

This dissertation has been 61-5020
microfilmed exactly as received

HURLEY, William Maurice, 1916-
A STUDY OF THE SELF-CONCEPTS OF
CRIMINALS AND NON-CRIMINALS.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1961
Education, psychology

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

A STUDY OF THE SELF-CONCEPTS OF
CRIMINALS AND NON-CRIMINALS

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

BY
WILLIAM MAURICE HURLEY
Norman, Oklahoma
1961

A STUDY OF THE SELF-CONCEPTS OF
CRIMINALS AND NON-CRIMINALS

APPROVED BY

Henry Angelino

C. R. R. R.

R. T. Friedman

Harry D. T. T.

W. L. L. L.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Appreciation is expressed to my committee, Dr. Henry Angelino, chairman, Dr. Arthur Heilman, Dr. J. Clayton Feaver, Dr. Omer Rupiper, and Dr. A. F. Glixman, who gave patient guidance to the research program. Richard Jones and Jack Heard, public relations department of the Texas State Department of Corrections, gained approval for the project in the prison. Alfonso Langley, director of education for the prison, aided in drawing the samples and made arrangements for testing procedures to be carried out under favorable conditions. Inmates of the education office worked the files to obtain necessary information for drawing the samples.

Appreciation is also expressed to Gay Crosslin and Dorothy Spencer for helping in the typing of the reading copies, and to Dr. Robert Burrows, of the English department of Ouachita Baptist College, for aid in grammatical corrections.

Considerable appreciation is expressed to Dr. Daniel Sheer, University of Houston, who made available the self-concept scale used, and gave valuable assistance at different times as the research developed.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. H. J. Parker for participating in the final defense of the dissertation in the place of Dr. A. F. Glixman.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED.....	1
II. HISTORY AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	7
III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE OF THE RESEARCH.....	13
IV. RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE RESEARCH.....	20
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RESEARCH.....	33
VI. APPENDIX	37
VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparisons of Self-Concepts of Criminals and Non-Criminals and of Four Types of Criminals	22
2. Comparison of Mean Scores of Self-Concepts of Criminals and Non-Criminals.	24
3. Comparison of Self-Concepts of Younger and Older Criminals and Non-Criminals.	28
4. Mean Scores of Self-Concepts of Criminals and Non-Criminals at Two Age Levels.	29
5. Discrepancy of Self-Concept Scores and Ideal Self-Concept Scores	30
6. Discrepancy Scores of Criminals and Non-Criminals at Different Age Levels	31
7. Coefficient of Correlation Between Self-Concept and Ideal Self-Concept Scores of the Different Groups . . .	32
8. Self-Concept Raw Scores of Non-Criminals	51
9. Self-Concept Raw Scores of Older Criminals	52
10. Self-Concept Raw Scores of Younger Criminals	53
11. Self-Concept Raw Scores of Non-Criminals--Older and Younger	54
12. Coefficient of Correlation Scores of Discrepancy Between Self-Concept and Ideal Self-Concept of the Various Groups Selected at Two Age Levels.	55
13. Self-Concept Raw Scores of Criminals	56

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

The Problem

Statement of the problem. The present investigation seeks to: (1) determine the difference in the self-concepts of criminals from those of non-criminals, and, (2) determine the difference in the self-concepts of one type of criminal from those of other types. The four types of criminals compared were burglars, robbers, forgers, and sex criminals. The determination of the difference was achieved in each case by selecting inmates with less than three weeks of incarceration in order to eliminate the effects of institutionalization.

It was hoped that four basic questions might be answered by this research: (1) Is there a significant difference in the self-concepts of criminals and those of non-criminals? (2) Is there a significant difference in the self-concepts of one type of criminal compared with other types? (3) Is there a significant difference in the discrepancy scores of criminals as compared to non-criminals?¹ (4) Is there a difference in the self-concepts of individuals of different age levels--criminal and non-criminal?

¹A discrepancy score indicates the difference between the self-concept and the ideal self-concept of each individual.

It was anticipated in the beginning of the research that the self-concepts of criminals should differ from those of non-criminals. Balester, in a comparison of the self-concepts of juvenile delinquents and adults, found a significant difference.¹ It was anticipated, also, that a significant difference would be found in the self-concept scores of adult criminals and adult non-criminals.

It was thought that a significant difference, also, might be found in the self concept scores of one type of criminal as compared to those of another type. The four types of criminals used in this research expressed varying degrees of aggressive behavior. It was assumed that the self-concept scores of the highly aggressive might be significantly different from those of the less aggressive. Carl Rogers asserted that there is a relation between an individual's personal adjustment and his self-concepts, and that to bring about improvement in the individual's personal adjustment is to bring about a change in his self-concepts.² Others have found a relation

¹Raymond Balester, "Self-Concept and Juvenile Delinquency," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956), p. 2.

²Carl Rogers, Client Centered Therapy (New York: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1951), p. 56.

between self-concepts and grade achievement,¹ marital success,² and peer group friend attitudes in the delinquent.³

Justification for the research. The justification for the research is found in its potential twofold contribution. First, it is hoped that it will throw some light on the problem of rehabilitation of the criminal. Prison officials are concerned with the failure of modern prison methods to effect proper rehabilitation of the criminal while institutionalized. A large percent of the criminals incarcerated in American prisons are recidivists. Elliott indicated that as early as 1923 fifty percent of those for whom information was available had prior prison records.⁴ One survey referred to by Sutherland indicated that sixty-eight percent of the criminals had a prior record in a penal institution.⁵ He further indicated that

¹Max Bruck, "A Study of Age Difference and Sex Difference in the Relationship Between Self-Concept and Grade Point Average" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1957); Peter H. Stevens, "Self-Concept Behavior and Student's Academic Achievement" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1956).

²Daniel Eastman, "Self-Acceptance and Marital Happiness" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1956).

³Sarah G. Allison, "Parent and Peer-Group Friend Attitudes as They Relate to the Self-Concept of the Juvenile Delinquent" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1957).

⁴Mabel Elliott, Crime in Modern Society (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952), p. 95.

⁵Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1939), p. 585.

that recidivism may be explained in terms of characteristics of the offenders or in terms of the inadequacy of the agencies of reformation. It is possible that the present research might contribute to a better understanding of the former.

Second, it is hoped that the research will contribute to the general field of self-concept theory. The scientific approach to self-concept study is relatively new, beginning basically with Raimy's research in 1948.¹ Since then, so far as is known, only one major work, using self-concept approach, has appeared in the field of criminal behavior.²

Two questions should be answered to justify the use of the self-concept as a method of studying the criminal: (1) is there evidence that the self-concept is an adequate method of studying human behavior, and, (2) is the self concept related to overt behavior? In answer to the first question Balester says, "Recently the self-concept has appeared as a popular, and probably important, term in psychology. It is being formulated through increasing activities..."³

There seems to be, also, ample evidence that the self-concept is related to overt behavior. Balester felt that his research gave ample support to this relation and it has been

¹V. C. Raimy, "The Self-Concept as a Factor in Counseling and Personality" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1948).

²Balester, loc. cit.

³Ibid., p. 12.

further substantiated by others including Stevens,¹ Omewake,² and Hillson and Worchel.³

Definition of Terms Used

The terms in this research are used as follows:

Self-concept. Raimy defined the term as "the more or less organized perceptual object resulting from present and past self observation...what a person believes about himself."⁴ The term is used in this paper to indicate the way a person sees himself or believes about himself as reflected through the scores of the Sheer Self-Concept Scale.

Ideal self-concept. The term ideal self-concept is used to indicate the way a person imagines he would like to be as reflected through the scores of the Sheer Self-Concept Scale.

Criminal. An individual who has committed an offense punishable by law and who has been apprehended and confined to a penal institution.

¹Peter H. Stevens, "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Certain Aspects of Self-Concept Behavior and Student's Academic Achievement," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1956).

²Katherine Omwake, "The Relation Between Acceptance of Self and the Acceptance of Others," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII, 6 (December 1954), p. 443.

³J. S. Hillson and Phillip Worchel, "Self-Concept and Defensive Behavior in the Maladjusted," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXI, 1, (February 1959), p. 83.

⁴Raimy, loc. cit., p. 154.

Non-criminal. An individual who has never committed a crime serious enough to have been apprehended and convicted.

Robber. An individual who has been apprehended and convicted for armed robbery.

Burglar. An individual who has been apprehended and convicted of burglarizing a place of business after working hours or a residence while the occupants were not present.

Forger. One convicted of passing forged instruments, checks, or bonds.

Sex criminal. One who has been convicted of committing an overt sexual attack on another person.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Development of the Scientific Approach

Many approaches have been made to the study of the criminal. Lombroso, in the last century, believed that criminal traits could be related to the physical characteristics of the individual.¹ The neo-classical approach strongly emphasized the needs of the criminal. The psychiatrists have advanced state of mind as the cause of criminal behavior.² Psychoanalysts have stressed the animal nature of man and that his criminal behavior arises from his inability to overcome his original nature.³ Healey and Bonner viewed it as a resentment against society.⁴

In 1900 Freud began to take serious the study of personality through self study.⁵ In the second quarter of the

¹David Abrahamsen, Crime and the Human Mind (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), p. 4.

²Ibid., p. 16

³Marshall B. Clinard, Sociology of Deviant Behavior (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1950), p. 30.

⁴Karl A. Menninger, The Human Mind (3rd. ed., New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955), p. 35.

⁵Ives Hendricks, Facts and Theories of Psychoanalysis (New York: MacMillan Company, 1913), pp. 86-88.

twentieth century such writers as Horney,¹ Allport,² began to make the self an important concept in psychological theory. Raimy gave the concept careful definition.³ This came at an appropriate time when psychology was fast becoming personal in its outlook and clinical psychology was growing rapidly with its emphasis on personal analysis. Since the appearance of Raimy's work, a whole series of writings and research projects have been completed using this concept as a basis.⁴

Snygg and Combs made an important contribution by relating self-concept to phenomenal self.⁵ They also raised many issues in the area of self-concept for future research scientists to solve. The recognition of self-concept as an approach to the study of personality has grown until authorities outside the field of psychology have pointed up the importance of this approach.⁶ Even though much has been done in the field

¹Karen Horney, Neurosis and Human Growth (New York: W. W. Norton Company, 1937).

²G. W. Allport, Personality: A Psychological Interpretation (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937).

³V. C. Raimy, loc. cit.

⁴See bibliography.

⁵Donald Snygg and Arthur Combs, Individual Behavior (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1949), p. 79ff.

⁶Marshall Clinard, Sociology of Deviant Behavior (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1958), p. 39.

of self-concept, very little research has dealt directly with the criminal.

Review of the Literature

So far as is known, only two major research projects have applied the self-concept approach to the study of the criminal since the appearance of Raimy's work. Allison studied the attitudes of delinquents toward parent and peer group as it related to their self-concepts,¹ and Balester used the self-concept approach to study adults, non-delinquents, incarcerated first offenders and groups of repeater delinquents.² Since extensive surveys of the literature have been done, both in general self theory and in Q-methodology, by Balester and Raymaker no elaborate survey is reported in this study.³

Three basic discoveries have come from studies related to the general framework of the present research. First, clinicians have demonstrated that there is a relation between self-concept and adjustment. Carl Rogers observed that a proper regard for one's self was necessary for the individual to make an adequate adjustment.⁴

¹Sarah G. Allison, loc. cit.

²Raymond Balester, loc. cit.

³Henry Raymaker, "Relationship Between the Self-Concept, the Ideal Self-Concept, and Maladjustment" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956).

⁴Carl Rogers, loc. cit., p. 56.

Second, clinicians have also discovered that there is a relation between an individual's self-perception and his perception of environment. Chodorkoff performed a study of the self-perception, perceptual defense and adjustment. In the study he concludes that "the more faulty and inaccurate the individual's perception of his environment, the more inaccurate and faulty the individual's perception of himself...the more inadequate his personal adjustment."¹

Third, it has been discovered that there is a relation between the amount of discrepancy between an individual's self-concept and his ideal self-concept and his adjustment. Maslow believed that the neurotic person is maladjusted because he has failed to bring his ideal self-concept close to his self-concept.² Rogers theorized that because of the neurotic's discrepancy between his self-concept and his ideal self-concept he feels threat which causes him to be less accepting of himself.³ Hanlon, Hoptaetter, and O'Connor supported the Rogers assumption by stating that recent studies of patient change during

¹Bernard Chodoroff, "Self-Perception, Perceptual Defense, and Adjustment," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLIX, 1954, pp. 508-512.

²A. H. Maslow, "Deprivation, Threat and Frustration," Psychological Review, XLVIII (1941), pp. 364-366.

³Carl Rogers, loc. cit.,

successful psychotherapy have "demonstrated an increase in the correlation between the client's self-concept and his ideal self-concept as measured by the Roger's Q-sort."¹

The only major research directly related to the present study is the Balester investigation. When he compared delinquents with non-delinquents he found that "the mean Q-sort self-concept scores of delinquent subjects will be significantly different from the mean Q-sort self-concept scores of non-delinquents."² He also discovered that a comparison of the mean positive Q-sort self-concept scores for all groups of subjects on three sorts produced an F-ratio larger in comparisons of variances between adults and delinquents than between adults and non-delinquents. One major difference exists between the Balester study and the present research. Balester was primarily interested in the effects of institutionalization on self-concepts while the present study is concerned with the difference in self-concepts of criminals vs. non-criminals at the time they enter prison before effects of institutionalization begin.

The foregoing review of the literature provides some basic assumptions that fit into the framework of this research. It has been demonstrated that there is a relation between self-concept

¹T. E. Hanlon, P. R. Hoptaetter, and J. P. O'Connor, "Congruence of Self and Ideal Self in Relation to Personality Adjustments," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXVIII, 3 (1954), p. 215.

²Balester, loc. cit.

and behavior. Since the criminal has failed to adjust to society, it is feasible to theorize that this lack of adjustment should be reflected in his self-concept scores. Also, it has been demonstrated that the individual's self-perception and his perception of environment is related. It has been demonstrated that the individual's adjustment is related to the amount of discrepancy that exists between his self-concept and his ideal self-concept. Since the criminal is socially maladjusted it might be expected that the discrepancy scores of the criminal would differ significantly from those of the non-criminal.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE OF THE RESEARCH

Purpose of the Research

The primary purpose of the research was to compare the self-concepts and the discrepancy between the self-concepts and ideal self-concepts of criminals and non-criminals before the effects of institutionalization began. Comparisons were assessed by use of the Sheer Self-Concept Scale to be described below.¹ Also, the same comparisons were made of four types of criminals within the criminal group--burglars, robbers, forgers, and sex criminals. The groups were divided into age levels--nineteen years of age and under and twenty-seven years of age and above. The self-concept scores and the discrepancy scores of each age group, criminal and non-criminal, were compared to determine if the self-concept scores and the discrepancy scores of criminals and non-criminals changed with increasing age.

Choosing the Subjects

The criminal sample. The criminal sample of ninety-five inmates used in this research was chosen from the Texas State Prison, Huntsville, Texas. All prisoners of the Texas Department of Corrections are first admitted to the Huntsville prison and placed in an isolation ward until they have been processed and

¹See Appendix for items of the Sheer Self-Concept Scale.

reassigned to various units of the prison system. All inmates in the isolation ward at the time of the study who met the criterion were used.

The criminal sample was chosen on the following basis:

1. White, male prisoners, sixteen years of age and above were used.
2. The sample was restricted to first admissions who were without prior prison records, either in a prison, reformatory, or house of correction.
3. No known psychotic subjects were included in the sample.
4. In order to keep the effects of institutionalization at a minimum, only those subjects who had been in isolation three weeks or less were chosen.
5. No known alcoholics were included.
6. The sample was restricted to those who were one of the four types--burglars, robbers, forgers, and sex criminals.
7. No illiterates were included in the sample.
8. The criminal sample was divided into two age groups--nineteen years of age and under and hereafter referred to as the young criminal and twenty-seven years of age and above and hereafter referred to as the older criminal.

The non-criminal sample. This sample of twenty-seven non-criminals was chosen from three groups: Group I, six married men, 27-34 years of age, chosen randomly from the community, and hereafter referred to as the older non-criminals; Group II, eleven

high school senior boys 17-19 years of age and hereafter referred to as the younger non-criminal group; and Group III, male college students, 20-26 years of age. Since the criminal and non-criminal groups were to be compared by age levels, this method of choice made possible the matching of the non-criminal sample with the criminal sample by age.

Three restrictions were placed on the sample:

1. No individual was included who had been arrested and convicted of a crime.
2. No alcoholics were included in the sample.
3. No one with a psychiatric record was chosen.

Instruments Used in the Research

The two instruments used in the research were the Standardized Oral Reading Test, by William S. Gray and the Sheer Self-Concept Scale, a Q-sort developed by Daniel Sheer of the University of Houston. The first instrument was used to determine those subjects who had the ability to read and comprehend the statements of the Sheer scale.

The Standardized Oral Reading Test has been an acceptable instrument for several years. The test is one of the older instruments in use, but it is still considered highly acceptable as a diagnostic analysis of oral reading ability.¹

¹Harry A. Green, Albert Jorgensen, and J. Raymond Gerberich, Measurement and Evaluation in the Elementary School (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, Inc., 1950), p. 336.

The Sheer Self-Concept Scale was developed by Daniel Sheer to measure five personality factors by the Stephenson's Q-sort technique. The development was begun on data obtained in the Michigan Assessment Program. The scale consists of one hundred self appraisal statements constructed to quantify five personality dimensions--social adaptability, emotional control, conformity, inquiring intellect, and confident self-expression. Each dimension contains twenty items of self-appraisal--ten which reflect negative attitudes and ten which reflect positive ones. The scale is a Q-sort technique presented in such a manner as to give a haphazard order to the items.

The items were validated by factors using Flanagan's suggested coefficient of $r = .22$ as acceptable. Only four items in the Sheer scale ranged below this at an $r = .21$. When split-half reliabilities were run, the range varied from $r = .92$ for social adaptability and emotional control to $r = .87$ for inquiring intellect, and $r = .89$ for conformity and confident self-expression. When product moment intercorrelations were computed, they ranged from $r = .48$ between inquiring intellect and confident self-expression, and between emotional control and conformity, to $r = -.06$ between social adaptability and inquiring intellect.

To validate further sex differences were checked. He discovered that the females reflected more social adaptability and conformity, while males had more inquiring intellect. The

self-concept scale was, also, given to one hundred subjects in the standard way and then repeated with the instructions to fake the test, that is to give the most socially desirable picture of themselves. Correlation between self-sort (standard instructions) and the social desirability was $r = .42$; between faked self-sort and the social desirability scale was $r = .79$; and, between the self-sort and the faked sort was $r = .23$.

The Method of Administration

Each subject was asked to read orally paragraphs six, seven and eight of the Standardized Oral Reading Test. The test was administered individually to each subject, and those who missed as many as eight words per hundred words read were rejected from the study. Only four of the criminals and none of the non-criminals was rejected. A miss of eight words per hundred words is comparable to fifth grade level of reading and was considered a minimum requirement for comprehending the Sheer scale.

The Sheer scale was administered to each subject who passed the reading test. He was given the one hundred cards containing the items of the self-concept scale and told to sort the cards into three piles, with those items he considered least like him placed in the pile to his left and those most like him in the pile to his right and the neutral ones in the center pile. After he completed sorting into three piles, eight

cards numbered one through eight were placed in front of him with card number one to the subject's left and card number eight to his right and the others in consecutive order between one and eight. He was then instructed to resort the three piles into the eight piles with those statements least like him to the left and those most like him to the right and the others arranged from left to right, from least like him to most like him progressively.¹

When each subject had completed the original sort, the cards were collected and counted to make sure that each pile contained the correct number. The instructions were repeated to insure that each subject had understood the original instructions and followed them properly. The subject was then given a second stack of cards, exactly like the original ones, and told to sort these as he had the first sort except that now he was to sort the cards on the basis of what he would like to be rather than what he conceived himself to be. The original sort was to ascertain his self-concept scores, while the re-sort was to determine his ideal self-concept scores.

The Statistical Procedure Used

Three general comparisons were made. Self-concept scores, and discrepancy scores between self-concept and ideal self-concept were the basis of comparison of: (1) 95 criminals with 27 non-criminals, (2) the four types of criminals (burglars, robbers, forgers, and sex criminals) with each other, (3) the young

¹Full instructions are to be found in the appendix.

criminals with young non-criminals and older criminals with older non-criminals. Due to the nature of the Q-sort, each subject received a score on each dimension--social adaptability, emotional control, inquiring intellect, confident self-expression, and conformity. Since the assumptions basic to utilization of parametric statistics cannot be used, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the results. It was felt that this was an effective measure since "this is one of the most powerful of the non-parametric tests, and is a useful alternative to the parametric t test when the researcher wishes to avoid the t test's assumption..."¹

The Mann-Whitney U test indicates whether there is a significant difference in two sets of scores but it does not indicate the direction or extent of the difference. To determine this a mean was computed from raw scores for each individual on each dimension. These means were average for each group and the groups means were compared to determine which group had the greater number of positive self statements.

¹Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 184.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Comparisons of Self-Concepts

Criminals compared with non-criminals. In each of the five dimensions of the Sheer scale--social adaptability, emotional control, conformity, inquiring intellect, and confident self-expression --there was a significant difference in the scores of the criminals as compared with the non-criminals at the 0.01 level of significance (Table I).

1) Social adaptability. This dimension on the Sheer scale was developed to suggest a person with these traits would consider himself good company, as participating readily in group activities, spontaneous, responsive, and a "good Joe." Since the self-concept scores of each individual represent a placement of items along a span of one to eight with one being statements least like him and eight being those statements most like him, a smaller mean would indicate a less favorable evaluation of himself. Criminals reflected a mean lower than the non-criminals, indicating that the former conceives of himself as being less socially adapted than the latter (Table II).

Thus, a less ideal self-concept is an accompaniment to criminal behavior. Data are insufficient from which to draw inferences about the causal position of the criminal's self-concept.

2) Emotional control. This factor suggests a pattern of behavior which involves a mature guidance of emotional expression with placidity and self-sufficiency. It is interesting to note that the criminals rate themselves more positive on this dimension than the non-criminals. This would seem to indicate that whereas the criminal felt that he was less socially adapted than the non-criminal he felt that he had a greater emotional control than the non-criminal. Poor emotional control, per se, is not a sufficient condition to account for criminal behavior. Non-criminals may have poor emotional control, but the behavior outcome for the non-criminal is not anti-social.

3) Conformity. This dimension reflects the extent to which a person describes himself as doing the right thing, who obeys social mores, and has a respectful attitude toward authority and a conception of the relationship between superiority and subordinate. In this factor the criminal rated himself significantly above the non-criminal. One can only speculate as to why the criminal feels that he conforms to the mores of society

TABLE I
COMPARISONS OF SELF-CONCEPTS OF
CRIMINALS AND NON-CRIMINALS AND
OF FOUR TYPES OF CRIMINALS

Groups:		Social Adaptability		Emotional Control		Conformity		Inquiring Intellect		Confident Self- Expression	
Non-criminal (N=27)	Criminal (N=95)										
Robbery	(N=21)										
Burglary	(N=30)										
Forgery	(N=29)										
Sex Crime	(N=15)										
		** U	z	U	z	U	z	U	z	U	z
Criminal vs. non-criminal		2552	6.61*	2270	5.83*	585	6.41*	2346	20.76*	1282	7.41*
Criminal groups:											
Robbery vs. sex		246	2.84*	268	1.51	211	1.94	194	1.17	253	2.48*
Robbery vs. forgery		461	30.76*	474	.96	549	4.81*	508	4.01*	456	2.98*
Sex vs. forgery		334	7.09*	443	.14	211	1.36	338	1.55	217	2.69*
Burglary vs. forgery		768	2.74*	884	16.79*	805	8.24*	852	6.13*	795	5.46*
Burglary vs. robbery		647	6.35*	638	5.79*	749	8.30*	567	2.76*	315	4.32*
Burglary vs. Sex		426	4.84*	374	3.59*	470	3.01	487	2.88	383	3.81*

*Significant at the 0.01 level of significance.

**U from the Mann-Whitney U test.

better than the non-criminal. It might be reasoned that the criminal compares himself with other criminals and that his conformity is to be viewed as conformity to a group like himself. Also, it may mean that he sees himself as conforming in many areas of his behavior but not in the one area of anti-social behavior.

4) Inquiring intellect. This factor suggests a pattern of behavior which includes broad interests, independent mindedness, and imaginativeness with a curiosity and an awareness of the environment. This dimension reflected a significant difference with the mean scores of the criminal ranging below those of the non-criminal (Table II). This seems to indicate that the criminal feels that he has less inquiring intellect than the non-criminal conceives of himself.

5) Confident self-expression. This dimension suggests a pattern of behavior which concerns the person's confidence in himself as overtly expressed in social interactions. It includes assertiveness, adventurousness and frank expressiveness. The criminal reflected lower mean scores, indicating that the criminal considers himself less self-confident, less assertive, and less adventurous than the non-criminal. It might be theorized that the criminal's lower self-expression interpreted in terms of life goals might be a cue to his criminal behavior. Whether the lower self-confidence is an outcome or a precipitator of criminal behavior is undetermined.

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES OF
CRIMINALS AND NON-CRIMINALS

Groups	Social Adaptability		Emotional Control		Conformity		Inquiring Intellect		Confident Self-Expression	
	Mean	σ	Mean	σ	Mean	σ	Mean	σ	Mean	σ
Non-criminal (N=27)	5.35	9.70	4.67	13.89	5.19	14.68	4.99	14.66	4.76	14.46
Criminal (N=95)	4.67	15.62	5.12	13.41	5.26	12.73	4.76	12.69	4.53	14.11
Sex crimes (N=15)	4.90	12.33	5.09	16.61	5.01	17.86	4.07	11.22	4.64	14.00
Robbery (N=21)	4.55	16.64	4.69	12.96	5.09	11.18	4.90	13.00	4.37	15.68
Forgery (N=29)	4.95	15.84	5.70	14.04	5.50	13.60	5.10	14.76	4.90	13.86
Burglary (N=30)	4.63	16.37	4.91	12.04	5.30	10.44	4.71	10.00	4.25	14.07

Comparison of self-concepts of criminal groups. As has been indicated the criminals were divided into four groups or types--robbers, burglars, forgers, and sex criminals. The self-concept scores of each of these were compared on each dimension of the Sheer scale.

1) Social adaptability. When the four criminal groups were compared there was a significant difference between all types. The robbery group reflected the lowest mean while the forgers reflected the highest. Since this dimension suggests a person who is spontaneous, responsive, and who engages readily in social activities, it might have been suspected that the forger would reflect a higher mean score than the other criminal groups. His ability to mix socially and to sell himself is a part of the art of committing forgery without being immediately suspected.

2) Emotional control. There is no significant difference in the self-concept scores of one type of criminal as compared to the others with the exception of burglary. The burglar differs significantly from the other groups. Robbers, forgers, and sex criminals do not differ significantly from each other (Table II). Compared with the other groups, the burglar feels he has a relatively low emotional control. Only the burglar feels that he has a lower emotional control than the robber.

3) Conformity. In this factor there was a significant difference found between all of the criminal groups with the exception of the scores of those committed for sex crimes. Even

though the sex criminal did not differ significantly from the others in this dimension he reflected the lowest mean score of any of the criminal groups. This seems to indicate that he did not conform to the mores of society and he was aware of this lack.

4) Inquiring intellect. The sex criminal did not differ significantly from robbers, burglars, and forgers, but the latter groups did differ significantly from each other.

5) Confident self-expression. There was a significant difference between each of the criminal groups. The burglar rated himself as the most lacking in confident self-expression. The forger rated the highest, having a mean score higher than the non-criminal groups as well as each of the criminal groups (Table II). This means that the burglar was least self-confident while the forger was the most.

Comparison of self-concepts at different age levels. The self-concept scores of four groups were segregated from the data to be compared at two age levels: (1) criminals 19 years of age and under, (2) non-criminals 19 years of age and under, (3) criminals 27 years of age and older, and (4) non-criminals 27 years of age and older.

The self-concepts of young criminals did not differ significantly from those of the young non-criminal, but the older criminal did differ significantly from the older non-criminal. The self-concept scores of criminals showed a decline with age in all factors except inquiring intellect, and conformity. In

the latter two dimensions there was a slight rise (more positive statements) in the self-concept scores of the criminals with increasing age (Table III).

Since the self-concept scores tend to remain more constant for the criminal than for the non-criminal it may be theorized that this is an indication of failure on the part of the criminal to adjust to reality. The non-criminal seems to have changing concepts that adjust to the changing role in life at different age levels, whereas the criminal does not. This may mean that the criminal tends to rely more on the same pattern of behavior throughout life. The criminal's rigidity and inflexibility of self-concepts may contribute to his criminal behavior.

Comparison of Self-Concepts and Ideal Self-Concepts

The discrepancy scores were determined by obtaining a coefficient of correlation between the self-concept scores of each subject used in the research and his ideal self-concept scores. The relationship of the self-concept and the ideal self-concept was determined by a table given by Daniel Sheer. Each r was converted to a Fisher's z score and the mean of the total of z scores was then transformed to an r . The significance of the average r 's was then determined by then use of Table A-30a in Dixon and Massey.¹ Only one significant r existed, namely for the non-criminal group. For the criminal groups--burglary,

¹W. J. Dixon and F. J. Massey, Jr., Introduction to Statistical Analysis (2nd ed; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951), p.468.

TABLE III
COMPARISON OF SELF-CONCEPTS OF YOUNGER
AND OLDER CRIMINALS AND NON-CRIMINALS

Groups	Social Adaptability		Emotional Control		Conformity		Inquiring Intellect		Confident Self- Expression	
	**U	z	U	z	U	z	U	z	U	z
Young Non-criminals (N=11) vs. Older Non-criminals (N=6)	33	0	30	.311	47	1.45	51	.187	35	9.64
Young criminals (N=28) vs. older criminals (N=28)	557	4.59*	522	3.23	542	3.96*	489	3.29*	449	2.54
Young criminals (N=18) vs. young non-criminals (N=11)	168	.89	135	.467	139	.52	130	.402	184	1.10
Older criminals (N=28) vs. older non-criminals (N=6)	245	2.45*	142	8.08*	157	1.96*	186	3.06*	165	2.27*

* significantly different at the 0.05 level of significance.

**Mann-Whitney U Test

TABLE IV
MEAN SCORES OF SELF-CONCEPTS OF
CRIMINALS AND NON-CRIMINALS
OF TWO AGE LEVELS

Group	Social Adaptability	Emotional Control	Conformity	Inquiring Intellect	Confidence Self- Expression	All Factors
Young criminals (N=18)	4.93	4.88	5.17	4.67	4.33	4.79
Young non-criminals (N=11)	5.47	4.82	4.98	4.81	5.06	5.02
Older criminals (N=28)	4.52	4.78	5.09	4.80	4.40	4.73
Older non-criminals (N=6)	4.91	4.65	5.29	6.52	4.88	5.25

forgery, robbery, and sex crime--no significant r 's existed. This suggests that there is no significant relationship between the self-concepts and the ideal self-concepts of each of the criminal groups as compared by the Sheer Self-Concept Scale, but for the non-criminal group there is a significant relationship between the self-concepts and the ideal self-concepts.

TABLE V
DISCREPANCY OF SELF-CONCEPT SCORES
AND IDEAL SELF-CONCEPT SCORES

Criminal (N=95) vs. non-criminal (N=27)	2201	7.13*
Criminal groups:		
Burglary (N=30) vs. robbery (N=21)	441	.883
Burglary (N=30) vs. sex crime (N=15)	431	1.57
Sex crime (N=15) vs. robbery (N=21)	166	.53
Burglary (N=30) vs. forgery (N=29)	680	1.174
Forgery (N=29) vs. robbery (N=21)	458	1.08
Forgery (N=29) vs. sex crime (N=15)	426	1.63

*Significant at the 0.01 level of significance.

It may be theorized that the criminal feels much nearer his ideal self-concept than the non-criminal and therefore feels less motivation toward self improvement than the non-criminal.

A comparison of discrepancy scores at different age levels.

When the coefficient of correlation scores were compared at two age levels, the same result was obtained for the criminal group at each age level as when the group was considered as a total

group. However, when the non-criminal group was compared it was discovered that for the young non-criminal there was no relationship between the self-concept and the ideal self-concept, but in the case of the older non-criminal a relationship was discovered. This would suggest that the relationship for the total non-criminal group is determined by the older non-criminal, not by the younger non-criminal, (Table XII).

TABLE VI

DISCREPANCY SCORES OF CRIMINALS
AND NON-CRIMINALS COMPARED
AT DIFFERENT AGE LEVELS

Groups	Mann-Whitney U	z*
Young criminals (N=18) vs. young non-criminals (N=11)		1.51
Older criminals (N=28) vs. older non-criminals (N=6)		.586

*A z-score of 1.64 was necessary to be considered significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

TABLE VII
COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN
SELF-CONCEPT AND IDEAL-SELF
CONCEPT SCORES OF THE
DIFFERENT GROUPS

Burglary (N=30)		Forgery (N=29)		Sex-Crimes (N=15)		Robbery (N=21)		Non-Criminal (N=27)	
r	z	r	z	r	z	r	z	r	z
-.30	-.3095	-.38	-.4000	-.63	-.7414	-.40	-.4236	.01	.0100
-.20	-.2027	.02	.0200	-.05	-.0500	-.09	-.0902	.12	.1206
-.02	-.0200	.05	.0500	-.05	-.0500	-.04	-.0400	.19	.1923
-.03	-.0300	.07	.0701	-.01	-.0100	-.06	-.0601	.20	.2027
.02	.0200	.07	.0701	.13	.1307	.06	.0601	.24	.2448
.02	.0200	.08	.0802	.22	.2237	.08	.0802	.26	.2661
.03	.0300	.10	.1003	.29	.2986	.11	.1104	.31	.3205
.08	.0802	.20	.2027	.36	.3769	.15	.1511	.31	.3205
.09	.0902	.23	.2342	.40	.4236	.20	.2027	.35	.3654
.16	.1614	.26	.2661	.43	.4599	.38	.4001	.37	.3884
.18	.1820	.29	.2985	.46	.4973	.40	.4236	.38	.4001
.27	.2769	.30	.3000	.49	.5361	.41	.4356	.46	.4973
.30	.3000	.30	.3000	.54	.6042	.48	.5229	.47	.5101
.39	.4118	.32	.3316	.62	.7250	.52	.5763	.48	.5230
.42	.4477	.34	.3541	.66	.7928	.55	.6184	.53	.5901
.43	.4599	.38	.4001			.61	.7089	.53	.5901
.43	.4599	.43	.4599			.64	.7582	.54	.6042
.43	.4599	.43	.4599			.65	.7753	.56	.6328
.44	.4722	.45	.4847			.68	.8291	.62	.7250
.46	.4973	.45	.4847			.77	1.0203	.62	.7250
.48	.5229	.49	.5361					.66	.7928
.49	.5361	.49	.5361					.68	.8291
.53	.5901	.54	.6042					.69	.8480
.54	.6041	.58	.6625					.70	.8673
.61	.7089	.63	.7414					.80	1.0986
.62	.7250	.64	.7582					.88	1.3758
.66	.7928	.69	.8480						
.67	.8107	.71	.8872						
.72	.9076	.43	.4599						
.40	.4236								
Total 10.9847		11.0008		5.0688		7.6131		13.5006	
Mean .3661		.3293		.3373		.3806		.5192	
Average r .354		.318		.328		.40		.57*	

*Significant.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Summary

The problem of this research grew out of a sense of need to better understand the criminal and to develop a more effective program of rehabilitation for the criminal, recognized by the high percentage of recidivists in the American penal population. The self-concept method was chosen to compare 95 criminals with 27 non-criminals, and four types of criminals to compare with each other-- 29 forgers, 21 robbers, 30 burglars, and 15 sex criminals.

The criminal sample was chosen from first admissions, white males of the Texas State Department of Corrections. All prisoners are first admitted to the isolation ward of the Texas State Prison, Huntsville, Texas before being processed and redistributed to other units of the prison system. All subjects were chosen from the isolation ward and who had not been imprisoned more than three weeks.

The non-criminal sample was chosen from white males of a suburban town in the Houston, Texas area and from the campus of a near by state college. The sample was matched with the criminal sample and was composed of nine high school seniors, six young married men, and eleven students from the college campus.

The Sheer Self-Concept Scale and three sections of the Gray Oral Reading Test were administered to each subject. The purpose of the reading scale was to determine those subjects who possessed the ability to read and comprehend the items of the Sheer scale. The Sheer scale, a self Q-sort test, was administered twice to each subject--once to determine his self-concept scores and a second time to determine his ideal self-concept scores. The test contains five personality dimensions--social adaptability, emotional control, conformity, inquiring intellect, and confident self-expression. Three group comparisons were made--criminals with non-criminals, four types of criminals with each other, and young criminals with young non-criminals and older criminals with older non-criminals. The age level comparisons consisted of twenty-eight older criminals and six older non-criminals, twenty-seven years of age and above, and eleven young non-criminals and eighteen young criminals, nineteen years of age and under.

In each of the five dimensions of the Sheer scale there was a significant difference in the self-concept scores, both when criminals were compared with non-criminals and when types of criminals were compared with each other. A comparison of the self-concept scores of young criminals compared with young non-criminals reflected no significant difference. However, when the self-concept scores of older criminals were compared with older non-criminals there was a significant difference.

The discrepancy scores of criminals compared with non-criminals suggest that there is a relationship between the self-concepts and the ideal self-concepts of non-criminals but there is no significant relationship in those of various types of criminals.

Recommendations

For future research with criminals the following recommendations are made:

1. The number of the non-criminal sample should be enlarged. A criticism might be made concerning the smallness of the non-criminal sample as compared to the criminal, especially the small number in the older non-criminal group. Enlargement of the non-criminal sample would tend to reflect whether this criticism is a justifiable one or not.
2. It is suggested that future investigations should be made to determine why the criminal feels that he is less socially adapted than the non-criminal but possesses a greater sense of conformity. It was theorized that this might imply one of two conclusions: (1) that he might be comparing himself with those of his kind, and, (2) that he felt that he conformed in other areas besides the one in which he is anti-social. Further research is needed to determine which of these assumptions is accurate, if either, or what other assumptions might be made from these comparisons.

3. It was hoped in the beginning of the research, that a contribution might be made to the program of rehabilitation. There is much to suggest that an effective program should entail the changing of self-concepts and ideal self-concepts of the criminal. Further research is needed to determine if this can be appropriately handled through some program of psychotherapy or through some other program.

4. There is much in this study to indicate that the Q-sort scale lends itself to quantification necessary to make it a highly acceptable instrument for future research with criminals. It is suggested that other instruments might be used profitably to further analyze the differences in the self-concepts of criminals and non-criminals. It is felt that studies in personality make-up, socio-economic background, security-insecurity scales might reveal an abundance of material beyond the present study.

APPENDIX

The Instructions Given to Each Subject

The following instructions were given to each subject in the administration of the Sheer Self-Concept Scale.

You have a bundle of cards. On each card there is a statement. You are to read each card and place it in one of three piles. In the pile to your left you will place the cards that contain statements which are least characteristic of you. In the pile to your right you will place those statements that are most like you. In the center pile you will place the neutral statements--those that are in between like and not like you. When you have finished making the three piles you are to place before you the eight pile cards in order from one to eight with one to your left and eight to your right. You will then sort the cards in the three piles into the eight piles working from left to right progressively with the cards least like you in pile one, those next least like you in pile two and so on until you arrive with those most like you in pile eight.

You will notice that each pile card has a number showing the number of cards that must be in that pile when you are finished. On pile card number one is the small number six, on pile card two the number nine, and on each one a number. When you are finished you must have in each pile the number called for. Remember, you are to sort the cards on the basis of what you think you are. Are there any questions? You may begin. You may take your time. There is no time limit on the test.

When each subject had finished the original sort, the cards were collected and counted to make sure that each pile contained the proper number. The instructions were repeated to make sure the subject had run the scale in a proper manner. When the original sort was completed the subject was given a second stack of cards just like the original stack.

With the second stack of cards the following instructions were given:

I am giving you another stack of cards. They are exactly like the first stack. I want you to sort these cards just as you did the first stack, by making first three piles with the statements least like you to your left and those most like you in the pile to your right. You will then rearrange these three piles in eight piles just as you did before, except this time you will choose the statements on the basis of what you would like to be rather than that you think you are. Do you understand? Again there is no time limit.

To the prison sample the following additional instructions were given:

This is a personality seale. You do not have to take the test. You are being asked to work voluntarily on a research project. You do not have to cooperate if you do not want to. If you do not wish to cooperate you may return to your quarters now.

To those remaining the following statement was made:

This is a research project. Your name or number will not be used in any written report coming from this research. Each of you will be given a statement to sign in which we are pledging you that your name and number will not be used. The statement you are to sign reads as follows: I am happy to cooperate with Mr. W.M. Hurley. I understand that my name and number will not be used in any publication coming from this research.

Each inmate was then asked to sign the statement. None refused to sign.

The Self-Concept Test Statements

Factor I. Social Adaptability

Negative Statements:

1. I am intolerant of people who bore me.
3. I maintain a dignified reserve when I meet strangers.
5. I am very discriminating in my choice of friends.
7. I often seclude myself, so that every Tom, Dick, and Harry cannot bother me.
9. I avoid very close relationships with other people.
11. I usually keep myself somewhat apart from the general run of people.
13. I cannot accept people with bad manners.
15. If I am not interested in a person, I will usually not have much to do with him.
17. I will do anything rather than suffer the company of tiresome and uninteresting people.
19. I prefer the company of older, talented or generally superior people.

Positive Statements:

2. I am in my element when I am with a group of people who enjoy life.
4. I become very attached to my friends.
6. I like to hang around with a group of friendly people and talk about anything that comes up.
8. I make as many friends as possible and am on the look-out for more.
10. I accept social invitations rather than stay at home alone.
12. I make a point of keeping in close touch with the doings and interests of my friends.

14. I become bound by strong loyalties to friends and institutions; it may be a college, a club, a vocational group or a political party.
16. I make friends rather quickly and feel at ease in a few minutes.
18. I make special efforts to promote good feeling when I am with other people.
20. I enjoy myself immensely at parties or other social gatherings.

Factor II. Emotional Control

Negative Statements:

21. My feelings and emotions are easily aroused.
23. I usually let myself go when I am excited about something.
25. I have unaccountable swings of moods: elations and depressions.
27. I am considered somewhat excitable by my friends.
29. I am rather sensitive and easily stirred.
31. I have intense likes and dislikes.
33. I display 'temper' when the occasion warrants it.
35. I can get quite 'heated-up' over some matter which interests me.
37. I find it difficult to control my emotions.
39. I am influenced in my decisions by how I happen to be feeling at the time.

Positive Statements:

22. I am calm and placid most of the time.
24. I usually express myself with caution and restraint.
26. I take part in things without much display of enthusiasm.
28. I am generally moderate in my feelings about things.
30. It takes a good deal to make me angry.
32. I am usually 'calm and collected' when arguing with someone.
34. I find that my life moves along at an even pace without many ups and downs.
36. I do things in a leisurely sort of way without worry or irritations.
38. My emotional life is marked by moderation and balance.
40. I find it easy to remain calm in an excitable situation.

Factor III. Conformity

Negative Statements:

- 41. I become stubborn when others attempt to force me to do things.
- 43. I argue against people who attempt to order me around.
- 45. I do not usually follow a course of action dictated by others.
- 47. I disregard all rules and regulations that restrict my freedom.
- 49. I protest sometimes, when a person steps in front of me in a waiting line.
- 51. I often blame other people when things go wrong.
- 53. I sometimes disregard the personal feelings of other people.
- 55. I frequently start new projects without waiting to finish what I have been doing.
- 57. I find that my likes and dislikes change quite frequently.
- 59. I am quick to discard the old and accept the new: new fashions, new methods, new ideas.

Positive Statements:

- 42. I give my time and energy to those who ask for it.
- 44. I enjoy putting my own affairs aside to do someone a favor.
- 46. I seldom do anything for which anyone could blame me.
- 48. I always try to tell the truth.
- 50. I have a strong sense of responsibility about my duties.
- 52. I stick to a plan of action which I have decided upon.
- 54. I am on time for my appointments.
- 56. I always try to go along with established principles and rules.
- 58. I am consistent and dependable in my dealings with others.

60. I can work at a difficult task for a long time without getting tired of it.

Factor IV. Inquiring Intellect

Negative Statements:

- 61. I often seek the advice of older men and follow it.
- 63. I am not one to question the ideas of better qualified people.
- 65. I 'feel out' the opinions of others before making a decision.
- 67. I am rather dependent upon the opinions and judgment of my friends.
- 69. I am likely to rely upon the judgment of some member of my family.
- 71. I spend very little time imagining distant plans and goals.
- 73. It is easier for me to deal with concrete facts in one special field than with general ideas about man or nature.
- 75. I am seldom critical about ideas which most people accept.
- 77. I dislike everything that has to do with money--buying, selling, and bargaining.
- 79. I usually stay with one idea for a long time before considering new ones.

Positive Statements:

- 62. I have a number of ideas I would like to try out.
- 64. I find business and financial information interesting.
- 66. I am interested in all kinds of new mechanical devices.
- 68. I enjoy reading about various economic and social problems.
- 70. I try to keep up with news about the world situation.
- 72. I like to do things with my hands: manual labor, manipulation or construction.

- 74. I enjoy reading books which deal with general ideas-- books on science, aesthetics, philosophy, etc.
- 76. I enjoy discussing with my friends the value of various ideas or theories.
- 78. I find that I can usually hold my own in an intellectual discussion.
- 80. I am independent in my thinking about problems.

Factor V. Confident Self-expression

Negative Statements

- 81. I accept suggestions rather than insist on working things out in my own way.
- 83. I usually let the other person do most of the talking when I am in a conversation.
- 85. I usually follow instructions without much discussion about them.
- 87. I am more likely to give in when someone disagrees with me.
- 89. I am usually submissive and sorry when I have done wrong.
- 91. I am shy and inhibited in my relations with the opposite sex.
- 93. I get rattled when I have to speak before a group.
- 95. I usually lack self-confidence when I have to compete against others.
- 97. I find it difficult to assert myself.
- 99. I don't discuss my private feelings but keep them to myself.

Positive Statements:

- 82. I enjoy organizing or directing the activities of a group--team, club, or committee.
- 84. I can argue with vigor for my point of view against others.
- 86. I find it rather easy to lead a group and maintain discipline.
- 88. I usually influence others more than they influence me in discussion.
- 90. I assert myself with energy when the occasion demands it.

- 92. I enjoy kidding with people of the opposite sex.
- 94. I am usually active at club meetings and social gatherings.
- 96. I can talk rather freely about things, even to casual friends.
- 98. When I am in a group, I try to increase the enjoyment of others by telling amusing stories.
- 100. I do quite a bit of talking when I am in mixed company.

Factor VI. Activity Level

Negative Statements:

- SA 3. I maintain a dignified reserve when I meet strangers.
- SA 9. I avoid very close relationships with other people.
- SA 20. I enjoy myself immensely at parties or other social gatherings.
- EC 24. I usually express myself with caution and restraint.
- EC 26. I take part in things without much display of enthusiasm.
- EC 32. I am usually 'calm and collected' when arguing with someone.
- C 46. I seldom do anything for which anyone could blame me.
- C 48. I always try to tell the truth.
- CSe 93. I get rattled when I have to speak before a group.
- CSe 97. I find it difficult to assert myself.

Positive Statements:

- SA 1. I am intolerant of people who bore me.
- SA 8. I make as many friends as possible and am on the lookout for more.
- SA 10. I accept social invitations rather than stay at home alone.
- EC 23. I usually let myself go when I am excited about something.
- EC 27. I am considered somewhat excitable by my friends.
- EC 33. I display 'temper' when the occasion warrants it.
- II 80. I am independent in my thinking about problems.
- CSe 84. I can argue with vigor for my point of view against others.

CSe 98. When I am in a group, I try to increase the enjoyment of others by telling amusing stories.

CSe 100. I do quite a bit of talking when I am in mixed company.

TABLE VIII
 SELF-CONCEPT RAW SCORES
 OF NON-CRIMINALS

(N=27)

	Social Adaptability	Emotional Control	Conformity	Inquiring Intellect	Confident Self-Expression
	86	68	75	69	72
	94	70	78	81	77
	95	72	84	81	78
	95	74	84	84	80
	96	77	85	88	84
	99	77	91	89	89
	101	79	92	89	90
	102	79	98	90	92
	102	83	98	93	93
	102	92	99	94	94
	104	92	100	94	96
	104	93	101	94	98
	104	96	102	95	98
	103	96	106	97	100
	106	97	107	98	102
	109	98	108	98	102
	109	99	110	99	103
	109	101	113	100	104
	111	103	114	104	106
	117	103	115	111	110
	117	104	115	115	110
	117	107	116	116	111
	118	107	118	117	111
	119	108	119	120	112
	122	112	120	120	117
	122	116	123	126	117
	124	117	130	135	131
Total	2890	2520	2801	2692	2877
Median	106	96	106	97	100
Mean	107.04	93.33	103.74	99.70	99.15

TABLE IX
SELF-CONCEPT RAW SCORES
OF OLDER CRIMINALS

(N=28)

Social Adaptability	Emotional Control	Conformity	Inquiring Intellect	Confident Self-Expression
55	58	59	77	58
57	71	71	79	69
62	72	73	81	72
69	73	79	83	73
75	76	88	83	74
76	82	89	84	79
78	83	89	84	79
79	90	96	85	85
80	94	87	88	85
83	94	98	88	85
82	95	99	90	88
84	97	99	94	89
87	98	100	95	89
89	98	101	95	93
92	99	104	96	95
93	103	105	97	96
94	104	105	98	100
94	104	110	99	100
99	105	110	100	100
100	106	111	100	102
101	107	112	100	103
102	107	116	103	104
102	109	116	103	104
108	111	117	108	111
109	111	117	110	111
110	111	118	111	112
117	112	120	112	113
119	123	130	119	118
Total 2493	2703	2829	2662	2584
Median 90.5	98.5	102.5	95.5	94
Mean 89.04	96.54	102.03	95.07	92.29

TABLE X
SELF-CONCEPT RAW SCORES
OF YOUNGER CRIMINALS

(N=18)

Social Adaptability	Emotional Control	Conformity	Inquiring Intellect	Confident Self-Expression
77	74	85	73	61
78	81	87	75	65
80	86	89	79	71
85	86	90	80	78
87	88	95	82	80
91	93	98	88	80
94	96	100	91	82
96	98	100	91	83
100	99	103	93	85
101	100	105	93	86
105	100	105	95	90
106	103	108	97	95
109	104	109	100	95
109	106	109	101	97
109	107	111	103	98
114	112	119	105	102
117	112	119	106	105
119	118	123	120	106
Total 1777	1749	1750	1576	1559
Median 100.5	98.5	104	93	85.5
Mean 98.73	97.26	97.16	87.55	86.61

TABLE XI
SELF-CONCEPT RAW SCORES
OF NON-CRIMINALS

	Social Adaptability	Emotional Control	Conformity	Inquiring Intellect	Confident Self-Expression
Older Non-Criminals (N=6)					
	86	77	92	84	77
	95	83	100	100	90
	102	92	106	113	93
	104	96	108	116	103
	105	103	115	120	106
	109	107	115	126	117
Total	602	558	636	661	586
Median	103	94	107	115.5	98
Mean	100.33	93	106	110.61	97.67
Young Non-Criminals (N=11)					
	94	70	78	69	78
	99	72	84	88	92
	102	74	84	89	94
	104	96	85	90	98
	103	97	91	94	98
	109	98	99	97	100
	111	101	107	98	102
	117	108	113	98	111
	118	112	114	99	111
	122	116	119	104	112
	124	117	123	130	117
Total	1206	1061	1097	1053	1111
Median	109	98	99	97	100
Mean	109.64	96.43	99.73	96	101.18

TABLE XII

COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION SCORES OF DISCREPANCY
BETWEEN SELF-CONCEPT AND IDEAL SELF-CONCEPT
OF THE VARIOUS GROUPS SELECTED
AT TWO AGE LEVELS

Young non-criminals (N=11)		Older non-criminals (N=6)		Young criminals (N=18)		Older criminals (N=27)	
r	z	r	z	r	z	r	z
.12	.12	.31	.32	-.40	-.42	-.05	-.05
.24	.25	.37	.39	-.06	-.06	.02	.02
.26	.27	.53	.59	-.04	-.04	.03	.03
.31	.32	.68	.83	-.02	-.02	.05	.05
.35	.37	.70	.87	.08	.08	.07	.07
.47	.51	.88	<u>1.38</u>	.09	.09	.08	.08
.48	.52			.16	.16	.08	.08
.53	.59			.20	.20	.23	.23
.62	.73			.22	.22	.26	.27
.62	.73			.30	.30	.29	.30
.69	<u>.85</u>			.38	.40	.29	.30
				.43	.46	.30	.30
				.44	.47	.30	.30
				.52	.58	.34	.35
				.55	.62	.40	.42
				.61	.71	.40	.42
				.62	.73	.43	.46
				.66	<u>.79</u>	.43	.46
						.43	.46
						.46	.50
						.48	.52
						.49	.54
						.54	.60
						.58	.66
						.63	.74
						.64	.76
						.68	<u>.83</u>
Total	5.26		4.38		5.27		9.70
Mean	.47		.73		.29		.36
Average $\bar{r}$	.44		.62*		.28		.34

*Significant difference

TABLE XXXI
SELF-CONCEPT RAW SCORES OF CRIMINALS

Social Adaptability				Emotional Control				Conformity				Inquiring Intellect				Confident Self-Expression			
*(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
67	55	57	69	65	65	71	58	84	85	70	59	73	75	73	79	61	58	69	58
75	77	62	76	74	76	72	90	90	87	73	71	79	80	77	81	63	66	69	73
76	78	67	91	82	81	73	90	92	89	79	89	82	85	77	84	65	66	72	82
77	79	75	94	86	81	80	92	95	90	88	91	84	86	81	85	65	68	74	84
77	79	78	94	86	83	82	94	96	90	89	95	86	86	83	85	71	74	76	88
80	79	80	97	88	83	86	97	98	99	93	97	86	88	83	87	72	78	79	93
84	80	82	99	88	85	90	100	99	100	95	98	86	91	84	94	74	79	82	94
85	80	63	99	94	87	94	103	100	100	98	98	88	93	89	93	76	79	83	95
86	86	83	100	94	93	95	109	101	100	97	102	88	95	89	97	76	82	85	96
87	87	84	100	94	95	95	109	102	100	97	110	89	97	90	98	80	83	87	100
88	87	84	102	96	98	97	111	102	101	99	112	91	98	91	99	80	88	87	102
88	95	87	104	96	99	98	111	103	104	104	115	91	100	94	100	80	90	88	103
89	99	92	105	98	100	98	112	103	104	105	117	91	103	94	101	83	95	89	105
94	100	93	110	98	101	99	119	103	105	105	121	91	104	95	102	83	97	89	106
96	100	94	129	98	101	102	131	107	105	106	122	92	104	96	111	85	99	90	112
98	101	94		99	103	104		107	105	106		93	104	97		85	102	93	
98	106	94		100	104	104		108	111	106		93	105	97		86	102	96	
101	107	96		102	105	105		108	115	106		93	106	98		88	103	96	
106	109	96		104	106	106		109	118	106		95	112	99		89	105	96	
107	112	102		104	111	107		109	119	111		97	120	100		90	109	100	
108	117	102		104	118	107		110	135	111		99	126	100		93	111	101	
109		106		105		110		111		114		100		100		95		103	
111		107		107		110		112		116		101		101		95		104	
113		107		107		110		112		116		103		103		98		104	
114		108		108		111		117		116		103		108		100		105	
114		110		109		112		119		117		106		108		100		107	
117		113		110		114		121		119		107		113		100		111	
117		116		111		114		121		120		110		118		100		113	
119		119		114		122		121		130		110		119		104		118	
119				123				123				119				111			
2900	1918	3671	1469	2944	1975	2868	1526	3183	2162	2790	1497	2826	2058	2757	1398	2548	1834	2666	1391
97	87	94	99	99	98	102	103	107	101	106	104	92	98	96	95	85	88	90	95
966	9135		979	9811	9405	98	1013	107	1031	962	998	942	98	9306	898	8493	871	949	928

*(1) Burglar, (2) Robber, (3) Forger, (4) Sex criminal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Abrahamsen, David. Crime and the Human Mind. New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.
- Alexander, Franz and Staub, Hugo. The Criminal, The Judge and The Public, (Rev. Ed.), Glencoe, Illinois: The Falcon's Wing Press, 1956.
- _____ and Healey, William. Roots of Crime. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1935.
- Allport, G. W. Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937.
- Barr, Arvill, Davis, Robert A., and Johnson, Palmer. Educational Research and Appraisal. New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1953.
- Barnes, Harry E., and Teeters, Negley. New Horizons in Criminology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1944.
- Bromberg, Walter. Crime and the Mind. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1948.
- Clinard, Marshall B. Sociology of Deviant Behavior. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1958.
- Elliott, Mabel, Crime in Modern Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.
- Green, Harry, Jorgensen, Albert, and Gerberich, J. Raymond. Measurement and Evaluation in the Elementary School. New York: Longmans Green and Company, Inc., 1950.
- Hendricks, Ives. Facts and Theories of Psychoanalysis. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1944.
- Lecky, P. Self Consistency: a Theory of Personality. New York: Island Press, 1945.
- Menninger, Karl. The Human Mind. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

- Overstreet, Boanro and Harry. Mind Alive. New York: W. W. Norton Company, 1954.
- _____. The Mind Goes Forth. New York: W.W. Norton Company, 1956.
- Rogers, Carl. Client-Centered Therapy. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1951.
- Schlapp, Max, and Smith, E. H. The New Criminology. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1929.
- Sheldon, William H. Varities of Delinquent Youth. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1945.
- _____, and Stevens, S. S. The Varities of Temperment. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.
- _____, and Stevens, S.S., and Tucker, W. B., The Varities of Human Physique. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.
- Siegal, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- Snygg, D. and Combs, A. W. Individual Behavior. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949. (Rev. Ed., Combs, A. W. and Snygg, D., 1959).
- Sutherland, E. H., and Cressy, Donald R. Principles of Criminology (5th. ed.). New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1955.
- Thurston, Henry W. Concerning Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.
- Zilboorg, Gregory. The Psychology of the Criminal: Act and Punishment. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1954.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

- Adler, Alfred. "The Ego in Contemporary Psychology," Psychological Review, 1943, L, pp. 461-465.
- Aidman, Ted. "Change in Self Perception as Related to Changes in Perception of One's Environment," American Psychologist, 1948, III, p. 286.

- Benjamins, James. "Changes in Performance in Relation to Influence Upon Self Conceptualization," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950, XLV, 47, p. 480.
- Berger, E. M. "The Relation Between Expressed Acceptance of Self and Expressed Acceptance of Others," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, XLVII, pp. 778-782.
- Bertocci, P. A. "The Psychology of the Self, the Ego and Personality," Psychological Review, 1945. LIII, pp. 91-99.
- Bills, Robert E. "Self-Concepts and Rorschach Signs of Depression," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII, 2, April, 1954, pp. 135-137.
- Calkins, M.W. "The Self in Scientific Psychology," American Journal of Psychology, 1915, XXVI, pp. 495-524.
- Carwright, Desmond S. "Self-Consistency as a Factor Affecting Immediate Recall," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII, 2, 1956, pp. 213-218
- Chase, P. "Self-Concepts in Adjusted and Maladjusted Hospital Patients," Journal of Consulting Psychology, December, 1944, LI, pp. 304-314.
- Chein, I. "The Awareness of Self and the Structure of the Ego," The Psychological Review, 1944, LI, pp. 304-314.
- Chodorkoff, Bernard, "Self-Perception, Perceptual Defense, and Adjustment," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLIX, 1954, pp. 508-512.
- Choen, Louis P. "Land of Asperation, Behavior and Feeling of Adequacy and Self Acceptance," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1954, XLIX, pp. 84-86.
- Combs, Arthur, "New Horizons in Field Research: The Self-Concept," Educational Leadership, February, 1958, pp. 315-317.
- Dittes, J.G. "Effect of Changes in Self-Esteem Upon Impulsiveness and Deliberation in Making Judgments," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, May 1959, LVIII, 3, pp. 348-353.
- Fagan, Joen, and Guthrie, G.M. "Perception of Self and of Normality in Schizophrenics," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XV, 2, April 1959, pp. 203-207.
- Hanlon, Thomas E., Hofstatter, Peter, and O'Connor, James, "Congruence of Self and Ideal Self in Relation to Personality Adjustment," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII, 3, 1954, p. 215.

Hillson, Joseph, and Worshel, Phillip. "Self-Concept and Defensive Behavior in the Maladjusted," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XXI, February 1957, pp. 83-88.

Maslow, A. H. "Deprivation, Threat, and Frustration," Psychological Review, 1941, XLVIII, pp. 364-366.

Omwake, Katherine T. "The Relation Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVIII, 6, December 1954.

Reckless, W. "Self Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 1956.

Rogers, Carl. "Some Observations on the Organization of Personality," American Psychologist, 1947, II.

Zukerman, Marvin, Baer, Marc, and Monashkin, Irwin. "Acceptance of Self, Parents, and People in Patients and Normals," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XII, 4, October, 1956.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Allison, Sarah Gilleland. "Parent and Peer Group Friend Attitudes as They Relate to Self-concept of the Juvenile Delinquent." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1957.

Balester, Raymond. "Self-Concept and Juvenile Delinquency." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956.

Bruck, Max. "A Study of Age Differences and Sex Differences in the Relationship Between Self-Concept and Grade Point Average," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1957.

Chickering, Arthur W. "Self-Concept, Ideal Self-Concept and Achievement," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1958.

Fitts, William H. "The Role of Self-Concept in Social Perception," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1954.

Hickman, Norman W. "The Role of Self-Related Concept Discrepancies in Personal Adjustment," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1957.

Piety, Kenneth R. "The Role of Defense in Reporting on the Self-Concept," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956.

Raymaker, Henry. "Relationship Between the Self-Concept, the Ideal Self-Concept, and Maladjustment," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1956.

Raimy, V. C. "The Self-Concept as a Factor in Counseling and Personality," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1948.

Stevens, Peter H. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Certain Aspects of Self-Concept Behavior and Student's Academic Achievement," Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1956.