligence Test (SIT) (Slosson, 1963A) is an individually verbally administered scale which yields a single intelligence score. The scale is easily and quickly administered and scored. No reading or writing is required by the subject. The format for scoring follows that of the Stanford-Binet, utilizing the concept of basal age. All questions are presented verbally and require verbal responses. Item content stresses vocabulary, mathematical reasoning, auditory memory, and information. There are no time limits and the high ceiling makes the test sufficiently challenging for bright adolescents. While this test is not claimed to be an effective diagnostic tool, it is an adequate screening instrument to establish an approximate level of intellectual functioning (Slosson, 1963a).

Reliability. Slosson (1963a) reports test-retest reliability of .97 within a two month interval for a heterogeneous sample of 139 individuals between the ages of four and fifty. The mean I.Q. score produced by the initial tests was 99.0 and the re-test I.Q. score was 101.3. In the present study sample, estimates of internal consistency using a corrected split half method yielded a coefficient of reliability of .97.

Validity. The SIT and the Stanford-Binet, Form L-M, yielded basically the same pattern of scores when they were administered to 701 subjects. The concurrent validity of this short intelligence test is indicated by the correlations with the Stanford-Binet, Form L-M, as shown in the table below (Slosson, 1963a, p. v).

TABLE I

I.Q. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THE STANFORD-BINET, L-M, and SIT

Age	Number	r	Mean		Standard Deviation		Average Difference
			SB-LM	SIT	SB-LM	SIT	
4	27	.90	116.6	114.6	19.7	18.7	6.7
5	23	.93	102.1	101.5	20.7	18.0	5.6
6	61	.98	100.7	101.3	20.7	20.2	4.4
7	71	.98	98.9	98.4	23.5	20.9	5.9
8	44	.94	95.5	95.5	17.6	17.0	5.3
9	45	.97	100.7	100.6	25.1	23.7	5.1
10	40	.94	96.1	97.2	23.9	24.6	6.1
11	51	.96	93.1	92.6	21.4	22.0	4.9
12	36	.97	94.0	94.1	22.4	24.6	4.6
13	57	.96	96.3	97.0	23.4	24.9	5.0
14	66	.97	92.7	92.4	20.4	21.5	4.4
15	56	.94	92.7	91.7	18.8	18.2	5.1
16	39	.96	97.6	97.5	23.7	24.0	4.7
17	23	.94	106.0	106.6	16.9	16.7	5.0
18 and up	62	.97	101.7	102.5	31.8	31.2	5.9

Buros' Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook (1972) criticized Slosson for his failure to give adequate description of his standardization sample. Slosson's sample of children and adults from both rural and urban populations in New York State gave no indications of sex, ethnic membership, or educational and socio-economic characteristics. However, confidence in the test is warranted since Slosson (1963a) states that the items were adapted from recognized instruments in the field of intellectual measurement.

#### Slosson Oral Reading Test

The Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT) (Slosson, 1963b) consists of ten lists of 20 words each, graded by difficulty of the list. It is individually administered and is based on the ability of the subject to pronounce words at different levels of difficulty. The words were taken from standard school readers.

Reliability. Using a test-retest interval of one week, a reliability coefficient of .99 was obtained for the SORT. The corrected split half reliability coefficient estimate for the present study sample was .98.

Validity. Concurrent validity of the SORT was established by correlating results with the Standardized Oral Reading Paragraphs (Gray, 1915). On a sample of 108 children from first grade through high school a correlation of .96 was obtained.

### Existential Position Inventory

The Existential Position Inventory (EPI) (see Appendix A) also called the OK Questionnaire, is an unpublished test designed by Allen (1973). It is a measure of "life-position," a basic concept of Transactional Analysis. The instrument consists of 20 situations in which the subject must rate his feelings about himself (I'm OK or I'm not OK) and his feelings about others (You're OK or You're not OK). In each situation, the subject rates himself on a scale from one (very negative) to six (very positive) on three different traits. He also rates his feelings about others in the same situation. Ratings of 3.5 and below are considered to mean "I'm not OK" or "You're not OK." Ratings above 3.5 indicate "I'm OK" or "You're OK."

Allen's original instrument was designed for college age persons and contained a small number of items not applicable to high school age youth. These items were altered in the revised instrument (see Appendix A) to make it more suitable for the present study sample. An effort was made to retain the original content of the test.

Reliability. Reliability information for the EPI was not available. However, this instrument was used in the present study because of the unavailability of a proven test utilizing the life position concept.

An internal consistency reliability estimate, Cronbach's Alpha (Cronbach, 1951), was computed for the EPI as part of this study. The values for the reliability coefficients were computed separately for the life positions "I'm OK" and "You're OK." The coefficient of reliability was .97 for "I'm OK" and .94 for "You're OK."

Validity. Allen (1973) explored the validity of the EPI in a study using 111 undergraduate psychology students. Subjects were administered the EPI and the ROTTER Incomplete Sentence Blank (ISB) (Rotter, 1950). The ISB is a set of 40 sentence stems designed to measure degree of adjustment. Subjects sentence completions were scored on a scale from very well adjusted to very maladjusted. Allen concluded that high "I'm OK--You're OK" scores on the EPI had a statistically significant relationship to good adjustment, while high "I'm not OK--You're OK" and "I'm OK--You're not OK" scores were associated with maladjustment. "I'm not OK--You're not OK" scores were not significantly related to adjustment in his college sample. Allen did not specify what he considered to be high scores.

Further evidence of validity may be seen in Allen's findings of correlations between the EPI and self-reported emotions on the "Emotional Experience Checklist" (see Appendix A). High "I'm OK--You're OK" subjects reported more positive emotion, less anxiety and depression, and more boredom. High "I'm OK--You're not OK" subjects also reported less anxiety and depression and more boredom. High "I'm not OK--You're OK" subjects reported more anxiety and depression, and less positive emotion. These correlations are reported in Table II.

TABLE II  
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EMOTIONS AND EXISTENTIAL  
POSITION INVENTORY SCORES

Existential Position	<u>Emotion</u>				
	Anxiety	Positive Emotion	Anger	Depression	Boredom
General					
I + You +	-.20*	.35***	.03	-.16	-.04
I + You -	-.22*	.14	.14	-.34***	.20*
I - You +	.34***	-.28**	-.12	.34***	-.17
I - You -	-.01	-.11	-.03	.07	.04

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

\*\*\*  $p < .001$

#### Statistical Analysis

Two-way cross-classification tables were constructed and Pearson Chi-Squares computed to examine the relationships between seriousness of offense and nine predictor variables of church attendance, family income, sibling order, grade average, sex, marital status of parents, intelligence, reading level, and life position. All other two-way cross classification tables of the ten variables were also constructed and Pearson Chi-Squares were computed to determine relationships between the variables.

### Summary

Chapter III has presented a description of the procedure used in the present investigation. Forty-eight juvenile offenders aged 14 through 17 constituted the population for this study. Appropriate research instruments were administered to determine the relationship between seriousness of offense and nine predictor variables, church attendance, family income, sibling order, grade average, sex, marital status of parents, intelligence, reading level, and life position. The procedures were designed to determine if the nine hypotheses proposed in this investigation could be accepted or rejected.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The data in the present investigation was collected and analyzed as outlined in the procedures presented in Chapter III. The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings of the study.

#### Results Related to Hypothesis I

The value of chi-square computed from the frequency of church attendance by seriousness of offense contingency table was 7.73. Statistical significance at the .05 level with six degree of freedom requires a chi-square value of 12.59; thus Hypothesis I was not accepted. There was no statistically significant relationship at the .05 level between the seriousness of a juvenile's offense and the regularity of the juvenile's church attendance as shown in cross-classification Table III.

#### Results Related to Hypothesis II

The chi-square value computed from the family income by seriousness of offense contingency table was 22.49. This value was statistically significant at the .01 level. These results emphatically suggested hypothesis II was incorrect since the relationship was statistically significant in the direction opposite of that hypothesized. Examination of Table IV suggested that high income juveniles tended to commit very

serious crimes, while middle income juveniles committed more victimless crimes.

TABLE III  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE FOR  
SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Seriousness of Offense	Church Attendance			Row Total
	Number of Times per Year			
	0-4	5-11	12 or more	
1. Status Offenses	6	1	2	9
2. Victimless Crimes	10	4	4	18
3. Less than \$20 Damage	4	2	2	8
4. Felony Crimes	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>
Column Total	22	11	15	48

Chi-square value = 7.73  
Significance = .26

TABLE IV  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY INCOME FOR  
SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Seriousness of Offense	Family Income				Row Total
	Less than \$4000	\$4000 to \$7999	\$8000 to \$12,000	More Than \$12,000	
1. Status Offenses	1	5	3	0	9
2. Victimless Crimes	2	4	8	4	18
3. Less than \$20 Damage	3	2	2	1	8
4. Felony Crimes	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>13</u>
Column Total	7	11	16	14	48

Chi-square value = 22.79  
Significance = .0067

#### Results Related to Hypothesis III

There was no significant relationship at the .05 level between the seriousness of the offense committed by the juvenile and his grade average in school. A chi-square value of 7.06 resulted from the frequencies reported in Table V. The critical chi-square value significant at .05 with six degrees of freedom is 12.59. Thus, Hypothesis III was not affirmed.

TABLE V  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF GRADE AVERAGE FOR  
SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Seriousness of Offense	<u>Grade Average in School</u>					Row Total
	F	D	C	B	A	
1. Status Offenses	2	4	2	1	0	9
2. Victimless Crimes	1	6	6	5	0	18
3. Less than \$20 Damage	2	2	3	1	0	8
4. Felony Crimes	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>13</u>
Column Total	5	16	16	11	0	48

Chi-square value = 7.06  
Significance = .63

#### Results Related to Hypothesis IV

The computed chi-square value on seriousness of offense by intelligence scores (Table VI) was 7.29. Statistical significance at the .05 level with six degrees of freedom requires a chi-square value of 12.59. Hypothesis IV therefore, was not accepted. There was no statistically significant relationship at the .05 level between the seriousness of a juvenile's offense and the juvenile's intelligence as measured by the Slosson Intelligence Test (Slosson, 1963a).

TABLE VI  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF INTELLIGENCE TEST SCORES  
FOR SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Seriousness of Offense	Intelligence Test Scores			Row Total
	I.Q. Below 90	I.Q. 90-100	I.Q. Above 110	
1. Status Offenses	6	1	2	9
2. Victimless Crimes	6	9	3	18
3. Less than \$20 Damage	4	2	2	8
4. Felony Crimes	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>13</u>
Column Total	19	17	12	48

Chi-square value = 7.29  
Significance = .29

#### Results Related to Hypothesis V

There was no significant relationship at the .05 level between the seriousness of the offense committed by a juvenile and his life position (see Table VII). The chi-square value computed on the cross-classification Table VII yielded a chi-square value of 6.32. Statistical significance at the .05 level with nine degrees of freedom requires a chi-square value of 16.92. Hypothesis V, therefore, was not affirmed.

TABLE VII  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF LIFE POSITIONS FOR  
SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Seriousness of Offense	<u>Life Position</u>				Row Total
	I'm + You +	I'm - You +	I'm + You -	I'm - You -	
1. Status Offenses	7	1	1	0	9
2. Victimless Crimes	16	1	0	1	18
3. Less than \$20 Damage	5	2	1	0	8
4. Felony Crimes	<u>11</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>13</u>
Column Total	39	5	3	1	48

Chi-square value = 6.32  
Significance = .71

#### Results Related to Hypothesis VI

The value of chi-square computed from the seriousness of the offense committed by the marital status of parents contingency table was 6.36. A chi-square value of 16.92 is required to obtain statistical significance at the .05 level with nine degrees of freedom, therefore Hypothesis VI was not affirmed. There was no statistically significant relationship between the seriousness of a juvenile's offense and the

marital status of his parents, as shown in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII  
OBSERVED MARITAL STATUS OF PARENTS FOR  
SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Seriousness of Offense	Child Lives With:				Row Total
	No Natural Parent	1 Parent	1 Natural & 1 Step- Parent	2 Natural Parents	
1. Status Offenses	1	2	2	4	9
2. Victimless Crimes	1	2	3	12	18
3. Less than \$20 Damage	0	2	1	5	8
4. Felony Crimes	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>13</u>
Column Total	2	9	6	31	48

Chi-square value = 6.36

Significance = .7035

#### Results Related to Hypothesis VII

There was no statistically significant relationship at the .05 level between the seriousness of a juvenile's offense and the reading level of the juvenile. A chi-square value of 2.57 resulted from the

frequencies reported in Table IX. The critical chi-square value at the .05 level with nine degrees of freedom is 16.92; therefore, Hypothesis VII was not affirmed.

TABLE IX  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF READING GRADE LEVEL  
FOR SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Seriousness of Offense	<u>Reading Level</u>				Row Total
	Defective 1 - 3	Functional 4 & 5	Adequate 6 & 7	Good 8 & Above	
1. Status Offenses	1	1	2	5	9
2. Victimless Crimes	2	3	4	9	18
3. Less than \$20 Damage	2	1	1	4	8
4. Felony Crimes	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>13</u>
Column Total	6	6	11	25	48

Chi-square value = 2.57  
Significance = .9789

## Results Related to Hypothesis VIII

The chi-square value computed from the seriousness of a juvenile's offense by the sex of the offender contingency table was 3.02. Statistical significance at the .05 level with three degrees of freedom requires a chi-square value of 7.82. Thus, Hypothesis VIII was not affirmed. There was no statistically significant relationship at the .05 level between the seriousness of a juvenile's offense and the sex of the juvenile. See Table X below.

TABLE X

OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF SEX FOR SERIOUSNESS  
OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Seriousness of Offense	Sex		Row Total
	Males	Females	
1. Status Offenses	6	3	9
2. Victimless Crimes	14	4	18
3. Less than \$20 Damage	8	0	8
4. Felony Crimes	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13</u>
Column Total	38	10	48

Chi-square value = 3.02  
Significance = .39

## Results Related to Hypothesis IX

The chi-square value computed from the seriousness of a juvenile's offense by the juvenile's position in sibling order contingency table was 14.49. Statistical significance at the .05 level with nine degrees of freedom requires a chi-square value of 16.91. Thus Hypothesis IX was not affirmed. There was no significant relationship at the .05 level between the seriousness of a juvenile's offense and the juvenile's position in sibling order. See Table XI.

TABLE XI

OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF BIRTH ORDER FOR  
SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSE CATEGORIES

Seriousness of Offense	<u>Birth Order</u>				Row Total
	Youngest	Middle	Oldest	Only	
1. Status Offenses	5	3	1	0	9
2. Victimless Crimes	5	6	5	2	18
3. Less than \$20 Damage	1	3	4	0	8
4. Felony Crimes	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>13</u>
Column Total	16	20	10	2	48

Chi-square value = 14.5

Significance = .11

## Relationships Between Predictor Variables

The mean and standard deviation for each variable are shown in Table XII. Chi-squares were calculated for all possible two-way classifications of the predictor variables. As reported in Table XIII, several of the chi-square values were found to be statistically significant. The computed chi-square value indicated a significant correlation at the .01 level between family income and the following predictor variables: (1) intelligence test scores, (2) Reading Level, (3) School Grades, and (4) Church Attendance. Subjects from families with low income tended to earn low scores on the Slosson Intelligence Test (SIT), while subjects from high income families tended to earn high scores on the SIT (see Appendix B, Table XIV). Subjects who scored high on the Slosson Oral Reading Test tended to come from upper income families, while most poor readers were from low income families (see Appendix B, Table XV). Likewise, subjects with higher grades in school live in families with higher income, while more low grades were made by subjects from low income families (see Appendix B, Table XVI). Subjects who came from high income families attend church more often, while most low income subjects seldom attended church (see Appendix B, Table XVII).

A relationship at the .01 level of significance was also found between intelligence scores and reading level, and intelligence scores and school grades. As would be expected, subjects who scored higher on the SIT also scored higher on the Slosson Oral Reading Test and made better grades in school, while subjects with low intelligence scores earned lower reading test scores and had poorer grades (see Appendix B, Tables XVIII and XIX).

TABLE XII  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR VARIABLES

Variable	Mean	S.D.
Seriousness of Offense	2.521	1.091
Church Attendance	1.854	.875
Family Income	2.771	1.036
Intelligence Scores	95.375	18.473
Life Position - Self (I)	4.317	.698
Life Position - Others (You)	4.348	.509
Marital Status of Parents	3.375	.937
Reading Level	155.271	48.84
Sibling Order	1.958	.849
Sex	.208	.41
Grade Average	1.688	.949
Age	15.646	1.041

Relationships at the .05 level of significance were found between (1) grades and reading level, (2) grades and church attendance, (3) sibling order and intelligence, and (4) sibling order and marital status of parents. As was expected, subjects who had better grades in school earned higher scores on the Slosson Reading Test (see Appendix B, Table XX). A higher proportion of subjects who attended church regularly made above average grades, while more subjects who

TABLE XIII

## CHI-SQUARE SUMMARY TABLE

	Seriousness of Offense	Church Attendance	Family Income	I. Q. Scores	Life Position	Marital Status	Reading Level	Sibling Order	Sex	Grade Average	Age
Seriousness of Offense		7.73	*** 22.79	7.29	6.32	6.36	2.57	14.49	3.02	7.06	16.59*
Church Attendance			*** 19.14	8.28*	1.97	7.49	3.46	4.00	* 9.93	*** 13.66	4.22
Family Income				25.84**	9.83	12.08	25.84**	8.02	4.95	*** 33.75	10.99
I. Q. Scores					9.09	8.32	19.39**	14.50**	1.99	*** 33.45	5.44
Life Position						15.64	15.29*	4.05	.55	15.98*	11.60
Marital Status							8.09	19.91**	1.15	14.0	5.75
Reading Level								5.38	2.47	19.71**	14.20
Sibling Order									2.30	11.71	3.13
Sex										4.73	2.56
Grade Average											11.26

\* = .1

\*\* = .05

\*\*\* = .01

rarely attended church made below average grades (see Appendix B, Table XXI). More youngest siblings than were expected earned above normal intelligence scores on the Slosson Intelligence Test, and more middle siblings earned scores which placed them below the normal range of intelligence (see Appendix B, Table XXII). No clear patterns could be observed between marital status of parents and the sibling order.

#### Summary of the Findings

Family income appeared to have a significant relationship to the seriousness of the offense committed by a juvenile; high income juveniles tended to commit very serious crimes. Church attendance, grade average, I.Q. score, life position, marital status of parents, reading level, sex, or sibling order were not found to be significantly related to the seriousness of the offense. Significant relationships found between several predictor variables were noted.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Although generalization to populations outside Payne County should be done with caution, several implications are suggested. Payne County Youth Services has often used the measures of school grades, parents' economic status, church attendance, and marital status of parents as indicators of a juvenile's adjustment. A youth referred by the court or family who had success in school, attended church regularly, and had a stable family with adequate income was often treated in less depth and for a shorter period of time. Somehow these positive environmental factors were erroneously equated with good adjustment and insulation from serious criminal activity. It was found, however, that juveniles in this study who had high family income seemed to concentrate on more serious felony crimes and seldom committed status or other minor offenses.

The findings of this study should be interpreted with the awareness that a larger sample size resulting in larger expected frequencies in the chi-square cross classification tables would have resulted in more dependable chi-square values. Discussion of further implications in regard to specific variables follows.

### Church Attendance

Although research is sparse in the area of church attendance as it relates to delinquency, the evidence presented in the literature points toward a positive relationship between religious affiliation and several characteristics which may be related to delinquent behavior, i.e., close knit families (Johnson, 1973), positive self-concept (Landers, 1960), and mental health (Stark, 1971). In our study sample 31 per cent of the subjects attended church regularly (more than once a month), while 46 per cent attended church less than five times per year. Fifty-four per cent of those who committed felony crimes attended church regularly, while only 22 per cent of the status offenders attended church regularly. It appears that those juveniles in our sample who never or seldom attended church were more likely to be involved in minor violations than in serious law violations. Those who attended church regularly were more often involved in very serious crimes.

It should be noted that poor church attendance was also positively related to low family income, poor grades, and to a lesser degree (.1 level of statistical significance) to low I.Q. scores. All of these factors appear to form a cluster of variables which could be viewed as related to socio-economic status values.

### Family Income

The related research in the area of family income either found little relationship between socio-economic status and delinquency (Kratcoski, 1975; Stephenson, 1973) or found that the more serious or violent offenses were committed by lower class juveniles (Tobias, 1970;

Fannin and Clinard, 1965). Assuming that family income is a measure of socio-economic status, the findings of the present study fail to support the majority of the literature reviewed. In the present study sample, 37 per cent of the subjects' families had an annual income of less than \$8,000. Sixty-three per cent of the families earned more than \$8,000. The unexpected finding was that 69 per cent of the felony crimes were committed by juveniles whose family income was above \$12,000, which was 29 per cent of the sample. However, further research is suggested to confirm these findings and examine possible causative factors.

As might be expected, it was found that the high-income families attended church more often. These families also had juvenile offenders with higher intelligence test scores, higher reading level, and higher grade averages. Juveniles in this group were seldom brought to the attention of the court for status offenses or petty theft.

The statistically significant relationship between high family income and high I.Q. scores may offer some explanation for these youngsters' involvement in more serious crimes. It is suggested that these juveniles may be involved in more pre-planned schemes, while the low family income juveniles with lower I.Q. scores may be more prone to commit crimes of opportunity which tend to be minor, such as shoplifting, truancy, or petty theft.

#### Grade Average

While no significant relationship was found between grades and seriousness of offense, it is noteworthy that none of the study sample of juvenile offenders had an "A" average, and none of the subjects who

committed felony offenses had an "F" average. Forty-one per cent of the delinquents in the Glueck (1950) study made "D" average and below. In the present study 44 per cent of the subjects made "D" and below. The mean grade earned by the study sample was 1.7 on a four point scale.

High grades were correlated with high family income (.01 level of significance), high I.Q. scores (.01 level of significance), and high reading level (.05 level of significance). Grade average was also related to church attendance at the .05 level with juveniles who made higher grades having higher church attendance and those having lower grades having lower church attendance.

#### Life Position

Eighty-one per cent of the subjects were identified by the EPI as "I'm OK--You're OK," 11 per cent as "I'm not OK--You're OK," six per cent as "I'm OK--You're not OK" and two per cent as "I'm not OK--You're not OK." This information would indicate that most offenders feel "OK" about their selves (positive self concept) and "OK" about others (accepting of others). There is no significant difference between the life positions of the various seriousness of offense categories. These findings are similar to Balester's (1956) findings that most delinquents and non-delinquents had positive self-concept scores. Allen (1973) also found EPI scores of a sample of university students generally falling into the "I'm OK--You're not OK" category. Following the theories of Harris (1969), Berne (1964), and James and Jøngeward (1971), it was anticipated that a large proportion of felony offenders would score "I'm OK--You're not OK" on the EPI. This hypothesis was not supported.

One of the major tasks of this study was to determine if life position would be an accurate predictor of serious offense. It was concluded that life positions of juvenile offenders as measured by the EPI are not predictive of seriousness of offense.

#### Marital Status of Parents

Most research in this area found broken homes to be a factor in delinquency (Craig and Clinard, 1956); Silverman and Dinitz, 1974). In a study of 100 institutionalized boys, 78 per cent were from broken homes (Garrish, 1975). In contrast, only 36 per cent of the subjects of this study were from broken homes. Data also failed to support Datesman and Scarpitti (1975), who suggest that the effects of family disorganization are more damaging to females than to males. In the present study, 34 per cent of the males were from broken homes compared to 40 per cent of the females.

For the purpose of examining the relationship of broken homes on juvenile behavior, the first three categories of children living with someone other than two natural parents may be combined and examined. The per cent of offenders who came from broken homes in each of the seriousness of offense categories is 56 per cent of the status offenders, 33 per cent of those who commit victimless crimes, 38 per cent of those who committed crimes of less than \$20 damage, and 23 per cent of the felony offenders. Neither in grouping the data in the above manner, nor in the chi-square table (see Table VIII, p. 51) was any pattern detected which would indicate that broken homes were predictive of serious delinquent activity.

### Sibling Order

While there was no statistically significant relationship found between birth order and seriousness of a juvenile's offense, some interesting distributions were observed. Of the study sample, 42 per cent were middle children, 33 per cent were youngest, 10 per cent were oldest and two per cent were only children. No felony crimes were committed by oldest or only children, while 62 per cent of the felonies were committed by middle children and 38 per cent by youngest children. This observation is congruent with McCord, McCord and Zola (1959), who found a greater per cent of boys who were middle children were convicted of crimes than in any other sibling order position.

### Summary

The predictor variables of family income, church attendance, I.Q. Test scores, reading level, and grades in school may be viewed as a cluster of variables which are all related to socio-economic status values. They all had statistically significant relationships to family income, although only family income had a statistically significant relationship to seriousness of the offense committed by the juvenile.

Life position, which is believed to be influenced by all social and environmental factors (Berne, 1964; Harris, 1969), was not significantly related to any of the other variables. The life position, as measured by the EPI, was not found to be a significant predictor of seriousness of the offense committed by the juvenile.

Implications for Payne County Youth Services include increased emphasis on rehabilitation of the higher socio-economic status juvenile. According to the results of the present study, these juveniles are more likely to commit felony crimes than those from lower socio-economic backgrounds.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify factors predictive of serious delinquency which would serve in the identification of potential serious offenders and facilitate the implementation of preventive treatment programs. The subjects of this study were 48 juveniles who had been referred to the Payne County Juvenile Court and subsequently to Payne County Youth Services for investigation and treatment. The subjects were divided into four categories according to the seriousness of the offense they committed. A major limitation of the study was the small sample size.

It was hypothesized that offenses which were more serious would more often be committed by juvenile law violators who seldom attended church, had poor grades in school, low I.Q. scores, low reading level, were male rather than female, were from broken homes, had low family income, and were middle children, rather than only or oldest children. It was further hypothesized that a relationship would be found between the juvenile's life position and the seriousness of his offense.

Each subject was administered the Slosson Intelligence Test, the Slosson Oral Reading Test, and the Existential Position Inventory. Demographic data was obtained verbally from the juvenile on the "Juvenile Court Questionnaire" completed by the examiner. The

relationships between the variables were examined utilizing the chi-square statistical method.

A statistically significant relationship was found between family income and the seriousness of the offense committed by the juvenile, however, in the direction opposite that expected. Juvenile law violators who committed felony crimes more often came from high income families. All other hypotheses failed to be accepted. Juvenile offenders from high income families attended church more often, had higher I.Q. test scores, higher reading level, higher grade averages, and committed offenses of a more serious nature. Increased attention to youthful offenders with these characteristics is indicated.

#### Recommendations

Each year the crime rate increases; old prisons become overcrowded and new prisons are built to accommodate the increasing number of criminals sentenced by the courts. Persons in the area of juvenile corrections and counseling must continue to seek techniques for early identification and treatment of children with a high probability for criminal activity in later life. To accomplish this, more longitudinal studies beginning in the primary grades are needed. In the literature reviewed, only three studies were found which emphasized an extended follow-up (Glueck and Glueck, 1950, 1968; Robins, 1958; Powers and Witmer, 1951). It is recommended that public schools assume more responsibility in the area of identification and treatment of the early symptoms of later trouble, including conducting longitudinal studies.

State operated juvenile correctional institutions should conduct more research at the institutions exploring both identification factors and the success of different treatment models. In Oklahoma, The Department of Institutions, Social and Rehabilitative Services (DISRS) appears to be in an excellent position to conduct research or allow selected agencies to conduct research. DISRS is responsible for the operation of all state group homes and training schools, has custody of the child in a controlled environment, and has access to the history of the child and family. When the child is returned to the community, DISRS provides for after care and maintains contact with the family.

It is recommended that further studies in this area should concentrate on juveniles who repeat offenses, commit serious crimes, or are in danger of being institutionalized. Research on characteristics of minor or status offenders could be likened to trying to find how adults who have been cited for speeding differ from those who were not cited.

It is proposed that a more sensitive instrument utilizing the life position theory be developed to measure this variable. It should be applicable for use with young teenagers to facilitate early identification of children having high probability for delinquent behavior. The use of the life position concept in identification would facilitate the use of the Transactional Analysis Treatment model to help the juvenile gain insight into his behavior and adopt a positive life position.

Both the present study and the literature reviewed would tend to indicate that delinquency prediction by examining a few environmental factors is highly inaccurate. The search must be continued for factors

or groups of factors which can identify later delinquent behavior. The present study leaves open the question of why juveniles in the study sample from higher income families commit offenses which are more serious. Further research should be conducted in Payne County to verify this finding and to explore possible causative factors.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, Alfred.

- 1945 Social Interest, A Challenge to Mankind. London: Faber and Faber.

Allen, Jon G.

- 1973 "Existential Position and Adjustment in a College Population." Transactional Analysis Journal, Vol. 3, No. 4 (October), 22-24.

Amos, William E.

- 1963 "A Study of Self Concept: Delinquent Boys Accuracy in Selected Self-Evaluations." Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. 67-68, 49-87.

Balester, Raymond J.

- 1956 "The Self-Concept and Juvenile Delinquency." (Dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956) Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 16, Pt. 2 (May-September), 1169-1170.

Becker, Selwyn and Jean Carroll.

- 1962 "Ordinal Position and Conformity." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 65, No. 2, 129-131.

Berne, Eric.

- 1962 "Classification of Positions." Transactional Analysis Bulletin, Vol. 1, No. 3 (July), 23.
- 1964 Games People Play. New York: Grove Press, Inc.
- 1972 What Do You Say After You Say Hello? New York: Grove Press, Inc.

Bragg, Barry W. and Vernon Allen.

- 1970 "Ordinal Position and Conformity: A Role Theory Analysis." Sociometry, Vol. 33, No. 4 (December), 371-381.

Buros, Oscar K. (ed.)

- 1972 The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, Vol. 1.  
Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press.

Cavan, Ruth S.

- 1969 "The Concepts of Tolerance and Contraculture as Applied to Delinquency." Readings in Juvenile Delinquency. Ruth Cavan (ed.). New York: Lippincott Co., 5-19.

Clark, John P. and Edward W. Haurek.

- 1966 "Age and Sex Roles of Adolescents and Their Involvement in Misconduct: A Reappraisal." Sociology and Social Research, Vol. 50, No. 3 (July), 495-508.

CO EDD

- 1975 "Crime Rate Increasing in Oklahoma." CO EDD in Action, No. 2 (December), 5.

Combs, Arthur W. and D. Snygg.

- 1959 Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Row.

Craig, Maude and Selma J. Glick.

- 1965 "Application of the Glueck Social Prediction Table on an Ethnic Basis." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 11, No. 2 (April), 175-185.

Cronbach, L. J.

- 1951 "Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests." Psychometrika, Vol. 16, 297-334.

Dahl, Betty M.

- 1972 "Variables Related to Types of Offenses Committed by a Population of Adjudicated Delinquent Youths." (Abstract). Crime and Delinquency Literature, Vol. 4, No. 2 (June), 200.

Datesman, Susan and Frank Scarpitti.

- 1975 "Female Delinquency and Broken Homes." Criminology, Vol. 13, No. 1 (May), 33-35.

Dinitz, Simon, Frank Scarpitti, and Walter Reckless.

- 1962 "Delinquency Vulnerability: A Cross Group and Longitudinal Analysis." American Sociological Review, Vol. 27 (August) 515-517.

Faine, John R.

- 1975 "A Multidimensional Approach to Understanding Varieties of Delinquent Behavior." Dissertation Reported in Crime and Delinquency Literature, Vol. 7, No. 1 (March), 62-63.

Fannin, Leon F. and Marshall B. Clinard.

- 1965 "Differences in the Conception of Self as a Male Among Lower and Middle Class Delinquents." Social Problems, Vol. 13, No. 2 (Fall), 205-214.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

- 1967 Uniform Crime Reports for the United States. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Ofc.

Fein, Deborah, Sylvia O'Neill, Constance Frank and K. Velit.

- 1975 "Sex Differences in Preadolescent Self-Esteem." The Journal of Psychology, Vol. 90, 179-183.

Freeman, Beatrice and George Savastano.

- 1970 "The Affluent Youthful Offender." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 16, No. 3 (July), 264-272.

Galton, Francis.

- 1874 English Men of Science: Their Nature and Nurture. London: MacMillan and Co.

Gath, Dennis and Gavin Tennent.

- 1972 "High Intelligence and Delinquency - A Review." British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 12, No. 2, 174-181.

Gerrish, Paul.

- 1975 "A Factor Analysis of Juvenile Delinquency." (Dissertation, Rutgers University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 36B, No. 5 (November), 2468B.

Gilmore, J. B. and Edward Zigler.

- 1964 "Birth Order and Social Reinforcer Effectiveness in Children." Child Development, Vol. 35, 193-200.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck.

- 1950 Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Commonwealth Fund.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck.

- 1952 Delinquents in the Making: Paths to Prevention. New York: Harper.
- 1959 Predicting Delinquency and Crime. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- 1962 Family Environment and Delinquency. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- 1966 Physique and Delinquency. New York: Harper Publishing Co.
- 1968 Delinquents and Non-Delinquents in Perspective. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- 1970 Toward a Typology of Juvenile Offenders. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Gold, Martin.

- 1963 Status Forces in Delinquent Boys. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research.

Gold, S.

- 1971 "Equal Protection of Juvenile Girls in Need of Supervision in New York State." New York Law Forum, Vol. 17, 570-598.

Gray, William S.

- 1915 Standardized Oral Reading Paragraphs. New York: Bobbs Merrill Co.

Guilford, J. P. and Benjamin Fruchter.

- 1973 Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, Calvin S. and Gardner Lindzey.

- 1970 Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Harris, Thomas A.

- 1969 I'm OK--You're OK. New York: Harper and Row.

Haskell, Martin R. and Lewis Yablonsky.

- 1970 Crime and Delinquency. Chicago: Rand McNally Co.

Hogenson, Dennis L.

- 1974 "Reading Failure and Juvenile Delinquency." Bulletin of the Orton Society, Vol. 24, 164-169.

James, Muriel and Dorothy Jongeward.

- 1971 Born to Win. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Jersild, Arthur T.

- 1952 In Search of Self. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Johnson, Martin A.

- 1973 "Family Life and Religious Commitment." Review of Religious Research, Vol. 14, No. 3 (Spring), 144-150.

Johnson, Patrick B.

- 1973 "Birth Order and Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scores." (Abstract). Psychological Reports, Vol. 32, 536.
- 1975 "Birth Order and Thumb Sucking." (Abstract). Psychological Reports, Vol. 36, 598.

King, Charles H.

- 1975 "The Ego and the Integration of Violence in Homicidal Youth." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 45, No. 1, 134-145.

Kratcoski, Peter C. and John E. Kratcoski.

- 1975 "Changing Patterns in the Delinquent Activities of Boys and Girls: A Self-reported Delinquency Analysis." Adolescence, Vol. 5, No. 37, 83-91.

Landis, Judson T.

- 1960 "Religiousness, Family Relationships, and Family Values in Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish Families." Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 22 (November), 341-347.

Lasko, Joan K.

- 1954 "Parent Behavior Toward First and Second Children." Genetic Psychology Monographs, Vol. 49, 97-137.

McCord, W., Joan McCord and I. Zola.

- 1959 Origins of Crime: A New Evaluation of the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study. New York: Columbia University Press.

MacDonald, A. P.

- 1969 "Manifestations of Different Levels of Socialization by Birth Order." Developmental Psychology, Vol. 1, No. 5 (September), 485-492.

Montgomery, Robert L., Lynn Puetz, and Sallie Montgomery.

- 1975 "Birth Order, Graduate School, and Marriage." Psychological Reports, Vol. 37, No. 3 (December), 746.

Morris, R.

- 1964 "Female Delinquency and Relational Problems." Social Forces, Vol. 43 (October), 82-89.

Oklahoma Bureau of Investigation.

- 1975 Crime in Oklahoma: 1975 Summary Bulletin, January-March. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: The Oklahoma Bureau of Investigation.

Oklahoma Council on Juvenile Delinquency Planning.

- 1971 Youth In Trouble, A Shared Concern. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Dept. of Institutions, Social, and Rehabilitative Services.

Patterson, C. H.

- 1966 Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy. New York: Harper and Row.

Payne County Juvenile Court Records.

- 1975 Case # JFJ-75-64; Case # JFJ-74-204. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Payne County Courthouse.

Peek, Joseph H.

- 1975 "The Effect of Transactional Analysis Upon the Self-Concept of Adjudicated Delinquents." (Dissertation, Georgia State University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 36A, Part 1 (July-August), 793-A.

Phillips, John C.

- 1974 "The Creation of Deviant Behavior in High Schools: An Examination of Cohen's General Theory of Subcultures." Dissertation reported in Crime and Delinquency Literature, Vol. 7, No. 3 (September), 326-327.

Pierce, Sara Hunt.

- 1975 "A Descriptive Study of the Personality Differences Between Institutionalized Delinquents of Different Intelligence Quotient Levels and Non-Delinquents of Different Intelligence Quotient Levels." (Dissertation, the University of Rochester, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 36A, Part 1 (July-August), 713A.

Powers, Edwin and Helen Witmer.

- 1951 An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency: The Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study. New York: Columbia University Press.

Reckless, Walter, Simon Dinitz and Ellen Murray.

- 1956 "Self Concept As an Insulator Against Delinquency." American Sociological Review, Vol. 21 (December), 744-746.

Reckless, Walter, Simon Dinitz and Barbara Kay.

- 1957 "The Self Component in Potential Delinquency and Potential Non-Delinquency." American Sociological Review, Vol. 22 (October), 566-570.

Robins, Lee N. and Patricia O'Neal.

- 1958 "Mortality, Mobility, and Crime: Problem Children Thirty Years Later." American Sociological Review, Vol. 23 (April), 162-171.

Rosenow, C. and Anne Whyte.

- 1934 "The Ordinal Position of Problem Children." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 1, 430-444.

Rotter, Jullian B. and Janet Rafferty.

- 1950 The Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank (Test and Manual). New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Runyon, Richard and Audrey Haber.

- 1971 Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Sampson, E. E.

- 1962 "Birth Order, Need Achievement, and Conformity." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 64, No. 2, 155-159.

Scarpitti, Frank R., Ellen Murray, Simon Dinitz, and W. Reckless.

- 1960 "The 'Good' Boy in a High Delinquency Area: Four Years Later." American Sociological Review, Vol. 25 (August), 555-558.

Schacter, Stanley.

- 1959 The Psychology of Affiliation. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- 1963 "Birth Order, Eminence, and Higher Education." American Sociological Review, Vol. 28, 757-768.
- 1964 "Birth Order and Sociometric Choice." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 68, 453-456.

Schooler, Carmi.

- 1964 "Birth Order and Hospitalization for Schizophrenia." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 69, 574-579.

Schwartz, Brian A.

- 1976 "The Relationship Between Birth Order, Sex of Sibling and Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Development in a Sample of College Freshman Males from Two-Child Families." (Dissertation, New York University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 36B, No. 7 (January), 3625B.

Schwartz, Michael and Sandra Tangri.

- 1965 "A Note on Self-Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency." American Sociological Review, Vol. 30, No. 6 (December) 922- 926.

Sears, R. R.

- 1950 "Ordinal Position in the Family as a Psychological Variable." American Sociological Review, Vol. 15, 397-401.

Senna, Joseph, Spencer Rathus, and Larry Siegel.

- 1974 "Delinquent Behavior and Academic Investment Among Suburban Youth." Adolescence, Vol. 9, No. 36, 481-494.

Shore, Milton E.

- 1971 "Psychological Theories of the Causes of Anti-Social Behavior." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 17 (October), 456-468.

Silverman, Ira J. and Simon Dinitz.

- 1974 "Compulsive Masculinity and Delinquency." Criminology, Vol. 11, No. 4, 498-515.

Simpson, John E., Simon Dinitz, B. Kay, and Walter Reckless.

- 1960 "Delinquency Potential of Pre-Adolescents in High Delinquency Areas." British Journal of Delinquency, Vol. 10 (January), 211-215.

Sletto, R. F.

- 1934 "Sibling Position and Juvenile Delinquency." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 39, 657-669.

Slosson, Richard L.

- 1963A Slosson Intelligence Test for Children and Adults. East Aurora, N. Y.: Slosson Educational Publications.
- 1963B Slosson Oral Reading Test. East Aurora, N.Y.: Slosson Educational Publications.

Smart, R. G.

- 1963 "Alcoholism, Birth Order, and Family Size." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 66, 17-23.
- 1965 "Social Group Membership, Leadership, and Birth Order." Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 67, 221-225.

Staples, F. R. and R. H. Walters.

- 1961 "Anxiety, Birth Order, and Susceptibility to Social Influence." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 62, 716-719.

Stark, Rodney.

- 1971 "Psychopathology and Religious Commitment." Review of Religious Research, Vol. 12, No. 3 (Spring), 165-176.

Stephenson, P. Susan.

- 1973 "Myths About Juvenile Delinquency." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, Vol. 15, No. 1, 83-92.

Strong, Donald J. and Daniel D. Feder.

- 1961 "Measurement of the Self Concept: A Critique of the Literature." Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 8, No. 2, 170-173.

Stuntz, Edgar C.

- 1971 "Classification of Games by Positions." Transactional Analysis Journal, Vol. 1, No. 4 (October), 255-257.

Sullivan, H. S.

- 1947 Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry. Washington, D.C.: William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation.

Thamm, Robert.

- 1972 "Self-Acceptance and Acceptance-of-Others: An Exploration into Personality Syndromes." Transactional Analysis Journal, Vol. 2, No. 4 (October), 41-49.

Tobias, Jerry J.

- 1970 "The Affluent Suburban Male Delinquent." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 16, No. 3 (July), 273-277.

Tomaino, Louis.

- 1969 Changing the Delinquent. Austin, Texas: The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.

Trevvett, Nina B.

- 1965 "Identifying Delinquency-Prone Children." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 11, No. 2 (April), 186-191.

Tribble, Stephen.

- 1972 "Socio-Economic Status and Self-Reported Juvenile Delinquency." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, Vol. 14, No. 4, 409-415.

Unruh, Susan G., Martin Grosse and Edward Zigler.

- 1971 "Birth Order, Number of Siblings, and Social Reinforcer Effectiveness in Children." Child Development, Vol. 42, 1153-1165.

Warren, Jonathan R.

- 1966 "Birth Order and Social Behavior." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 65, 38-49.

Weiss, H. R. and Richard Sampliner.

- 1944 "A Study of Adolescent Felony Violators." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 34, 377-391.

Weller, G. M.

- 1965 "Arousal Effects on the Newborn Infant of Being First or Later Born." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 35, 341-342.

Wheeler, Gerald.

- 1971 "Children of the Court: A Profile of Poverty." Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 17, No. 2 (April), 152-159.

Wheeler, Gerald and Hervey Inskeep.

- 1972 "Youth in the Gauntlet." Faces of Delinquency. Eds. John Reed and Fuad Baali. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 313-318.

Wilgosh, Lorraine and Daniel Paitich.

- 1974 "Juvenile Offenders, Grouped According to Type of Delinquent Behavior and Their Parents: Intelligence, Achievement and Family Interaction." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, Vol. 16, No. 1, 68-76.

Wolfgang, Marvin, Robert Figlio, and Thorsten Sellin.

- 1972 Delinquency in a Birth Cohort. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Yando, Regina, Edward Zigler and Susan Litzinger.

- 1975 "A Further Investigation of the Effects of Birth Order and Number of Siblings in Determining Children's Responsiveness to Social Reinforcement." The Journal of Psychology, Vol. 89, 95-111.

APPENDIX A

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENTS

## EXISTENTIAL POSITION INVENTORY (Original)

## THE "OK" QUESTIONNAIRE

This is a measure of "existential position," an important concept in the theory of "Transactional Analysis" (e.g., Eric Berne, Games People Play; Tom Harris, I'm OK--You're OK). To answer accurately, you will need to understand the concept of existential position and think about how it applies to you.

All of us have some general feelings and attitudes about how "good," "worthwhile," and "OK" we are (or how "bad," "worthless," and "not-OK" we are). We also have some general feelings about how good, worthwhile, and OK (or bad, worthless, and not-OK) other people are. There are four existential positions, based on the combination of our feelings about ourselves ("I") and our feelings about other people ("You"):

I'm OK--You're OK: "We're all winners!"

I'm fine, good worthwhile, and "OK," and so are other people. I like myself and other people. You're a "prince" ("princess") and so am I!

I'm OK--You're not OK: "I'm better than you are!"

I'm fine, good, worthwhile, and "OK," but other people are not so hot. If other people were more like me, then they'd be more "OK." I'm "one-up," the "winner," you're the loser. Too bad there aren't more princes (princesses) like me around!

I'm not OK--You're OK: "You're better than I am."

Other people are fine, good, worthwhile, and "OK," but I'm not so hot. If only I could be a prince (princess) like them, everything would be OK. I'm "one-down," the "underdog," you're the winner. It's a good thing there aren't too many people like me around.

I'm not OK--You're not OK: "We're all losers."

I'm not much good, and neither is anybody else. My friends aren't much better than my enemies. There are no princes (princesses)! We are all "one-down," the "underdogs." At least we are all in the same boat.

If each of us could be "fit" into one position, this questionnaire would be simple: you'd just indicate which position fits you best.

However, most of us change positions, depending on two things: the situation we are in, and the trait we have in mind.

The Situation: You may feel OK in some situations (or with some people) and not others. For example, you may feel OK when you are with friends and not -OK when you are with strangers. Similarly, you may like other people when you are at a party ("You're OK") and dislike other people in the classroom ("You're not-OK").

The Trait: In any particular situation, you may feel OK in some ways and not-OK in others. For example, on a date you may feel "I'm OK-intelligent" and "I'm not-OK-shy." Similarly, you could feel that your date is attractive ("You're OK-good-looking") but not too bright ("You're not-OK-dumb").

A final complication is that "Ok-ness" can be a matter of degree: instead of feeling OK-rich vs. not-OK-poor, you may feel very rich, somewhat rich, somewhat poor, or flat-broke. Where you place yourself (or someone else) on this scale of OKness will depend on the situation you are in and the trait you have in mind.

This questionnaire takes all of these complications into account. You will be asked to indicate your existential position for 3 traits in 20 different situations. For each position, you will also be asked to rate the degree to which you feel OK (or not-OK) and the degree to which you feel the other people are OK (or not-OK).

Instructions:

These instructions may sound complicated. You may want to refer to the examples on the following page as you read them.

Each item is based on one situation, and your answers will probably be most accurate if you think of some personally meaningful situation rather than answering in general terms. For each item, try to recall a specific situation that you have been in. The first concrete situation that comes to mind will be fine. The situation may be recent or past, frequent or infrequent, or whatever, as long as it is one you can remember specifically. Make a brief note (a word or short phrase) of that specific situation in the space marked "Situation: \_\_\_\_\_." With that specific situation in mind, think of the existential position you were in at that time. Indicate your position by circling "+" for OK and "-" for not-OK for both "I" and "You."

To rate degrees of OKness, use 6-point scales (6 = very positive, 1 = very negative). For example, if the situation were "On a date" and you were rating the trait of attractiveness, you might choose the "I'm OK--You're OK" position (I + You +) and rate yourself very attractive (6) and your date fairly attractive (4), or vice versa. For the "I'm not-OK--You're OK" position (I - You +), you might rate yourself slightly unattractive (3) and your date moderately attractive (5).

Take a look at the examples on the following page.

Existential Position Code:

I            You            (+ = OK, - = not-OK)

⊕	-	⊕	-	I'm OK--You're OK
⊕	-	+	⊖	I'm OK--You're not-OK
+	⊖	⊕	-	I'm not-OK--You're OK
+	⊖	+	⊖	I'm not -OK--You're not-OK

Rating Scales:

- 1 = very negative (totally not-OK)
- 2 = moderately negative (moderately not-OK)
- 3 = slightly negative (slightly not-OK)
- 4 = slightly positive (fairly OK)
- 5 = moderately positive (solidly OK)
- 6 = very positive (super-OK)

A. On a date. Situation: with Bill last Friday

	<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>		
a)	attractive vs. unattractive	⊕	-	+	⊖	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>
b)	interesting vs. dull	+	⊖	⊕	-	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>
c)	sincere vs. insincere	⊕	-	⊕	-	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>

These answers mean that the person was "I'm OK--You're not-OK" for attractiveness, "I'm not -OK--You're OK" for interesting, and "I'm OK--You're OK" for sincerity. She rated herself solidly OK-attractive, totally not-OK-dull, and super-OK-sincere. She rated her date slightly not-OK-unattractive, fairly OK-interesting, and solidly OK-sincere.

B. With my parents. Situation: over last vacation

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) friendly vs. unfriendly	+ ⊖	⊕ -	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
b) adjusted vs. maladjusted	⊕ -	⊕ -	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>
c) openminded vs. closedminded	+ ⊖	+ ⊖	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>

Go over this one yourself until you understand it.

Final Notes:

1. There are no "correct" answers. Each item was chosen so that someone could be in any one of the four positions for any trait in that kind of a situation.
2. Please answer all items. If you can't think of a specific situation, or you are not sure of your positions in a particular situation, make your best guess.
3. For some items, a definite other person may not be involved (e.g., "When I get up in the morning"). For these items, base your answers on how you felt about other people in general when you were in that situation.

Existential Position Code:

I		You	(+ = OK, - = not-OK)
⊕	-	⊕	= I'm OK--You're OK
⊕	-	+ ⊖	= I'm OK--You're not-OK
+	⊖	⊕	= I'm not-OK--You're OK
+	⊖	+ ⊖	= I'm not-OK--You're not-OK

Rating Scales:

- 1 = very negative (totally not-OK)
- 2 = moderately negative (moderately not-OK)
- 3 = slightly negative (slightly not-OK)
- 4 = slightly positive (fairly OK)
- 5 = moderately positive (solidly OK)
- 6 = very positive (super-OK)

1. Borrowing something from someone. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Note: Answer according to how you felt in that situation.)

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) friendly vs. unfriendly	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) honest vs. dishonest	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) sincere vs. insincere	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

2. Talking to a teacher. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) openminded vs. closedminded	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) concerned vs. apathetic	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) intelligent vs. unintelligent	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

3. With people I don't know. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) outgoing vs. shy	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) interesting vs. dull	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) attractive vs. unattractive	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

4. When someone doesn't like me. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) openminded vs. closedminded	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) concerned vs. apathetic	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) kind vs. cruel	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

## Existential Position Code:

I      You      ( + = OK, - = not-OK)

⊕ -      ⊕ -      I'm OK--You're OK  
 ⊕ -      + ⊖      I'm OK--You're not-OK  
 + ⊖      ⊕ -      I'm not-OK--You're OK  
 + ⊖      + ⊖      I'm not-OK--You're not-OK

## Rating Scales:

- 1 = very negative (totally not-OK)  
 2 = moderately negative (moderately not-OK)  
 3 = slightly negative (slightly not-OK)  
 4 = slightly positive (fairly OK)  
 5 = moderately positive (solidly OK)  
 6 = very positive (super-OK)

5. In high school. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Note: "You" may mean "people in general" here.)

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) friendly vs. unfriendly	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) adjusted vs. maladjusted	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) attractive vs. unattractive	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

6. In a competitive situation. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) openminded vs. closedminded	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) honest vs. dishonest	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) intelligent vs. unintelligent	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

7. Asking someone for help. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) friendly vs. unfriendly	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) concerned vs. apathetic	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) sincere vs. insincere	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

## Existential Position Code:

<u>I</u>		<u>You</u>	( + = OK, - = not-OK)
⊕	-	⊕	- I'm OK--You're OK
⊕	-	+	⊖ I'm OK--You're not-OK
+	⊖	⊕	- I'm not-OK--You're OK
+	⊖	+	⊖ I'm not-OK--You're not-OK

## Rating Scale:

- 1 = very negative (totally not-OK)  
 2 = moderately negative (moderately not-OK)  
 3 = slightly negative (slightly not-OK)  
 4 = slightly positive (fairly OK)  
 5 = moderately positive (solidly OK)  
 6 = very positive (super-OK)

## 8. In an unfamiliar situation. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) friendly vs. unfriendly	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) adjusted vs. maladjusted	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) openminded vs. closedminded	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

## 9. After an argument. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) openminded vs. closedminded	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) kind vs. cruel	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) sincere vs. insincere	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

## 10. When I was a young child. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) friendly vs. unfriendly	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
b) kind vs. cruel	+ -	+ -	_____	_____
c) outgoing vs. shy	+ -	+ -	_____	_____

NOTE: You are halfway done. If you are getting tired of this, try daydreaming for a few minutes before you continue. You are asked to rate a lot of situations because a smaller number might give a biased picture.

## Existential Position Code:

<u>I</u>		<u>You</u>	( + = OK, - = not-OK)
⊕	-	⊕	- I'm OK--You're OK
⊕	-	+ ⊖	I'm OK--You're not-OK
+	⊖	⊕	- I'm not OK--You're OK
+	⊖	+ ⊖	I'm not-OK--You're not-OK

## Rating Scales:

- 1 = very negative (totally not-OK)  
 2 = moderately negative (moderately not-OK)  
 3 = slightly negative (slightly not-OK)  
 4 = slightly positive (fairly OK)  
 5 = moderately positive (solidly OK)  
 6 = very positive (super-OK)

11. In the classroom. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) openminded vs. closedminded	+	-	+	-
b) concerned vs. apathetic	+	-	+	-
c) interesting vs. dull	+	-	+	-

12. When I get up in the morning. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

Note: "You" = "people in general" or the person(s) you were in bed with.)

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) kind vs. cruel	+	-	+	-
b) outgoing vs. shy	+	-	+	-
c) attractive vs. unattractive	+	-	+	-

13. In a serious discussion. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) openminded vs. closedminded	+	-	+	-
b) concerned vs. apathetic	+	-	+	-
c) intelligent vs. unintelligent	+	-	+	-

## Existential Position Code:

<u>I</u>		<u>You</u>	(+ = OK, - = not-OK)
⊕	-	⊕	- I'm OK--You're OK
⊕	-	+	⊖ I'm OK--You're not-OK
+	⊖	⊕	- I'm not-OK--You're OK
+	⊖	+	⊖ I'm not-OK--You're not-OK

## Rating Scales:

- 1 = very negative (totally not-OK)  
 2 = moderately negative (moderately not-OK)  
 3 = slightly negative (slightly not-OK)  
 4 = slightly positive (fairly OK)  
 5 = moderately positive (solidly OK)  
 6 = very positive (super-OK)

## 14. Being interviewed for a job. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) interesting vs. dull	+	-	+	-
b) attractive vs. unattractive	+	-	+	-
c) intelligent vs. unintelligent	+	-	+	-

## 15. Giving advice to someone. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) concerned vs. apathetic	+	-	+	-
b) honest vs. dishonest	+	-	+	-
c) sincere vs. insincere	+	-	+	-

## 16. With people in authority. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>	<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) adjusted vs. maladjusted	+	-	+	-
b) openminded vs. closedminded	+	-	+	-
c) intelligent vs. unintelligent	+	-	+	-

## Existential Position Code:

<u>I</u>		<u>You</u>		(+ = OK, - = not-OK)
⊕	-	⊕	-	I'm OK--You're OK
⊕	-	+	⊖	I'm OK--You're not OK
+	⊖	⊕	-	I'm not-OK--You're OK
+	⊖	+	⊖	I'm not-OK--You're not-OK

## Rating Scales:

- 1 = very negative (totally not-OK)  
 2 = moderately negative (moderately not-OK)  
 3 = slightly negative (slightly not-OK)  
 4 = slightly positive (fairly OK)  
 5 = moderately positive (solidly OK)  
 6 = very positive (super-OK)

17. When I am all alone. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Note: "You" = "people in general.")

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>		<u>"You"</u>		<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) adjusted vs. maladjusted	+	-	+	-	_____	_____
b) concerned vs. apathetic	+	-	+	-	_____	_____
c) honest vs. dishonest	+	-	+	-	_____	_____

18. At work. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>		<u>"You"</u>		<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) friendly vs. unfriendly	+	-	+	-	_____	_____
b) interesting vs. dull	+	-	+	-	_____	_____
c) intelligent vs. unintelligent	+	-	+	-	_____	_____

19. Lying in bed at night. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

<u>Traits</u>	<u>"I"</u>		<u>"You"</u>		<u>"I"</u>	<u>"You"</u>
a) adjusted vs. maladjusted	+	-	+	-	_____	_____
b) honest vs. dishonest	+	-	+	-	_____	_____
c) sincere vs. insincere	+	-	+	-	_____	_____

## Existential Position Code:

I      You    (+ = OK, - = not-OK)

⊕ - ⊕ - I'm OK--You're OK  
 ⊕ - ⊖ - I'm OK--You're not-OK  
 + ⊖ ⊕ - I'm not-OK--You're OK  
 + ⊖ + ⊖ I'm not-OK--You're not-OK

## Rating Scales:

- 1 = very negative (totally not-OK)  
 2 = moderately negative (moderately not-OK)  
 3 = slightly negative (slightly not-OK)  
 4 = slightly positive (fairly OK)  
 5 = moderately positive (solidly OK)  
 6 = very positive (super-OK)

20. Studying for an exam. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Note: "You" = classmates and/or teacher)

Traits	"I"	"You"	"I"	"You"
a) adjusted vs. maladjusted	+	-	+	-
b) honest vs. dishonest	+	-	+	-
c) intelligent vs. unintelligent	+	-	+	-

How accurate were your answers? Very \_\_\_\_\_ Fairly \_\_\_\_\_

Slightly \_\_\_\_\_ Not at all \_\_\_\_\_

EXISTENTIAL POSITION INVENTORY (Revised)

The "OK" Questionnaire

This is a questionnaire to determine our feelings about ourselves and our feelings about other people. Feelings may change in different situations; therefore, you are to choose 20 specific situations and remember how you felt about yourself and others at these times. For each item, try to recall a specific situation that you have been in. Make a brief note (a word or short phrase) of that specific situation in the space marked "Situation: \_\_\_\_\_."

To rate degree of feeling, use the following 6-point scale:

- 1 = very negative (totally bad)
- 2 = moderately negative (bad)
- 3 = slightly negative (slightly bad)
- 4 = slightly positive (fairly good)
- 5 = moderately positive (solidly good)
- 6 = very positive (super good)

Look at the following example:

A. On a date. Situation: With Jane last Friday

How I feel about me:

Unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	Attractive
Dull	1	2	3	4	5	6	Interesting
Insincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sincere

How I feel about you:

Unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	Attractive
Dull	1	2	3	4	5	6	Interesting
Insincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sincere

These answers mean that the person felt himself to be solidly attractive, while his date was slightly unattractive. However, he felt very negative about being dull, and rated his date as fairly interesting. He felt they were both sincere, he being the most sincere.

Note: "You" can refer to a specific person in the situation, or it may refer to people in general.

1. Borrowing something from someone. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Unfriendly 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Dishonest 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Insincere 1 2 3 4 5 6

Friendly  
Honest  
Sincere

How I feel about you:

Unfriendly 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Dishonest 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Insincere 1 2 3 4 5 6

Friendly  
Honest  
Sincere

2. Talking to a teacher. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Closedminded 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Apathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6

Openminded  
Concerned  
Intelligent

How I feel about you:

Closedminded 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Apathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6

Openminded  
Concerned  
Intelligent

3. With people I don't know. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Shy 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Dull 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Unattractive 1 2 3 4 5 6

Outgoing  
Interesting  
Attractive

How I feel about you:

Shy 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Dull 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Unattractive 1 2 3 4 5 6

Outgoing  
Interesting  
Attractive

4. When someone doesn't like me. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Closedminded 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Apathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Cruel 1 2 3 4 5 6

Openminded  
Concerned  
Kind

How I feel about you:

Closedminded 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Apathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6  
Cruel 1 2 3 4 5 6

Openminded  
Concerned  
Kind

5. Speaking in front of the class. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Outgoing
Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	Attractive

How I feel about you:

Shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Outgoing
Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	Attractive

6. In a competitive athletic situation. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Clumsy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Agile
Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	6	Fair
Uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5	6	Having fun

How I feel about you:

Clumsy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Agile
Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	6	Fair
Uncomfortable	1	2	3	4	5	6	Having fun

7. Asking someone for help. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	Concerned
Insincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sincere

How I feel about you:

Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	Concerned
Insincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sincere

8. In an unfamiliar situation. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Insecure	1	2	3	4	5	6	Confident
Closedminded	1	2	3	4	5	6	Openminded

How I feel about you:

Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Insecure	1	2	3	4	5	6	Confident
Closedminded	1	2	3	4	5	6	Openminded

9. After an argument. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Insincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sincere
Cruel	1	2	3	4	5	6	Kind
Closedminded	1	2	3	4	5	6	Openminded

How I feel about you:

Insincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sincere
Cruel	1	2	3	4	5	6	Kind
Closedminded	1	2	3	4	5	6	Openminded

10. When I was a young child. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Cruel	1	2	3	4	5	6	Kind
Shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Outgoing

How I feel about you:

Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Cruel	1	2	3	4	5	6	Kind
Shy	1	2	3	4	5	6	Outgoing

11. In the classroom. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	Intelligent
Closedminded	1	2	3	4	5	6	Openminded
Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	Concerned

How I feel about you:

Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	Intelligent
Closedminded	1	2	3	4	5	6	Openminded
Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	Concerned

12. When I get up in the morning. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Cruel	1	2	3	4	5	6	Kind
Pessimistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	Optimistic
Unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	Attractive

How I feel about you:

Cruel	1	2	3	4	5	6	Kind
Pessimistic	1	2	3	4	5	6	Optimistic
Unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	Attractive

13. In a serious discussion. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Closedminded 1 2 3 4 5 6 Openminded  
 Apathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6 Concerned  
 Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 Intelligent

How I feel about you:

Closedminded: 1 2 3 4 5 6 Openminded  
 Apathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6 Concerned  
 Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 Intelligent

14. Being interviewed for a job. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Dull 1 2 3 4 5 6 Interesting  
 Unattractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 Attractive  
 Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 Intelligent

How I feel about you:

Dull 1 2 3 4 5 6 Interesting  
 Unattractive 1 2 3 4 5 6 Attractive  
 Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 Intelligent

15. Giving advice to someone. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Insincere 1 2 3 4 5 6 Sincere  
 Apathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6 Concerned  
 Dishonest 1 2 3 4 5 6 Honest

How I feel about you:

Insincere 1 2 3 4 5 6 Sincere  
 Apathetic 1 2 3 4 5 6 Concerned  
 Dishonest 1 2 3 4 5 6 Honest

16. With people in authority. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 5 6 Comfortable  
 Closedminded 1 2 3 4 5 6 Openminded  
 Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 Intelligent

How I feel about you:

Uncomfortable 1 2 3 4 5 6 Comfortable  
 Closedminded 1 2 3 4 5 6 Openminded  
 Unintelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 Intelligent

17. When I am all alone. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Maladjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	Adjusted
Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	Concerned
Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	Honest

How I feel about you:

Maladjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	Adjusted
Apathetic	1	2	3	4	5	6	Concerned
Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	Honest

18. Doing a job. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Dull	1	2	3	4	5	6	Interesting
Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	Intelligent

How I feel about you:

Unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	6	Friendly
Dull	1	2	3	4	5	6	Interesting
Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	Intelligent

19. Lying in bed at night. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Maladjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	Adjusted
Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	Honest
Insincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sincere

How I feel about you:

Maladjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	Adjusted
Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	Honest
Insincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	Sincere

20. Studying for an exam. Situation: \_\_\_\_\_

How I feel about me:

Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	Honest
Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	Intelligent
Maladjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	Adjusted

How I feel about you:

Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	Honest
Unintelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	Intelligent
Maladjusted	1	2	3	4	5	6	Adjusted

How accurate were your answers: Very \_\_\_\_\_ Fairly \_\_\_\_\_ Slightly \_\_\_\_\_ Not at all \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Sex: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_

## EMOTIONAL EXPERIENCE CHECKLIST

All of us are capable of a wide variety of emotional experiences. Yet, for each of us, some emotions are more characteristic or typical than others. In a sense, we each have "preferred" ways of responding emotionally. The items below ask you to indicate which emotions are more (or less) characteristic for you.

Emotions may be distinguished as to intensity (how strongly you feel the emotion) and frequency (how often you feel the emotion). The emotions that you feel most intensely may or may not be the same emotions as those you feel most frequently. You are asked to make this distinction in the two items below.

1. Frequency: Rank all of the following emotions according to how frequently you feel them. Put a "1" next to the feeling which is most frequent for you; a "2" next to the second most frequent feeling, and so on, until you have put a "5" next to the emotion which is least frequent for you.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Nervous (anxious, insecure)
2. \_\_\_\_\_ Cheerful (delighted, amused)
3. \_\_\_\_\_ Angry (resentful, disgusted, annoyed)
4. \_\_\_\_\_ Depressed (sad, down)
5. \_\_\_\_\_ Bored\* (apathetic)

2. Intensity: Rank all of the following emotions according to how intensely you feel them. Put a "1" next to the feeling which is most intense for you, a "2" next to the second most intense feeling, and so on, until you have put a "5" next to the emotion which is least intense for you.

1. \_\_\_\_\_ Nervous (anxious, insecure)
2. \_\_\_\_\_ Cheerful (delighted, amused)
3. \_\_\_\_\_ Angry (resentful, disgusted, annoyed)
4. \_\_\_\_\_ Depressed (sad, down)
5. \_\_\_\_\_ Bored\* (apathetic)

\*Note: "Boredom" is used here as a feeling, not as a lack of feeling. In this sense, boredom may be quite intense. For example, one might say: "I feel slightly bored" or "I feel extremely bored."

JUVENILE COURT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Sex: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_

3. Age: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Of the children in my family, I am (circle one)

Youngest                      Middle                      Oldest                      Only child

5. Total annual family income (circle one)

Less than \$4000                      \$4000 to \$8000                      \$8000 to \$12,000                      Above \$12,000

6. I live with (check one):

\_\_\_\_\_ A. Someone other than my real parents

\_\_\_\_\_ B. One natural parent only

\_\_\_\_\_ C. One natural and one step-parent

\_\_\_\_\_ D. Both natural parents

7. Church attendance, including Sunday School or youth group:

\_\_\_\_\_ A. 0 to 4 times per year

\_\_\_\_\_ B. 5 to 11 times per year

\_\_\_\_\_ C. 12 or more times per year

.....

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

8. I.Q. \_\_\_\_\_

9. Reading Level \_\_\_\_\_

10. School Attendance \_\_\_\_\_

11. Grade Point Average \_\_\_\_\_

12. Life Position \_\_\_\_\_

13. Offense \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE XIV  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF I.Q. SCORES  
FOR FAMILY INCOME CATEGORIES

Family Income	I.Q. Scores			Row Total
	Below 90	90-110	Above 110	
Less than \$4000	7	0	0	7
\$4000 to \$7999	7	3	1	11
\$8000 to \$12000	3	10	3	16
Above \$12000	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>14</u>
Column Total	19	17	12	48

Chi-square value = 27.16  
Significance = .0001

TABLE XV  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF READING LEVEL SCORES  
FOR FAMILY INCOME CATEGORIES

Family Income	Reading Level				Row Total
	Defective 1 - 3	Functional 4 & 5	Adequate 6 & 7	8 & Above	
Less than \$4000	4	2	1	0	7
\$4000 to \$7999	1	2	4	4	11
\$8000 to \$12000	1	2	4	9	16
Above \$12000	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>14</u>
Column Total	6	6	11	25	48

Chi-square value = 25.84  
Significance = .002

TABLE XVI  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF GRADES FOR  
FAMILY INCOME CATEGORIES

Family Income	<u>Grade Average in School</u>					Row Total
	F	D	C	B	A	
Less than \$4000	3	4	0	0	0	7
\$4000 to \$7999	2	4	5	0	0	11
\$8000 to \$12000	0	6	8	2	0	16
Above \$12000	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>14</u>
Column Total	5	16	16	11	0	48

Chi-square value = 33.75  
Significance = .0001

TABLE XVII  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE  
FOR FAMILY INCOME CATEGORIES

Family Income	<u>Church Attendance</u> <u>Number of Times per Year</u>			Row Total
	0 - 4	5 - 11	12 or more	
Less than \$4000	5	1	1	7
\$4000 to \$7999	10	1	0	11
\$8000 to \$12000	4	6	6	16
Above \$12000	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>14</u>
Column Total	22	11	15	48

Chi-square value = 19.14  
Significance = .0039

TABLE XVIII  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF READING LEVEL  
FOR I.Q. SCORE CATEGORIES

I.Q. Scores	<u>Reading Level</u>				Row Total
	Defective 1 - 3	Functional 4 & 5	Adequate 6 & 7	Good 8 & Above	
Below 90	5	4	5	5	19
90-110	1	2	6	8	17
Above 110	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12</u>
Column Total	6	6	11	25	48

Chi-square value = 19.39  
Significance = .0035

TABLE XIX  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF GRADES FOR  
I.Q. SCORE CATEGORIES

I.Q. Scores	<u>Grade Average in School</u>					Row Total
	F	D	C	B	A	
Below 90	5	11	3	0	0	19
90-110	0	5	9	3	0	17
Above 110	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12</u>
Column Total	5	16	16	11	0	48

Chi-square value = 33.45  
Significance = .0001

TABLE XX  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF GRADE AVERAGE  
FOR READING LEVEL CATEGORIES

Reading Grade Level	<u>Grade Average in School</u>					Row Total
	F	D	C	B	A	
Defective 1 - 3	1	4	1	0	0	6
Functional 4 & 5	2	1	3	0	0	6
Adequate 6 & 7	1	5	5	0	0	11
Good 8 and above	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>25</u>
Column Total	5	16	16	11	0	48

Chi-square value = 19.71  
Significance = .0198

TABLE XXI  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF GRADE AVERAGE  
FOR CHURCH ATTENDANCE CATEGORIES

Church Attendance No. of Times per Year	<u>Grade Average in School</u>					Row Total
	F	D	C	B	A	
0 - 4	4	9	7	2	0	22
5 - 11	0	6	3	2	0	11
12 or more	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>15</u>
Column Total	5	16	16	11	0	48

Chi-square value = 13.66  
Significance = .0337

TABLE XXII

OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF I.Q. SCORES  
FOR SIBLING ORDER CATEGORIES

Sibling Order	<u>I.Q. Scores</u>			Row Total
	Below 90	90 - 110	Above 110	
Youngest Child	3	5	8	16
Middle Child	12	5	3	20
Oldest Child	4	5	1	10
Only Child	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Column Total	19	17	12	48

Chi-square value = 14.5

Significance = .02

TABLE XXIII

OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF I.Q. SCORES FOR REGULARITY  
OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE CATEGORIES

Church Attendance No. of Times per Year	<u>I.Q. Scores</u>			Row Total
	Below 90	90-110	Above 110	
0 - 4	12	7	3	22
5 - 11	5	4	2	11
12 or more	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>15</u>
Column Total	19	17	12	48

Chi-square value = 8.29

Significance = .0818

TABLE XXIV  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF CHURCH ATTENDANCE  
FOR MALES AND FEMALES

Sex	<u>Church Attendance</u>			Row Total
	Number of Times per Year			
	0 - 4	5 - 11	12 or more	
Male	20	5	13	38
Female	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10</u>
Column Total	22	11	15	48

Chi-square value = 9.93  
Significance = .007

TABLE XXV  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF LIFE POSITION  
FOR GRADE AVERAGE CATEGORIES

Grade Averages in School	Life Position				Row Total
	I +	I -	I +	I -	
	You +	You +	You -	You -	
F	2	2	0	1	5
D	13	2	1	0	16
C	14	1	1	0	16
B	10	0	1	0	11
A	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Column Total	39	5	3	1	48

Chi-square value = 15.98  
Significance = .0672

TABLE XXVI  
OBSERVED DISTRIBUTION OF LIFE POSITION  
FOR READING LEVEL CATEGORIES

Reading Grade Level	<u>Life Position</u>				Row Total
	I + You +	I - You +	I + You -	I - You -	
Defective 1 - 3	5	0	1	0	6
Functional 4 - 5	3	2	0	1	6
Adequate 6 - 7	11	0	0	0	11
Good 8 and above	<u>20</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>25</u>
Column Total	39	5	3	1	48

Chi-square value = 15.29  
Significance = .0833

2  
VITA

James Evert Lunsford

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: FACTORS RELATED TO THE SERIOUSNESS OF OFFENSES OF JUVENILE  
LAW VIOLATORS

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Mountain View, Oklahoma, December 15,  
1935, the son of James Evert and Ruth Lunsford.

Education: Graduated from Bethany High School, Bethany, Oklahoma,  
in May, 1955; received Bachelor of Science degree in  
Education from Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma  
in 1963; received Master of Teaching in Guidance from  
Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma in 1968; completed  
requirements for the Doctor of Education degree at Oklahoma  
State University in May, 1976.

Professional Experience: Industrial Arts Teacher, 1963-69,  
School Counselor and Psychology Teacher, 1969-71 at  
Bethany Junior-Senior High School; Counselor for Bureau  
of Indian Affairs Institute for Indian Children with  
Learning Disabilities, summer of 1970; Director-Counselor,  
Payne County Youth Services, 1972 to present.