## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/4507

7908835

REILLY, THOMAS FRANCIS
A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF THE ADJUDICATED ADOLESCENT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA, ED.D., 1978

University Microfilms International 300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1979

THOMAS FRANCIS REILLY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

# A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF THE ADJUDICATED ADOLESCENT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

THOMAS FRANCIS REILLY

Norman, Oklahoma

1978

A DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF THE

ADJUDICATED ADOLESCENT

APPROVED BY

Floyd V. Karlsson

Gaye McNutt

Thomas H. Gallacher

Robert A. Swanson

Gene Pumpleton

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation was to develop a descriptive profile of the adjudicated adolescent based on the identification of (a) common delinquent characteristics (e.g., demographic data, delinquent behavior data, and scholastic achievement data), (b) anti-authority behavioral patterns, and (c) the illustration of the scholastic underachievement data of adjudicated adolescents. This study is based on 200 randomly selected case studies of adjudicated adolescents who were referred to a licensed psychologist, acting as a consultant to a juvenile bureau in an urban center in the Southwestern United States.

The investigation has addressed two primary questions.

1. For which offenses are delinquents, at different ages, most frequently adjudicated?

2. Is there a relationship among demographic data, delinquent behavior data, and scholastic achievement data at the time of adjudication?

Elements of the data obtained conclusively support functional relationships between adjudicated adolescents and (a) demographic behavior data, (b) anti-authority behavior data, and (c) scholastic behavior data. This investigation has identified a series of interactive patterns common to adjudicated adolescents thus establishing the need for strong continuous research efforts in this problem area.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. Lloyd Korhonen, chairman of the doctoral committee, for his continuous patience and encouragement during the preparation and development of this investigation.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Gene Pingleton, Dr. Gaye McNutt, and Dr. Tom Gallaher for reading the manuscript and for counsel as members of the committee.

The author would especially like to thank Dr. Al Smouse and Dr. Bill Graves for their valuable assistance in advising me on the statistical analysis of the data.

A special thanks is extended to Dr. Nelda Ferguson for her special interest and insight into the research effort of this investigator. Gratitude is also expressed to the secretarial staff at Timberridge for their patience and able assistance in this investigation.

Finally, I am greatly indebted to my wife, Donnita, for her constant support and encouragement and to Dr. Lyndal M. Bullock, my mentor and friend, who has been the catalyst in my pursuit of higher education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... iii

LIST OF TABLES ..... vi

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

The Purpose of the Study ..... 1

Questions Addressed in the Investigation ..... 2

Limitations of the Investigation ..... 2

Significance of the Investigation ..... 2

Definition of Terms ..... 3

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ..... 5

Introduction ..... 5

Personality Characteristics ..... 10

Demographic Profile ..... 16

Delinquent Behavior Profile ..... 23

Scholastic Profile ..... 29

Prevention/Treatment ..... 39

III. METHODOLOGY ..... 44

Subjects of the Investigation ..... 44

Obtaining the Data ..... 46

Statistical Design ..... 46

TABLE OF CONTENTS (con't)

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA..... 48

Descriptive Statistics..... 50

Tabular Data..... 50

V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... 77

Summary..... 77

Discussion..... 78

Recommendations..... 83

REFERENCES..... 85

APPENDIX A..... 98

APPENDIX B.....107

APPENDIX C.....118

LIST OF TABLES

Table


1. Subjects Utilized in the Present Study Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex..... 45

2. Status of Home Conditions at the Time of Adjudication for all Subjects Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex..... 51

3. Family Data Reported for all Subjects by Age Range, Race, and Sex..... 52

4. Sex of all Subjects Reported by Race and Age Range.. 53

5. School Status and Chronological Age Range for all Subjects Reported by Race and Sex..... 55

6. Mean Chronological Age Reported for all Subjects by Status of Home Condition, Age Range, Race, and Sex.. 58

7. Subjects Immediate Family Members Who Were Incarcerated at the Time of the Subjects Present Adjudication Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex..... 60

8. Subjects Who Indicated They Had Experienced Some Type of Drug Intake Just Prior to Committing the Alleged Offenses Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex..... 61

9. Subjects Who Indicated They had a Suspension from Normal School Activities Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex..... 63

10. Offenses Committed by Subjects in this Investigation Reported by Age Range, Race, Sex, and Nature of Offense..... 64

11. Previous Offenses Committed by Subjects in this Investigation Reported by Age Range, Race, Sex, and Nature of Offense..... 65

12. Scholastic Achievement Including Reading, Arithmetic and Intelligence Quotient (IQ) Scores for all Subjects Reported by Race, Sex, and Age Range... 70

13. Special Learning Problems of all Subjects Reported by Race, Sex, and Age Range..... 72

14. Discrepancy Between the Mean Reading and Mean Arithmetic Scores and the Grade Expectancy Level for all Subjects Reported by Race, Sex, and Age Range..... 74

15. Discrepancy Between the Mean Expected Grade Attainment and the Mean Actual Grade Attainment Reported by Race, Sex, and Age Range..... 76

Contingency Table C-1 Chi square of independence on subjects from broken homes and those who experienced drug intake prior to committing the offense(s).....118

Contingency Table C-2 Chi square of independence on race of subjects and grade level attained in school.....119

Contingency Table C-3 One way analysis of variance on arithmetic scores of subjects and subjects who committed crime against person offenses.....120

Contingency Table C-4 Chi square of independence on subjects with learning problems and those who experienced drug intake prior to committing the offense(s).....121

# CHAPTER ONE

# INTRODUCTION

Juvenile delinquency is a serious problem in contemporary America and has been for centuries. The Romans used the term delinquency to depict vagrance and neglect (Barron, 1959). Over the years, the problem of delinquency has grown in epidemic proportions. In 1947, 16.1% of all arrests made in the United States involved males and females under the age of 21 (Neumeyer, 1950). By 1976, young people, aged 22 and younger accounted for almost 60% of all criminal arrests (Mathias, 1977). Pooley (1977) reports that crime and delinquency now cost the American taxpayer $88 billion per year. Although statistics and recommendations regarding the problem of delinquency are available in the literature (Hirschi & Selvin, 1967; Mangel, 1974; Neumeyer, 1950), much more attention needs to be given to the enormous problem of profiling adolescent criminal typologies in order to conserve dollars, and more importantly, human potential.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation was to develop a descriptive profile of the adjudicated adolescent based on the identification of (a) common delinquent characteristics (e.g., demographic data, delinquent behavior data, and scholastic achievement data), (b) anti-authority behavioral patterns, and (c) the illustration of

the scholastic underachievement data of adjudicated adolescents. This study is based on 200 randomly selected case studies of adjudicated adolescents who were referred to a licensed psychologist, acting as a consultant to a juvenile bureau in an urban center in the Southwestern United States.

The investigation has addressed two primary questions.

1. For which offenses are delinquents, at different ages, most frequently adjudicated?

2. Is there a relationship among demographic data, delinquent behavior data, and scholastic achievement data at the time of adjudication?

## Limitations of the Investigation

The major limitations of this study are:

1. The subjects are all present or former residents of the Southwestern metropolitan area from which the sample population was drawn.

2. The population utilized in this study consisted of 200 randomly selected subjects from the total population of adjudicated adolescents referred for evaluation between January, 1974, and March, 1978, to a licensed psychologist who was acting as a consultant for a juvenile bureau.

3. Background data contained in the case studies were self-report data supplied by the subjects.

## Significance of the Study

Central to this study was the development of an adjudicated adolescent profile such that it could serve as a referral point

for change agents in their interactions with the populations of adjudicated adolescents. The successful construction of an adjudicated adolescent profile could serve as a basis for future research in the area of model construction for change agents.

To successfully establish a model of the contemporary, adjudicated adolescent, it is necessary to analyze the problem of juvenile delinquency. The profile should be such that it will (a) be helpful in understanding the problem and (b) have predictive power (Pollack, 1968).

## Definition of Terms

Adolescent: A youth between thirteen and nineteen years of age.

Adjudicated: The act or process of having been sentenced judicially.

Broken homes: Families having less than two natural parents residing in the home whether by reason of separation, divorce, or death.

Change agent: That person designated to transform, replace, or substitute socially deviant behaviors such as educators, psychologists, and correctional officials.

Criminal action: Behavior which is interpreted as injurious to the public, and is "prosecuted by state against a person charged with a public offense committed in violation of a public law." (State ex rel. Keefe v. Schmiege, 28 N.W. 2nd 345, 348).

Delinquent Behavior Profile: Data relating to the formal categorization of adolescent delinquent behavior into three types: (a) nonadult, e.g., truancy, out-of-control, and runaway behavior; (b) crime against person, e.g., drugs, armed robbery, strong armed robbery, and assault; and (c) crime against property, e.g., burglary, larceny, unauthorized use of a vehicle.

Demographic Profile: Data relating to the dynamic balance of a population such as broken homes, number of siblings, sex, grade level in school, chronological age, immediate family members who are or have been incarcerated for criminal offenses at the time of the subject's adjudication, drug intake immediately preceding delinquent behavior and subsequent apprehension for said behavior, and school suspension.

Juvenile delinquent: An adolescent officially known to have violated some provision of the law as currently interpreted.

Scholastic Profile: Data relating to an overview of the academic strengths and weaknesses of the subjects.

# CHAPTER TWO

# REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

## INTRODUCTION

The literature in this study focuses on the nature of juvenile delinquency based on (a) demographic, (b) behavioral, and (c) scholastic data. Each of the three areas contribute data to the overall problem of juvenile delinquency. The review of literature is presented to establish a research base for this study.

### Juvenile Delinquency

The term juvenile delinquency came into use in the early 1800's and remains in use today (Achenbach, 1975). The original designation of the term was not criminal in nature. Instead, it was for poor and homeless children, whether or not they had committed crimes (Achenbach, 1975). In the recent past, those youth whose conduct brought them to the attention of the courts have been termed as delinquent.

Contemporary use of the term juvenile delinquency is without specific meaning. It is commonly descriptive of generally disapproved behaviors engaged in by some young people (Rachin, 1975) and describes offenses ranging from truancy to murder. Generally, the offender is less than eighteen years of age.

The term "juvenile delinquency" is ambiguous, at best. Quay (1963), in commenting on the ambiguity of the term and its meaning observed that the legal definition has been the most popular "...a child who has appeared before a juvenile judge for an official hearing and disposition" (p. 318). Juvenile laws, however, vary from place to place. In many locales, the term "juvenile delinquency" has been refined to include only such "conduct which, if committed by an adult, would be a violation of the criminal law" (Orlando & Black, 1975, p. 357). Violation of those laws pertaining only to children would now be included. Hirschi and Selvin (1967), however, refer to delinquency in terms of "repeated acts" and "persistent misbehavior tendencies" (p. 61). Emery and Marholin (1977) feel that "delinquent behavior is a response or series of responses which is aversive to society as a whole" (p. 867).

Factors Influencing Incidence

The concept of delinquency is more general than its legal definition. The study of delinquency is usually approached in one or more of the following ways: (a) the individual; (b) the environment; and/or (c) physical and/or psychological deficits (Chicago Police Department, 1968). Certain delinquents and their delinquencies are probably products of social factors and intrapsychic factors (Quay, 1964).

Delinquency is the adolescent's response to humiliation, shame, and the loss of self-esteem (Friedenberg, 1959). Scarpitti (1965) indicates that delinquency is simply a response to the social milieu where deviance is the norm. Glasser's (1960) response to the problem of juvenile delinquency centers around incompletely formed egos. His belief is that the person with a character disorder has gaps in the ego formation, thus causing delinquents to act as though law and order were not in existence. Paradoxically, these individuals know they are doing wrong even while breaking the law. Individuals such as these are powerless to stop the prohibited activity because a complete functional ego is not involved.

There are several theories regarding delinquency and subsequent adult criminality. One theory regards the lower class delinquent's perception for material suggests and delinquent expectations by socially approved means of achieving these goals (Gibbons, 1965). Another theory (Matza & Sykes, 1961; Yochelson & Samenow, 1977) regards the delinquent's perception for material success through a prototype of a leisured elite. The thrill of adventure is emphasized while the discipline of employment is rejected. Although the concept of a leisured elite is, practically speaking, a fantasy, the delinquent views it as reality. A third theory (Cohen, 1955), suggests that middle class delinquency is a response to anxiety regarding sex role identification which frustrates and inhibits attainment of

adult self sufficiency. Still a fourth theory is psychogenic in nature and holds that persons committing crimes are acting out emotional problems (Kvaraceus & Miller, 1959). Unfortunately, these theories do not account for those persons who "act out" their emotional problems in noncriminal ways (Gibbons, 1965). Although different theories have been espoused, most contemporary researchers agree on three theoretical points: (a) delinquency is a multicausal phenomenon; (b) the term has been a waste basket concept; and (c) current efforts should be aimed at the establishment of specific, "homogeneous subgroups within the heterogeneous syndrome" (Barcai & Rabkin, 1974), p. 388).

Delinquent Typologies

Beginning with the original work of Hewitt and Jenkins (1946) many research studies have consistently demonstrated that deviant behaviors can be adequately divided into four categories. Although they have been known by different names, they can be referred to as (a) conduct disorder, (b) personality disorder, (c) inadequacy-immaturity, and (d) socialized delinquency (Quay, 1978, p. 9). Etiological theory can be divided into two categories: (a) emphasis on the importance of attitudes and emotions of individual delinquents, and (b) delinquency resulting from the social environment (Clarizio & McCoy, 1976). An etiologically based delinquency classification system was developed by Waldrop (1967). In it, five model groupings were

identified: (a) organic; (b) grossly deprived delinquent; (c) emotionally disturbed delinquent; (d) family problem delinquent; and (e) situational delinquency.

Hewitt and Jenkins (1946), in their original study, constructed three behavior syndromes and four situational delinquent patterns. The three behavior syndromes were (a) the unsocialized aggressive behavior syndrome which is characterized by assaultive tendencies, anti-authority feelings, cruelty, and inadequate guilt feelings; (b) the socialized delinquent syndrome which is characterized by gang activities, chronic school truancy, and runaway behavior; and (c) the overinhibited behavior syndrome characterized by seclusiveness, apathy, and submissiveness. The four situational patterns were: (a) parental rejection; (b) parental negligence and exposure to delinquent behavior; (c) family repression; and (d) physical deficiency.

More recently, Reiss (1952) and Quay (1964, 1966) have identified three personality types among delinquents. The Reiss personality types were (a) weak ego controls; (b) defective superego controls, and (c) integrated control. The Quay personality types were (a) the psychopathic delinquent; (b) the subcultural delinquent; and (c) the neurotic delinquent (Clarizio & McCoy, 1976). In his review of delinquent typologies, Kinch (1962), also identified three delinquent

classes: (a) antisocial; (b) prosocial; and (c) asocial. Finally, Peterson, Quay, and Tiffany (1961) generated a set of personality constructs related to delinquent behavior. These constructs include (a) neuroticism or emotional disturbance, and was associated with tension, anxiety, guilt or psychopathy and reflected distrust and impulsiveness; (b) aggressive antisocial attitude; and (c) reflection of a delinquent background and participation in a delinquent subculture.

Glueck and Glueck (1950), assessed factors considered as potentially important to delinquency. Some of the more significant factors were (a) fewer delinquents were living with their natural parents; (b) delinquents were more frequently the victims of indifference or hostility; (c) inconsistent discipline; (d) delinquents showed a higher prevalence of educational retardation; and (e) 56% of the delinquents were gang members as opposed to less than 1% of the controls.

## Personality Characteristics

There has been a marked change in the delinquent population over the last ten years. The delinquent of today is younger, brighter, and can be culturally categorized by such traits as meanness and violence (Mauser, 1974). Their grades are below average. Many have fallen one or more grades behind their classmates or have completely dropped out of school. They are concentrated in large, urban cities, with delinquency rates highest among those from broken homes and/or where there are large numbers of siblings (Winslow, 1968).

The sociopathic personality is often a trait of the juvenile delinquent. Violation of laws becomes a matter of course, the rights of others become secondary to personal gratification, and established order is flaunted. The sociopathic delinquent "may be asocial or antisocial and operates this way, again, by pattern" (Tomaino, 1969, p. 19).

Antisocial Personality

In the view of many psychiatrists, adolescent delinquent behavior is an

> action screen, behind which hides, not the arrogant, defiant, seemingly omnipotent rebel, but a cowering, angry, and dependent child who is afraid of life. The greater the fear, the more flamboyant the boys strut, the more impenentrable the girl's mask (Richette, 1969, p. 208).

Many times, the acting out behavior is a result of the individual not having previously learned a more appropriate manner of handling anxieties and frustrations. Social responsibility is a rarity and social relationships exist only to gratify personal needs (Hamner, 1969).

A characteristic of the adolescent sociopath is an inability or difficulty in establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships. Part of that problem revolves around the distrust many youths feel for authority figures such as teachers and police. Many delinquents expect adults functioning in these roles to interact with them as would parents or friends. When this interaction is not forthcoming, the delinquent's perception of the individual is hostile and results in rejection (Hardy &

Cull , 1974). The youth that has no assurance that his physical or emotional needs will be cared for "naturally feels that the world is unfriendly" (Ross, 1962, p. 61).

Deviance

Deviant behavior is behavior labeled as such by those people viewing the behavior as deviant (Becker, 1963). Like other behaviors, deviance is learned and reinforced through social interaction (Becker, 1969). It is enhanced and encouraged by the social environment, yet delinquents do not receive treatment until a very late stage in their delinquency. Through expression of acting-out behaviors in adolescent delinquents, it should be recognized that certain social and emotional needs have not been consistently met ("Problems of Juvenile Delinquency", 1974). Further, acting out behavior would be less likely to occur in nonalienated youths. It is likely that deviance is not and will not be understood without reference to the environment from which the deviance is exhibited.

Labeling

Predicting delinquency in children through the labeling process can be unwise, particularly when the self-fulfilling prophecy is recognized as a real entity (Wittman, 1974). There appears to be a strong negative correlation between labeling children as delinquent and their willingness to respond positively (Richette, 1969). Wheeler and Cottrell (1969) have determined that labeling particular acts as "criminal" is crucial to the progress of a criminal career. From the moment a person

is labeled, that person is watched. Every mistake made by that individual will further convince the labelers of the delinquent's guilt (Winslow, 1968).

After being labeled, delinquents are quickly isolated from nondelinquents and in the process lose those items society equates with healthy relationships, i.e., learning, sharing, and social acceptance (Tomaino, 1969). Ullmann and Krasner (1975), report, however, that an offender must first be caught before being officially labeled as delinquent. Reinforcement of a negative self-concept through social rejection experienced as a result of the delinquent label, can convince the individual that it is not possible to follow societal norms (Lemert, 1967).

## Child Abuse

Following such parental rejections as divorce and physical or emotional abuse, it is likely that a child will become rebellious, aggressive, and insecure (Hirschi, 1969). Fontana (1973) states that a major factor in future criminality is the abuse and neglect endured by children presently. "In many states penalties for abusing animals are more severe than those for abusing children" (National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse, 1976).

## Early Signs of Delinquency

Early signs of delinquency will likely be observed in school and the home. Loss of interest in school subjects often precedes conflicts with authority figures in the home and school which is followed by some acting-out behavior causing society to respond (Hardy & Cull, 1974).

Acting-out behavior, in many cases, is crucial in the development of a delinquent. Elliott and Voss (1974) have delineated five basic stages through which a youth might progress, although the delinquent does not always follow the stages sequentially. The stages are "(a) involvement in nonserious delinquent behavior; (b) involvement in serious delinquent behavior; (c) police contact for a nonserious delinquent offense; (d) police contact for a serious delinquent act; and (e) adjudication by the court" (p. 89).

Emerging Patterns

The emerging patterns of delinquency over the last 12 to 15 years look very much like the same pattern which has existed since the mid-twenties. These are

> (a) most crimes were petty crimes of theft and vandalism and could be labeled as the traditional reaction to authority; (b) the youth who committed these crimes were usually deterred by a single contact with the criminal justice system; and (c) most of these youths were in the 16 to 18 age bracket (Severns, Bell, & Gregnano, 1976, p. 22).

Some startling new trends have begun to emerge, in that, many of the crimes presently being committed involve violence and are of a much more serious nature. The average age of the youths committing crimes now is likely to be under 16. The juvenile criminals are now very much gang oriented with the object of their criminality being the very old or the very young.

Juvenile crimes are now being committed in places previously thought to be safe such as schools, stores, and neighborhood

centers. The greatest concern may be, however, that the young delinquent appears to be less responsive than ever to the traditional controls of family, schools, and police (Severns, Bell, & Gregnano, 1976).

Delinquency Correlates

Wooton (1967) examined 21 delinquency studies and delineated 12 commonly mentioned situations.

1. The likelihood of a child being delinquent increases with the size of the family.

2. There is a fairly strong relationship between delinquency and criminality among other family members.

3. There is a negative relationship between delinquency and church attendance.

4. Club membership has not been demonstrated to be a factor in delinquency.

5. Good workers are less likely than poor workers to be delinquent.

6. Social class and delinquency are negatively related.

7. Globally, studies suggest a relationship between poverty and delinquency.

8. There is no relationship between delinquency and employment of the mother outside the home.

9. Health and delinquency are not related.

10. The worse the child's performance in school, the more likely he is to become delinquent.

11. There is a high relationship between truancy and delinquency.

12. There is a slightly greater likelihood of children from broken homes becoming delinquent than children from intact homes.

Some epidemological correlates that can increase the likelihood of a person being labeled as delinquent include

> ...being male, from an unstable home of lower socioeconomic status, residing in an area marked by low owner occupancy and overcrowding, and being 16 to 17 years of age are the features that seem most predictive of a person's attaining delinquent status (Ullmann & Krasner, 1975, p. 557).

A likely candidate for delinquency is the individual who views himself as competent, even in failure. It is he who is more likely to blame the system for personal failure, and is consequently more likely to become delinquent (Hirschi, 1969).

## Demographic Profile

### Families

Family disorders remain a catalyst for delinquency today, much the same as times past ("Problems of Juvenile Delinquency," 1974). The incidence of juvenile delinquency increases dramatically with problems in the immediate family.

A child's first exposure to the socialization process is usually within the family constellation. It is here that a child learns to accept rules and curb desires, to manage emotions, adjust to authority figures, and to respond in socially appropriate and acceptable ways regarding the satisfaction of personal needs (Winslow, 1968).

A position considered to be virtually axiomatic in the social and behavioral sciences is the importance of family factors on the behavior of children (Friedman, Mann, & Friedman, 1975). Culbertson and Schrink (1974), believe the family to be the most important aspect of the delinquent environment. The breakdown of the family is most important when analyzing delinquency. "We look for quick solutions, but family stability is the long-term answer" ("The Youth Crime Plague," 1977, p. 25).

As family problems increase, the chance for juvenile delinquency within the family increases (Mathias, 1977). Teicher (1976) observed that as human beings "we're aggressive, violent, destructive, self-centered -- we're uncivilized. The family should have a socializing effect. Standards, ethics, honesty, that's the key" (p. 143).

Some family characteristics which may enhance the possibility of delinquency are one parent families, families with high numbers of siblings, and chronic bickering between parents. Also, parental inconsistencies and negative father-son relationships have a bearing on potential delinquency. Collectively, these things work to unseat the authority and respect commanded by most parents (Winslow, 1968). Toby (1957) found that areas having high rates of family disorganization have correspondingly high rates of delinquency in girls and preadolescent boys. The disorganized family is not able to give the firm supervision that

the organized family provides. Further, disturbances in the father-son relationship have been demonstrated to be more closely associated with delinquency than material deprivation (Andry, 1960).

Parents

The roots of disturbance usually lie in the early experiences of a person and include parental inconsistencies. Several investigators (Becker, 1964; Glueck & Glueck, 1964; James, 1970) have pointed out the unwitting contribution made by parents to antisocial behavior through inconsistent parenting.

A child's delinquency is basically determined through shortcomings of the parents such as health care and child-rearing practices. Those children likely to become delinquent have parents who are demonstrably inconsistent, erratic, and lax ("Problems of Juvenile Delinquency," 1974). Conversely, "consistent discipline leads to identification" and a subsequent lack of criminal behavior (McCord, McCord, & Zola, 1959, p. 194).

De Lissovoy (1973), found that young parents are basically an "intolerable group -- impatient, insensitive, irritable, and prone to use physical punishment with their children" (p. 22). Many parents, when called on to defend their neglect become defiant and verbally attack their accusers (Loble & Wylie, 1967). "It appears that one of the best predictors of adult psychopathy is having a father who was himself psychopathic, alcoholic, or antisocial" (Hare, 1970, p. 109).

Too often, parents do not safely care for their children. Intelligence is often the problem but many times the parents are too young to know better. Alcoholism is often a problem of parents, and consequently their children (James, 1970). Arnold (1976), suggests that families are primary in delinquent causation. He states that parents do not teach responsibility and discipline, children are physically abused far too frequently, and finally, many children are viewed as failures within the family constellation.

Broken Homes

Another aspect of parental influence on delinquency development comes from the impact of a broken home on the youth. High proportions of delinquents come from some type of broken home (Wattenburg & Saunders, 1954). More specifically, a study done in Virginia (Messinger, 1977), indicated only 22.1% of the delinquent population studied had been living at home with both natural parents prior to committment. Hardy and Cull (1974) say that "figures now show that approximately 50% of delinquents come from broken homes" (p. 42). Nye (1957), however, reports that children from unhappy, unbroken homes reported a higher incidence of delinquent behavior and greater parent-child adjustment problems than did children of divorced broken homes.

Siblings

There is support for the argument that boys coming from families with large numbers of brothers run a higher risk of delinquency than other boys (Clarke & Softley, 1975). Further

Glueck and Glueck (1950), determined a relationship between general family size and delinquency.

Age Levels

Delinquency often starts early in life. Approximately 60% of delinquents have committed their first offense by the age of 10 (Glueck & Glueck, 1950). However, FBI statistics indicate that for males, 17 year olds are arrested more frequently, followed by 18 year olds, and 16 year olds (Short, 1966).

Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin (1972) found that most delinquencies start at age 16. Mukherjee (1971) found that 39% started delinquent activity at age 16 or later.

Race

In the United States especially, race has been found to be an important variable in its relationship to crime and delinquency (Mukherjee, 1971). Black-white differences in delinquent activity can at least begin to be explained through the differences in academic achievement (Hirschi, 1969). Pettigrew (1964), however, found that regardless of race, personality and social functioning will be effected through social and economic disadvantages.

In the Ahlstrom and Havighurst (1971), study, it was found that maladaptive late adolescent adjustments among blacks was much higher than whites. Further, blacks and males have been found to be more criminally aggressive than whites or females based on their high rates of crimes against persons (Wolfgang,

1969). Even so,

> the factor of race is almost as important as that of sex in determining whether a person is likely to be arrested and imprisoned for an offense. Many more whites than negroes are arrested every year but negroes have a significantly higher rate of arrest in all categories except such offenses as public order and morals (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967).

Male/Female Delinquency

In 1965, one fifth of the males and more than one half of the females referred to juvenile court were referred for offenses that would be noncriminal for adults. The primary referrals for delinquent males included larcey, burglary, and motor vehicle theft; females were referred for runaway behavior, ungovernable behavior, larceny and sex offenses (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967).

> More girls are getting involved in violent crime. From 1970 to 1975, the arrest rate of girls under 18 for serious offenses climbed 40% v. 24% for boys. In 1975, 11% of all juveniles arrested for violent crimes were female (The Youth Crime Plague, 1977, p. 19).

Even so, the offenses most common to the adjudicated female adolescent are sex violations (Cohen, Granger, Provence, & Solnit, 1975), incorrigibility, and running away (Tappan, 1949), with females admitting to only 1% of serious offenses (Elliott & Voss, 1974).

Peer Groups

Group support is the essence of delinquency. They thrive together. Security and recognition are found on the street.

Their attitudes, ambitions and dress are those of the group (Winslow, 1968). The alienation experienced by delinquents from society increases the power and magnitude of the delinquent peer group as an enforcer (Tupker & Pointer, 1975). Young people value the opinions of their peers, and without a strong parent-child relationship, the peer groups will win out in conflict with the family (James, 1970). In short, the peer group is the number one influence for most adolescents (Ahlstrom & Havighurst, 1971).

Dropouts

Elliott (1966) declared there are twice as many dropouts involved in delinquent activity as compared to high school graduates. Hathaway and Monachesi (1963) were more specific. Thirty-nine percent of the males and 31% of the females who drop out are delinquent, compared with base rates of 24% and 10.4%, respectively.

Some studies have carefully noted that a causal relationship cannot be established merely through the existence of an association between dropout and delinquency (Schreiber, 1963); Jeffrey & Jeffrey, 1970). Elliott and Voss (1974), however. have established some independent predictors of delinquency and dropout which include (a) school failure; (b) alienation; and (c) association with dropouts. Schreiber (1964) further delineated four major factors involved in the dropout problem: (a) functional illiteracy; (b) repeating a year of school; (c) low intelligence; and (d) poor self-concept.

Drugs and Alcohol

Surveys have shown that a substantial number of teenagers drink alcoholic beverages. Estimates of 71% to 92% of high school students have tried drinking alcoholic beverages, with beer being the preferred beverage. Marijuana ranks second to alcohol in frequency of use (United States Department of Health, Education & Welfare, 1971). A study done by Gold and Reimer (1972), does not support the notion that increased drug use would correlate with increased crime.

## Delinquent Behavior Profile

Crime

Causative factors for the youth crime rate are hypothesized in a recent article("The Youth Crime Plague," 1977). Those factors mentioned were unemployment, slum housing, inadequate schools, and the pathology of the ghetto. The magnitude of the problem can be illustrated by the fact that in 1976, young people, aged 22 and younger, accounted for almost 60% of all criminal arrests. Sixteen percent of the population of the United States is made up of young people 10 to 17 years of age while accounting for 45% of those arrested for serious crime (Mathias, 1977).

From 1960 to 1967 there was a 59% increase in the number of juvenile arrests (Richette, 1969). "During 1975, motor vehicle theft, arson, burglary, and vandalism recorded high

percentages of juvenile referrals" (Crime in the United States, Uniform Crime Reports, 1975 p. 42)

> Youth arrests for all crimes rose 138% from 1960 through 1974. Proportionately, juveniles (those under age 18) are the largest contributors to the nation's crime problem. The number of juvenile arrests in 1974 was about 1.7 million, more than 27% of the total arrests for all age groups. In that same year, juveniles accounted for about 45% of all arrests for serious crimes (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977, p. 1).

In a December 1977, CBS 60 Minute Documentary, Dan Rather reported that more than half of all crimes in 1977 were committed by teens; many of whom are victims of uncaring parents and communities. This is consistent with Time magazine (" The Youth Crime Plague," July, 1977) where it was stated that juvenile crime has increased at twice the rate of adults since 1960.

Many delinquents come from environments where structure is conspicuously lacking. A gang provides the ghetto youth with the structure missing at home ("The Youth Crime Plague," 1977). The most outstanding single characteristic of the street gang member seems to be a high proclivity for violence (Friedman, Mann, & Friedman, 1975). Approximately 25% of juvenile crime is committed in urban settings by gangs. Characteristic of the times, today's urban gangs are "better organized than ever, more heavily armed, and less queasy about the blood they spill," ("The Youth Crime Plague," 1977, p. 20).

A distinction can be made between gangs and groups. The gang is a relatively large, highly developed membership having

an elaborate organization including such roles as leaders and lieutenants. The gang is a close knit organization and excites disapproval and opposition within the community (Cloward, & Ohlin, 1960).

The delinquent group is perceived as a small group who, without provocation, violate laws. The group is neither elaborate nor identifiable as in the gang. Also, unlike the gang, whose members often have lengthy criminal records, group members are seldom repeat offenders within the same group context.

Continued frustration at one's attempts at success will likely lead a person to crime (Cohen, 1955). In contrast, Yochelson and Samenow (1977), believe that "thinking patterns" in habitual criminals may be distinguished from noncriminals. They further contend that habitual offenders are more victimizers than victims of society through their rejection of society and its concommitant responsibilities. Those individuals charged with noncriminal behaviors such as truancy, runaway, or out-of-control represent more than one-third of the national case load being processed through our juvenile courts (Mauser, 1974).

Persons committing crimes against persons are primarily emotional offenders, whereas, persons committing crimes against property are basically nonemotional and committed for financial gain (Inbau & Reid, 1967). Richette (1969) disagrees. She states that the more affluent delinquents tend toward crimes

against property while the less affluent commit crimes against persons. A study done in the Southwestern state where the present investigation is being conducted (Oklahoma Association for Children with Learning Disabilities, 1974), indicated that property crimes made up the largest single category of offenses.

Violence

Characteristics of the potentially violent youth include a history of child abuse, alcoholic parents, and dehumanized relationships (Jampolsky & Haight, 1974). Button's (1973) study indicated a high correlation between the amount and severity of physical punishment endured by children and the amount and severity of antisocial aggressiveness displayed during adolescence. "It is as natural for a maltreated child to grow up to carry a knife as it is for a loved and cared for child to carry a pen or pencil" ("The Battered Children," 1977, p. 112). The violent youth is king of the streets, especially in big city ghettos ("The Youth Crime Plague," 1977).

The FBI Index of Reported Crimes classifies homicide, rape, robbery, and assault as violent crimes because they involve doing or threatening bodily injury (Radzinowicz & Wolfgang, 1971). Not all crimes, however, are violent. In 1968, only 13% of the FBI's Index of Reported Crimes were violent. Apparently, violent crime in urban America produces more fear than statistics (Radzinowicz & Wolfgang, 1971).

Some authorities believe that filmed violence is a catalyst for delinquency (Jampolsky & Haight, 1974). Radzinowicz &

Wolfgang (1971), maintain, however, that the news media does not play an important role in the contagion of criminal behavior.

Radzinowicz and Wolfgang (1971), list several points as important with regard to the commission of violent crimes in the United States: (a) occurence is primarily in large cities (Moynihan, 1969); (b) major offenders are overwhelmingly of the male gender; (c) urban violent crime is concentrated primarily on youths between the ages of 15 and 24; (d) the commission of the crimes has been primarily by individuals at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale; (e) the victims and offenders have very similar characteristics; and (f) repeaters account for the greatest proportion of serious violence. Adolescents committing violent crimes do not experience guilt. Instead, delinquents neutralize their guilt through a series of denials. These denials include (a) responsibility; (b) injury; (c) presence of a victim; (d) condemnation of accusers; and (e) appeal to higher loyalties like those of the peer group (Culbertson & Schrink, 1974).

Recidivism

Although no overall relationship has been established between severity of offenses and rate of recidivism (Ganzer & Saranson, 1973), the younger a person is upon release from incarceration, the more likely that person is to become a repeat offender (Roberts & Erikson, 1974). Sealey and Banks (1971) report, however, that delinquents with relatively high maturity levels were less likely to be recommitted.

The recidivism rate among incarcerated juveniles is higher than their adult counterparts ("An Oklahoma Epidemic: Kids in Trouble," 1977). It has been reported that approximately 90% of the residents in correctional institutions are repeat offenders ("Problems of Juvenile Delinquency," 1974).

Litwack and Hebert (1967) and Ganzer and Saranson (1973) suggest potential predictors of recidivism. Litwack and Hebert (1967), list: (a) the number of times an individual is placed in the discipline cottage; (b) the age at which the first court appearance was made; and (c) the age of the mother at the time of the offender's birth. Potential recidivism predictors considered to be the most promising are delineated by Ganzer and Saranson (1973): (a) family background; (b) age at first offense and committment; and (c) diagnostic classification.

Performance in the Outward Bound Program is cited by Baer, Jacobs, and Carr (1975) as being a useful predictor of recidivism. Virtually every delinquent who successfully completed a selected Outward Bound program was still free within a five year follow up period.

Gold and Williams (1969) concluded that apprehension actually encourages delinquency. In their study on 35 matched pairs, it was found that the recidivism rate was higher when there was any type of official intervention.

## Scholastic Profile

### Schools

The manifestation of delinquent behavior by adolescents is symptomatic of problems in the immediate environment. In order for change agents to ameliorate deviant adolescent behavior, the environment of the adolescent must be examined to determine an explanation for the behavior demonstrated (Culbertson & Schrink, 1974). Culbertson and Schrink (1974) also believe that school is one of the three most important aspects of the delinquent's environment, family and peer groups being the other two.

Alienation between parents and siblings can stymie learning and/or cause the child to underdevelop an adequate conscience (McCord, McCord & Zola, 1959). This idea is further supported by Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968), who found that delinquent behavior is nurtured and enhanced through the organizational policies and procedures demonstrated in many schools.

"A school system that further alienates the already alienated child cannot reasonably demand - or expect - regular attendance" (Richette, 1969, p. 236). Of the one million children dropping out of school each year, one in three will have some type of police contact (Schreiber, 1970). Serious maladjustment problems show up in one-half of the 30% of pupils not finishing high school (Ahlstrom & Havighurst, 1971). The National Education Association (1959) states that delinquency is ten times higher among drop outs than high school graduates.

As a group, delinquents are not academic achievers. If they have not dropped out of school completely, they have fallen behind their peer age group. Generally speaking, the grades they do make are below average (Markley, 1974).

School will enhance a child's problem if that child comes to the school from an inadequate family (Polk & Schafer, 1972). These individuals find formal education to be problematic rather than problem solving. Some factors contributing to the behavior of youths and their lack of school success include (a) norm-referenced intelligence scores which often shape the attitudes of teachers toward the students; (b) the use of irrelevant textbooks and materials; (c) inappropriate teaching methods for the student population; (d) the practice of testing and subsequent grouping; and (e) parental attitudes toward education (Tyler, 1951).

In Critchley's (1964) study, approximately 75% of the young offenders in France were found to be non-readers. Ahlstrom and Havighurst (1971) found juvenile delinquents to be three years below grade level in reading and arithmetic achievement.

Shaw (1966) reported on an analysis of the juvenile delinquent student's interest and success in academics. The report indicated that (a) work dependent on self-expression generally flourishes from the beginning; (b) subjects such as History and Geography, which deal in external facts come more slowly; (c) Geometry and Mathematics are more difficult for the adolescent delinquent due to the necessity for clear

reasoning; (d) Music, and then (e) Creative Writing are the most difficult.

For many slum youths, the American dream of education for everyone is not realistic. "Many American schools have become jumping off points into delinquency, rather than stepping stones to a better way of life" (Richette, 1969, p. 324). At least one author (Tarnopol, 1970), has determined a high correlation between delinquency and school failure. The United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (1977), report indicated a correlation between children having learning problems and children exhibiting delinquent characteristics.

Not all children are ready for formal schooling at the legally required age. Because of developmental inconsistencies, some children may never develop the academic skills necessary to succeed in school. Failing from the beginning, interest in school will wane, and the individual will do something causing recognition by the juvenile justice system. There is a disproportionate contribution to delinquency from those youth failing in school (Radzinowicz & Wolfgang, 1971). The contribution schools are making to delinquency will continue until and unless educational changes are made in the schools (Clarizio & McCoy, 1976).

It is the school where many of our youth suffer their most painful failure. It is in the school that a youth learns he is incapable of learning.

## Intelligence Quotient

Tarnopol (1970) found that delinquents with higher intelligence levels commit more crimes and are arrested less often than their peers having lower intelligence levels. However, Ausubel (1965), indicated that lower intelligence is unrelated to delinquency when taken as an entity unto itself. The inference is that lower intelligence increases suggestibility and the probability of being caught.

## Special Learning Problems

Of those individuals admitted to juvenile detention centers, 80% are from two to five years below grade level achievement in at least one of the areas of (a) reading; (b) spelling, or (c) arithmetic ("A Voice in the Wilderness," 1976). Schmideberg (1961) declared that a reading retardation of even three months should be regarded seriously and remediated immediately.

Many delinquents are simultaneously functioning below their ability level and are consequently behind in achievement (Raymaker, 1974). Poor adaptive abilities of future delinquents becomes evident by the end of the third grade (Conger & Miller, 1966). Concurrent factors include (a) a failure to understand the need for rules and regulations in social groups; (b) resentment and rejection of authority in the school situation; (c) being easily distracted in academics, and (d) less willing to treat others courteously (Conger & Miller, 1966).

A bad attitude has been a trademark of the youthful delinquent regarding his interaction with teachers. Specifically, the delinquent dislikes those school subjects requiring strict logical reasoning, persistency of effort, and good memory (Mauser, 1974).

In many cases, there is a close relationship between learning disabilities and juvenile delinquency ("A Voice in the Wilderness," 1976; U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977). In order for the learning disabled student to achieve maximally in the school setting, the specific learning disability must be fully diagnosed and treated. Without early diagnosis and remediation, development of deviant behavior patterns may ensue (Faigel, n.d.).

## Adjudication

Tappan (1949) stated that up to the age of seven, children were not held responsible for their criminal behavior due to a supposed lack of mental capacity. From seven to fourteen years of age, children were still not liable...but then for reasons of immaturity. From age fourteen to twenty-one it was said that an individual did possess criminal capacity and from age twenty-one on, the age factor was considered to be conclusive.

There is a substantial numerical decrease as one observes the number of crimes known to police, to those cases where an arrest is made, to court appearances, to convictions resulting from court appearances, and finally to imprisonment (LaFave, 1969). According to Dan Rather in a December, 1977 CBS 60 Minutes Documentary, in a recent New York survey, it was found

that of every 100 arrests, 44 went to court, and only 3 were sentenced. A percentage figure of 5-20% can be projected for that portion of the youth population manifesting behavior which leads to the adjudication process (Severns, Bell, & Gregnano, 1976).

The way an adolescent is processed through the juvenile justice system is varied and dependent. Basically, four factors are involved: (a) which person or agency first demonstrated concern for the child; (b) the moods and biases of the local judge; (c) the socioeconomic background of the adolescent's family; and (d) community or state resources where the child lives (James, 1970).

One influential factor in the adjudication process is cost. Court appointed attorneys and pretrial investigations are but two of the necessary but costly steps in adjudication (Rosen & Carl, 1974).

Garabedian (1974) reports his observations in the prosecution of cases in which a negative correlation was shown between the cases prosecuted. "The deputy district attorneys were least likely to prosecute those cases that had been referred by police departments having the highest charging rates" (p. 170).

Police disposition of juvenile offenders is not always the same and is dependent on extraneous variables. Some of the variables include the (a) nature of the offense, (b) re-

cidivism rate of the offender, and (c) parental ability to hire and pay for legal counsel.

A major factor in police determination of official action is subjective regarding the ability of a family to control the behavior of the apprehended sibling (Gold, 1971).

Adjudicatory Statuses

The County Juvenile Bureau of the county from which this investigation was undertaken has the following divisions in their adjudicatory statuses:

> Child in Need of Supervision...Refers to any person under eighteen years who is habitually truant from school or who is beyond the control of his parents, guardian, or legal custodian or habitually departs himself so as to injure or endanger the health or morals of himself or others.
>
> Delinquent Child...(1) Any male or female under the age of eighteen who has violated any federal or state law or municipal ordinance, excepting a traffic statute or ordinance or any lawful order of the court; (2) A child who has habitually violated traffic laws or ordinances.
>
> Dependent/Neglected Child...Any persons under the age of eighteen years who is for any reason destitute, homeless or abandoned; or who depends on the public for support; or who has not the proper parental care or guardianship; or whose home is deemed unfit; or who is in need of special care because of physical or mental conditions and his parents, custodians, or guardian is unable to provide it (Oklahoma County Juvenile Bureau, 1974, Note 1).

Successful Change Agents

Studt (1965), suggested seven areas of expertise which the change agent should be cognizant: (a) the delinquent's perception of the world; (b) the delinquent's self-image; (c) the value system of the delinquent; (d) the dynamics of the

delinquent's family constellation; (e) peer influence on the delinquent; (f) the delinquent's perception of authority figures; and (g) realistic expectations for the delinquent. In essence, if one knows the delinquent as a person, one can expect a more in depth approach to the disposition of a delinquent's alledged delinquency. If the change agent knows how the juvenile delinquent thinks, feels, and acts toward himself and others, treatment will be more practical and humanistic. This is consistent with James' (1970) conceptualization regarding premises of agreement among successful change agents. That is, virtually all unacceptable behavior is learned. Also, if given individualized loving care, all children can be helped while at the same time improving the environment which spawned the behavior. If this is not possible, the person needs to be given strength to cope with the destructive environment.

In order to effect change, delinquents must alter their dedication to the delinquent system. They must be made to feel anxious regarding the value of delinquency to them. Several requirements for the change agent having charge of delinquents have been delineated by Mauser (1974): (a) affective and physical acceptance should be communicated; (b) one should expect the best; (c) positive individual self-concept should be developed; (d) clearly defined limits should be established and maintained; (e) develop the ability to watch people; (f) don't expect too much too soon.

Finally, crime and juvenile delinquency cost the American taxpayer $88 billion per year. If prevention of crime and delinquency is to become a reality, change agents must be cognizant of the relationship between behavior and learning. Children with disturbing behaviors do not learn as well as or easily as other children (Pooley, 1977).

Diagnostic Tools

The importance of the accumulation of accurate diagnostic data cannot be over emphasized since such data often is the link in determining an effective rehabilitation/intervention strategy. Such data should include both formal and informal assessments of both academic and vocational abilities. The popularity of the Wechsler Scales is at least partly due to their potential use as a diagnostic tool (Sacuzzo & Lewandowski, 1976), but these are insufficient data if used alone.

Although an examiner can influence a testing situation and the subsequent accomplishments of the subject (Guertin, Rabin, Frank, & Ladd, 1962), age does not significantly influence the patterns of scaled scores (Holt, 1968). Cohen (1959) determined that child and adult achievement on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) and Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) are comparable from age 13 years, six months on.

There is a tendency for delinquents to score higher on the Performance rather than the Verbal sections of the

intelligence tests (Caplan, 1965). Performance IQ's being significantly greater than Verbal IQ's is the general pattern found in individuals with acting-out tendencies (Ogdon, 1977).

The most characteristic pattern of performance for adolescent sociopaths on the WAIS is a higher Performance IQ than Verbal IQ (Wechsler, 1958). A Performance IQ which is significantly above the Verbal IQ is primarily found in individuals who are acting-out. Personality types typically scoring higher on the Performance section include psychopaths, sociopaths, narcissistic character disorders (Blatt & Allison, 1968; Gilber, 1969; Guertin, Rabin, Frank & Ladd, 1962), and adolescent delinquents (Glueck & Glueck, 1964; Pope & Scott, 1967).

An irony of delinquent populations is the achievement of relatively high scores on the Picture Arrangement subtest of the Wechsler Scales. Such data suggest that antisocial individuals have a good grasp of social situations (Wechsler, 1958). When accompanied by a significantly higher Performance IQ over Verbal IQ, an unusually high Picture Arrangement subtest score may indicate delinquent tendencies. Inferred is the ability of the individual to be shrewd and manipulative of people and to scheme without regard for the social consequences of the schemes (Allison, Blatt, & Zimet, 1968; Gilbert, 1969; Rabin & McKinney, 1972),

## Prevention/Treatment

To set up an effective prevention/recognition program, knowledge of predelinquent behavior is necessary. The characteristics of aggressiveness, truancy, and out-of-control behavior could all be indicative of delinquency (Blos, 1961).

Prevention and treatment are dependent on the individual's perception of the problem (Clarizio & McCoy, 1976). Many workers in the field of delinquency have not been trained appropriately with respect to etiological theory (Gibbons, 1965). In general, there seems to be inadequate preventive services for youth. As a nation, America has been recalcitrant in her responsibility to the youthful population within her boundaries. A problem resulting from lack of prevention is that many of this nation's youthful population will not have the means available to them to develop to their fullest capacity as productive human beings (Hurd, 1953).

The term "prevention" is one which connotes anticipation or readiness. The goal of delinquency prevention would then be to develop sufficient skills such that those individuals in need will be able to satisfactorily negotiate the social system (Ullmann & Krasner, 1975). In order to prevent, treat, or rehabilitate those individuals who break the laws, some particulars in the environment must be identified as causal to the problem.

There are five major aims of delinquency and deviant social behavior and treatment. They are: (a) social and psychological rehabilitation; (b) elimination of symptoms; (c) protection of

the environment; (d) protection of the young person from the environment; and (e) deterring the offender and his peers from a repetition of the behavior ("Problems of Juvenile Delinquency," 1974).

Three basic approaches to the treatment of delinquency have been proposed: (a) an individual approach, (b) a group approach, and/or (c) punishment. The individual method has been and is used by psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers, while the group method is most popular with teachers and recreation specialists. Punishment is most often used when staff are untrained and when more appropriate methods of treatment are unknown (Coates, Miller, & Ohlin, 1975).

The educational component accompanying treatment has come in the form of training schools. An alternative would be the child advocacy program in which all services are brought together for the welfare of the child. This would include the placement of the adjudicated delinquent into a culture where positive, helping concepts are stressed (Lybarger, 1976).

Typically, the offender is treated as a malfunctioning machine while the therapist is viewed as a mechanic whose job is to repair the machine (Gibbons, 1965). Too often, inadequate finances and case loads which are too large inhibit the effective implementation of rehabilitative goals. The method of choice is contingent on the professional training and personality of the change agent and his/her clientele (Trojanowicz, 1973).

Over the years, delinquency prevention efforts have had little success. Most contemporary approaches to the delinquency model direct their efforts toward individuals and small groups. Mech (1975) delineates seven small scale delinquent prevention approaches: (a) individual services; (b) group services; (c) special education provisions; (d) social learning; (e) community outreach; (f) adult models; and (g) work experience.

Those interventions focusing solely on the child while ignoring environmental conditions such as family, school, and community have proven to be ineffective and inefficient (Apter, in press). Conversely, another approach to lowering the rising delinquency rates is to meet the needs of the delinquents and furnish them with needed services (Weser, Welsh, & Hunsicker, 1973).

Graubard (1969) discussed reasons concerning the failure of educational approaches. He concludes that educational procedures will continue to be ineffective, for the most part, until a more harmonious relationship can be established between the disparate worlds of the educator and the delinquent.

There are four strategies basically employed with the incarcerated juvenile. Priority is generally given to institutionalization; secondly, to punishment; followed by rehabilitation and reintegrative programs. Eighty-seven percent of institutionalized children have been viewed as having at least

minimal emotional disturbance; 16% are judged as having severe behavior problems or emotional disturbance (Coates, Miller, & Ohlin, 1975).

Orlando & Black (1975) state that courts have been thought of traditionally in terms of reconciling the interests of society with regard to the apprehended juvenile as well as an avenue through which rehabilitative services for deviant youth might be obtained. In reality, the juvenile court

> has not succeeded significantly in rehabilitating delinquent youth, in reducing or even stemming the tide of delinquency, or in bringing justice and compassion to the child offender (President's Commission on Law Enforcement, 1967, p. 80).

Is school pressure responsible for the periodic increases in incoming case loads for the juvenile justice system? Court cases increase with the opening of school in September and January and decrease when school is not in session (Garcia, 1976). Our juvenile justice system is a masquerade. Incarceration is called rehabilitation (Mathias, 1977). Rarely has imprisonment had a positive effect on a prisoner. Generally, the opposite is true. That is, the delinquent is more likely to become even more intensely antisocial (Barcai & Rabkin, 1974; James, 1970).

Rehabilitation efforts have been largely unsuccessful with the delinquent population (Messinger, 1977). Medical model treatment of delinquents as sick individuals (Baker, 1920; Nir & Cutler, 1973) has been equally disappointing.

Traditional treatment approaches in institutional settings with juvenile offenders have not been encouraging (Emery & Marholin, 1977; Caditz, 1959). Apparently, institutions are not even potentially capable of success (Wetmore, 1971). Development of an adequate prevention/intervention program should be based on the anticipation of immature behavior and consequent mature behavior from adults functioning as change agents. It should be remembered by change agents that many youths have learned to associate adult intervention with adult rejection (Long & Deem, 1975). Untreated delinquency will ultimately cost society more than the capital outlay necessary to establish an effective treatment program (Wetmore, 1971).

# CHAPTER THREE

# METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the present investigation was to develop a profile containing three major components which would interact to form a descriptive profile of the adjudicated adolescent. As used in this investigation, the term interact refers to a compilation of information rather than statistical information. This chapter delineates the procedures utilized in this investigation.

## Subjects for the Study

The subjects utilized in this study were randomly selected from the case files of a licensed psychologist who was serving as a consultant to a juvenile bureau. The office of the psychologist and the juvenile bureau were located in a large metropolitan area of the Southwestern United States. The random sample of subjects consisted of 200 adolescents between the ages of 13 years 6 months and 19 years 11 months. The subjects had been referred between January, 1974, and March, 1978, to the consulting psychologist who completed a comprehensive psychological, intellectual, and scholastic evaluation on each subject. Appendix A contains the information utilized in the evaluation process by the licensed psychologist.

Appendix B contains the raw data obtained on the subjects utilized in this study.

The ethnicity, sex, and age range of all 200 subjects selected for the study are delineated in Table 1.

Table 1

Subjects Utilized in the Present Study Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex

| Subjects Reported by Chronological Age Range | Total Number | | Race/Sex of Subjects | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Black | | White | | Other | |
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| 13 years 6 months-[1] 14 years 11 months | (46) 21 | 25 | 3 | 2 | 18 | 21 | 0 | 2 |
| 15 years 0 months- 17 years 11 months | (142) 122 | 20 | 34 | 1 | 83 | 16 | 5 | 3 |
| 18 years 0 months- 19 years 11 months | (12) 11 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTALS | 154 | 46 | 43 | 3 | 106 | 38 | 5 | 5 |
| | 200 | | 46 | | 144 | | 10 | |

[1] 13 years 6 months selected as youngest age based on comparability of WISC and WAIS scores (Cohen, 1959).

Of the 200 subjects there were 154 males and 46 females. Within this group there were 46 Black subjects, 144 White subjects, and 10 subjects who were Indian-American or Mexican-American. There were 46 subjects in the age range of 13 years 6 months to 14 years 11 months; 142 subjects were in the age range of 15 years 0 months to 17 years 11 months; and 12 subjects were in the age range of 18 years 0 months to 19 years 11 months. Information obtained from the age group 18-0 to 19-11 should be treated judicially due to (a) the vast differences in the ages of subjects 13 years 6 months

to 14 years 11 months and 18 years 0 months to 19 years 11 months; (b) the small N accrued in the 18 years 0 months to 19 years 11 months bracket.

## Obtaining the Data

Permission to conduct this investigation and to review each of the selected confidential case files was obtained through the licensed psychologist. Anonymity of the subjects, personnel, and the special institutions involved was insured.

The case files for the subjects utilized in this study were randomly selected from the composite case files housed in the office suite of the consulting psychologist by secretarial personnel. Although this randomization process fails to comply with the recommended randomization procedures, it was only under these conditions that the case files were available to the investigator. Any case files selected by the secretarial personnel which did not meet the age specification, age 13 years 6 months to 19 years 11 months, delineated for this study were rejected.

## Statistical Design

Information obtained from the 200 case studies of adjudicated adolescents were analyzed and will be summarized and presented in tabular form. Descriptive statistics were used in order to describe the homogeneity of the sample population. The statistical tools used were (a) frequencies, (b) percentages, (c) means, (d) ranges, (e) one way analyses of variance, (f) chi squares, (g) Pearson's r's and (h) point biserials. The .01 level of significance has been established for the reporting of statistical significance.

The data obtained from the 200 case studies have been illustrated in tabular form for each of the areas of demographic data, delinquent behavior data, and scholastic data. Common factors occurring in each table include (a) age, (b) race, and (c) sex. Data have been reported, whenever appropriate, in frequencies, percentages, means, ranges, one way analyses of variance, chi squares, Pearson's r's, and point biserials.

There were three age divisions: (a) young, (age 13-14); (b) middle, (age 15-17); and (c) older, (age 18-19). Race was likewise divided into three categories consisting of (a) black, (b) white, and (c) other which included Mexican-Americans and Indian-Americans. Each racial category has been divided into two sections: (a) male and (b) female.

The analysis of the data was performed and tables were constructed to clarify information related to (a) demographic data, (b) delinquent behavior data, and (c) scholastic data. Collectively, these subprofiles make up the descriptive profile. Each subprofile is a significant part of the Gestalt in that without the support of each subprofile, the descriptive profile would be without substance.

# CHAPTER FOUR

## ANALYSIS OF DATA

Information obtained from the 200 case studies of adjudicated adolescents have been analyzed and presented in this chapter in such a way that two questions may be answered.

1. For which offenses are delinquents of different ages most frequently adjudicated?

2. Is there a relationship among demographic data, delinquent behavior data, and scholastic data at the time of adjudication?

In order to answer these questions, data obtained from the case files of 200 adjudicated adolescents were used. The data included psychological, intellectual, and scholastic evaluations of each subject. Additionally, information was accrued through self report background data on each subject.

Descriptive statistics have been utilized in analyzing the data in order to effectively describe the homogeneity of the adjudicated adolescent sample population. The descriptive statistics used include (a) frequencies, (b) percentages, (c) means, (d) ranges, (e) Pearson's r's, (f) chi squares, (g) one way analysis of variance and (h) point biserials. Chi squares are used as tests of significance when data are encountered which can be expressed (a) in frequencies, or (b) as percentage data which is reduceable to frequencies. Contingency tables corresponding to tabled data in the text may be found in Appendix C.

Data has been presented in three categories: (a) demographic data; (b) delinquent behavior data; and (c) scholastic data. The demographic data relates to the dynamic balance of a population and includes data regarding home status, birth order, number of siblings per subject's family, sex, grade level in school at the time of adjudication, chronological age, immediate family members who are, or have been incarcerated for criminal behavior, drug intake immediately preceding delinquent behavior (that behavior which led to apprehension and the present adjudication), and school suspension of each subject.

Delinquent behavior data relates to the formal categorization of adolescent delinquent behavior into three types: (a) nonadult offenses (those offenses for which adults would not be adjudicated) such as truancy from school, out-of-control behavior, and runaway behavior; (b) crime against person offenses such as armed robbery, strong armed robbery, assault, and drug related offenses; and (c) crime against property offenses such as burglary, larceny, and unauthorized use of a vehicle.

Scholastic data relates to an overview of the academic strengths and weaknesses of the subjects and included Reading and Arithmetic achievement scores and their relationship to such variables as grade level, intelligence quotients, and special learning problems such as mental retardation and learning disabilities.

## Descriptive Profile

### Home Status

Data presented in Table 2 illustrates the status of home conditions at the time of adjudication for all subjects reported by age range, race, and sex. The greatest number of subjects reported as being from broken homes are white males in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category. Collectively, subjects from broken homes made up 69.5% of the delinquents studied in this investigation. Hence, only 30.5% of the delinquents studied had been living at home with both natural parents prior to adjudication for their present offense(s).

A chi square was computed using subjects from broken homes and subjects who had indications of drug intake as the comparative variables. Subjects having indications of drug intake immediately prior to apprehension were used as a comparative variable in order to determine if drug intake of this nature is relevant to the type of offense committed. Significance was established at the .01 level.

### Family Data

Data presented in Table 3 provides a comparison of family data reported for all subjects by age range, race, and sex. The greatest number of subjects reported were white males in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category. In this category, the range of siblings reported for the white male category was 1-8, with 41 subjects falling within the lower 50% of the birth order in their respective families. The mean number of siblings per family was 4.0 for this age group.

### Sex

A summary of the sex of all subjects reported by race and age range is provided in Table 4. From the sample population

TABLE 2

Status of Home Conditions at the Time of Adjudication
for All Subjects Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex

| Status of Home Condition at the Time of Adjudication | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months | | | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months | | | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months | | | Totals | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | % of Total | N | % | % of Total | N | % | % of Total | N | % | % |
| Broken Homes | (N 139) | | (N 200) | (N 139) | | (N 200) | (N 139) | | (N 200) | | (N 139) | (N 200) |
| Black Male | 2 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 27 | 19.4 | 13.5 | 4 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 33 | 23.8 | 16.5 |
| Black Female | 2 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 1 | .7 | .5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.2 | 1.5 |
| White Male | 15 | 10.8 | 7.5 | 53 | 38.1 | 26.5 | 3 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 71 | 51.0 | 35.5 |
| White Female | 16 | 11.5 | 8.0 | 9 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 1 | .7 | .5 | 26 | 18.7 | 13.0 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.2 | 1.5 |
| Other Female | 1 | .7 | .5 | 2 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.2 | 1.5 |
| | N | % | % of Total | N | % | % of Total | N | % | % of Total | N | % | % |
| Stable Homes | (N 61) | | (N 200) | (N 61) | | (N 200) | (N 61) | | (N 200) | | (N 61) | (N 200) |
| Black Male | 1 | 1.6 | .5 | 7 | 11.5 | 3.5 | 2 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 10 | 16.4 | 5.0 |
| Black Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 3 | 4.9 | 1.5 | 30 | 49.0 | 15.0 | 2 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 35 | 57.3 | 17.5 |
| White Female | 5 | 8.2 | 2.5 | 7 | 11.5 | 3.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 19.7 | 6.0 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.3 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.3 | 1.0 |
| Other Female | 1 | 1.7 | .5 | 1 | 1.7 | .5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.3 | 1.0 |

TABLE 3

Family Data Reported for All Subjects by Age Range, Race, and Sex

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. of Subjects | Range of Siblings per Family | $\bar{X}$ No. Siblings per Family | No. of Subjects* in Lower 50% of Birth Order |
| | | | | N |
| Black Male | 3 | 5-9 | 6.6 | 1 |
| Black Female | 2 | 2-8 | 5.0 | 0 |
| White Male | 18 | 1-10 | 4.3 | 12 |
| White Female | 21 | 1-12 | 4.0 | 9 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 2 | 2-9 | 5.5 | 1 |

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. of Subjects | Range of Siblings per Family | $\bar{X}$ No. Siblings per Family | No. of Subjects* in Lower 50% of Birth Order |
| | | | | N |
| Black Male | 34 | 1-10 | 5.2 | 15 |
| Black Female | 1 | -9 | 9.0 | 0 |
| White Male | 83 | 1-8 | 4.0 | 41 |
| White Female | 16 | 1-12 | 4.5 | 9 |
| Other Male | 5 | 1-9 | 3.5 | 3 |
| Other Female | 3 | 4-6 | 4.7 | 3 |

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. of Subjects | Range of Siblings per Family | $\bar{X}$ No. Siblings per Family | No. of Subjects* in Lower 50% of Birth Order |
| | | | | N |
| Black Male | 6 | 3-10 | 5.6 | 3 |
| Black Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 5 | 2-5 | 3.0 | 4 |
| White Female | 1 | -3 | 3.0 | 0 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* Represents only those subjects for whom data were available.

TABLE 4

Sex of All Subjects Reported by Race and Age Range

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46) | | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142) | | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12) | | Total (N 200) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Black Male | 3 | 6.5 | 34 | 23.9 | 6 | 50.0 | 43 | 21.5 |
| Black Female | 2 | 4.3 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1.5 |
| (Total) | 5 | (10.9) | (35) | (24.7) | (6) | (50.0) | (46) | (23.0) |
| White Male | 18 | 39.1 | 83 | 58.5 | 5 | 41.7 | 106 | 53.0 |
| White Female | 21 | 45.6 | 16 | 11.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 38 | 19.0 |
| (Total) | 39 | (84.8) | (99) | (69.7) | (6) | (50.0) | (144) | (72.0) |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3.5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2.5 |
| Other Female | 2 | 4.3 | 3 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2.5 |
| (Total) | 2 | (4.3) | (8) | (5.6) | (0) | (0) | (10) | (5.0) |
| Combined Sexes | | | | | | | | |
| All Male | 21 | 45.6 | 122 | 85.9 | 11 | 91.7 | 154 | 77.0 |
| All Female | 25 | 54.3 | 20 | 14.1 | 1 | 8.3 | 46 | 23.0 |
| Total | 46 | 100.0 | 142 | 100.0 | 12 | 100.0 | 200 | 100.0 |

of 200, there were 83 white males in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category. This represents 58.5% of all 15-0 to 17-11 subjects utilized in this investigation.

Grade Level Attained

A summary of school and chronological age range for all subjects is reported in Table 5 by race and sex. White males in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category have the greatest number of subjects reported as being in school. Fifty-three white male subjects had a mean grade level attained of 10.1. Although white males were the largest group in this age category, black males (N 22) in the same age category had a mean grade level attained of 10.9. Black males in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category who had dropped out of school prior to adjudication had a mean chronological age of 16.9. White males in the same age category had a mean chronological age of 16.7.

A chi square was computed using race of subjects and grade level in school as the comparative variables. The chi square was significant at the .01 level.

Chronological Age

A summary of mean chronological ages reported for all subjects by status of home condition, age range, and sex is provided in Table 6. For the age categories 13-6 to 17-11, black subjects had a higher mean chronological age than their white counterparts. In the 18-0 to 19-11 age category, whites and blacks had identical n's and mean chronological ages.

TABLE 5

School Status and Chronological Age Range for all Subjects Reported by Race and Sex

| | School Status and $\bar{X}$ CA of Subjects 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In School | | | | | Dropout | | | | | In School/Dropout | | | |
| | N | % N46 | % N200 | $\bar{X}$ CA | $\bar{X}$ Grade | N | % N46 | % N200 | $\bar{X}$ CA | $\bar{X}$ Grade | N | % N46 | % N200 | $\bar{X}$ CA |
| Black Male | 3 | 6.5 | 1.5 | 14.6 | 8.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6.5 | 1.5 | 14.6 |
| Black Female | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 14.5 | 9.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 14.5 |
| White Male | 16 | 34.8 | 8.0 | 14.2 | 8.4 | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 14.2 | N/A | 18 | 39.1 | 9.0 | 14.2 |
| White Female | 20 | 43.4 | 10.0 | 14.3 | 8.5 | 1 | 2.2 | .5 | 14.3 | N/A | 21 | 45.6 | 10.5 | 14.3 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 13.7 | 7.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 13.7 |
| Combined Races | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 5 | 10.9 | 2.5 | 14.6 | 8.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10.9 | 2.5 | 14.6 |
| All White | 36 | 78.2 | 18.0 | 14.2 | 8.5 | 3 | 6.5 | 1.5 | 14.2 | N/A | 39 | 84.8 | 19.5 | 14.2 |
| All Others | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 13.7 | 7.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 13.7 |

TABLE 5
(continued)

| | School Status and $\bar{X}$ CA of Subjects 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In School | | | | | Dropout | | | | | In School/Dropout | | | |
| | N | % N142 | % N200 | $\bar{X}$ CA | $\bar{X}$ Grade | N | % N142 | % N200 | $\bar{X}$ CA | $\bar{X}$ Grade | N | % N142 | % N200 | $\bar{X}$ CA |
| Black Male | 22 | 15.5 | 11.0 | 16.7 | 10.9 | 12 | 8.4 | 6.0 | 16.9 | N/A | 34 | 23.9 | 17.0 | 16.8 |
| Black Female | 1 | .7 | .5 | 17.3 | 12.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | .5 | 17.3 |
| White Male | 53 | 37.3 | 26.5 | 16.2 | 10.1 | 30 | 21.1 | 15.0 | 16.7 | N/A | 83 | 58.5 | 41.5 | 16.4 |
| White Female | 11 | 7.7 | 5.5 | 16.2 | 10.1 | 5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 16.3 | N/A | 16 | 11.3 | 8.0 | 16.2 |
| Other Male | 4 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 16.8 | 9.8 | 1 | .7 | .5 | 17.6 | N/A | 5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 16.9 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 16.4 | N/A | 3 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 16.4 |
| Combined Races | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 23 | 16.2 | 11.5 | 16.8 | 10.9 | 12 | 8.4 | 6.0 | 16.9 | 0 | 35 | 24.7 | 17.5 | 16.8 |
| All White | 64 | 45.1 | 32.0 | 16.2 | 10.1 | 35 | 24.7 | 17.5 | 16.7 | N/A | 99 | 69.7 | 49.5 | 16.4 |
| All Others | 4 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 16.8 | 9.8 | 4 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 16.7 | N/A | 8 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 16.8 |

TABLE 5
(continued)

| | School Status and $\bar{X}$ CA of Subjects 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In School | | | | | Dropout | | | | | In School/Dropout | | | |
| | N | % N12 | % N200 | $\bar{X}$ CA | $\bar{X}$ Grade | N | % N12 | % N200 | $\bar{X}$ CA | $\bar{X}$ Grade | N | % N12 | % N200 | $\bar{X}$ CA |
| Black Male | 3 | 25.0 | 1.5 | 18.1 | 12.3 | 3 | 25.0 | 1.5 | 18.1 | N/A | 6 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 18.1 |
| Black Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 1 | 8.3 | .5 | 18.1 | 12.0 | 4 | 33.3 | 2.0 | 18.1 | N/A | 5 | 41.7 | 2.5 | 18.1 |
| White Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8.3 | .5 | 18.0 | N/A | 1 | 8.3 | .5 | 18.0 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Races | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 3 | 25.0 | 1.5 | 18.1 | 12.3 | 3 | 25.0 | 1.5 | 18.1 | 0 | 6 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 18.1 |
| All White | 1 | 8.3 | .5 | 18.1 | 12.0 | 5 | 41.7 | 2.5 | 18.1 | N/A | 6 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 18.1 |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 6

Mean Chronological Age Reported for all Subjects
by Status of Home Condition, Age Range, Race, and Sex

| Status of Home Condition at Time of Adjudication | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46) | | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142) | | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12) | | Total (N 200) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | $\bar{X}$ CA | N | $\bar{X}$ CA | N | $\bar{X}$ CA | N | $\bar{X}$ CA |
| **Broken Homes** | | | | | | | | |
| Black Male | 2 | 14.7 | 27 | 16.8 | 4 | 18.2 | 33 | 16.8 |
| Black Female | 2 | 14.5 | 1 | 17.3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15.4 |
| Total | (4) | (14.6) | (28) | (16.8) | (4) | (18.2) | (36) | (16.7) |
| White Male | 15 | 14.2 | 53 | 16.4 | 3 | 18.1 | 71 | 16.0 |
| White Female | 16 | 14.2 | 9 | 15.9 | 1 | 18.0 | 26 | 15.0 |
| Total | (31) | (14.2) | (62) | (16,3 | (4) | (18.1) | (97) | (15.7) |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16.2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 16.2 |
| Other Female | 1 | 13.9 | 2 | 15.8 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 15.1 |
| Total | (1) | (13.9) | (5) | (16.0) | (0) | (0) | (6) | (15.7 |
| **Stable Homes** | | | | | | | | |
| Black Male | 1 | 14.4 | 7 | 16.9 | 2 | 18.0 | 10 | 16.9 |
| Black Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | (1) | (14.4) | (7) | (16.9) | (2) | (18.0) | (10) | (16.9) |
| White Male | 3 | 14.0 | 30 | 16.4 | 2 | 18.1 | 35 | 16.3 |
| White Female | 5 | 14.2 | 7 | 16.5 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15.6 |
| Total | (8) | (14.2) | (37) | (16.4) | (2) | (18.1) | (47) | (16.1) |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17.6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17.6 |
| Other Female | 1 | 13.5 | 1 | 17.8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15.7 |
| Total | (1) | (13.5) | (3) | (17.7) | (0) | (0) | (4) | (16.6) |
| **Combined Homes** | | | | | | | | |
| All Blacks | 5 | 14.6 | 35 | 16.8 | 6 | 18.1 | 46 | 16.7 |
| All Whites | 39 | 14.2 | 99 | 16.4 | 6 | 18.1 | 144 | 15.7 |
| All Others | 2 | 13.7 | 8 | 16.6 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 16.1 |
| Total | (46) | (14.2) | (142 | (16.5) | (12) | (18.1) | (200) | (16.1) |

When chronological age was compared with (a) race, (b) sex, (c) drug intake, (d) grade level attained in school, (e) nonadult offenses, (f) crime against person offenses, and (g) crime against property offenses the point biserial was significant at the .01 level.

Incarcerated Family Members

A comparison of subject's immediate family members who had been incarcerated previously or were incarcerated at the time of the subjects' present adjudication reported by age range, race and sex is illustrated in Table 7. In the present investigation, white subjects were more frequently (9.5%) members of families in which immediate family members had been or were incarcerated at the time of subjects' adjudication.

Drug Intake

A summary of responses for subjects who indicated they had experienced some type of drug intake just prior to committing the offense(s) for which they were adjudicated (at the time of the present investigation) reported by age range, race, and sex is reported in Table 8. White males in the age categories 15-0 to 19-11 reported having more drug experiences (11.0%) just prior to committing the offense(s) than the categorical group closest to them (Black males, 2.0%). There were no reported drug experiences for those subjects in the 13-6 to 14-11 age category.

School Suspension

The age range, race, and sex of those subjects who indicated they had experienced a formal suspension from normal

TABLE 7

Subjects Immediate Family Members Who Were Incarcerated at the Time of the Subjects' Present Adjudication Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46) | | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142) | | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12) | | Total (N 200) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Black Male | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3.5 | 2 | 16.6 | 7 | 3.5 |
| Black Female | 1 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |
| White Male | 3 | 6.5 | 11 | 7.7 | 1 | 8.3 | 15 | 7.5 |
| White Female | 2 | 4.3 | 2 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2.0 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 1 | 2.2 | 5 | 3.5 | 2 | 16.6 | 8 | 4.0 |
| All White | 5 | 10.9 | 13 | 9.2 | 1 | 8.3 | 19 | 9.5 |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.0 |

TABLE 8

Subjects Who Indicated They Had Experienced Some Type of Drug Intake Just Prior to Committing the Alleged Offenses as Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex

| Race and Sex of Subject | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46) | | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142) | | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12) | | Total (N 200) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Black Male | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.1 | 1 | 8.3 | 4 | 2.0 |
| Black Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 0 | 0 | 21 | 14.8 | 1 | 8.3 | 22 | 11.0 |
| White Female | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.1 | 1 | 8.3 | 4 | 2.0 |
| All White | 0 | 0 | 22 | 15.5 | 1 | 8.3 | 23 | 11.5 |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |

school activities is provided in Table 9. White males in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category were reported as being more frequently suspended than all other 15-0 to 17-11 age groups combined.

Offenses Committed

A comparison of offenses committed by the subjects in this investigation reported by age range, race, sex, and the nature of the offenses is presented in Table 10. White females were the predominant group in the 13-6 to 14-11 age category for non-adult offenses. In the 15-0 to 17-11 age category, white males were adjudicated more frequently in each categorical offense area. In the 18-0 to 19-11 age category, black males, white males, and white females were dispersed in a nearly equal manner in terms of adjudicatory status.

Previous Adjudication

A comparison of previous offenses committed by subjects in this investigation reported by age range, race, sex, and nature of the offense is provided in Table 11. In the 13-6 to 14-11 age category, white males and females accounted for all but one adjudicated offense. The 15-0 to 17-11 age category was more diverse, however. The only group not reporting at least one adjudication was the black females. White males accounted for 46.6% of all the offenses committed for their age group in this investigation. In the 18-0 to 19-11 age category, white males and black males were the only groups reporting. Black males accounted for 58.3% of the criminal offenses in that age group, while white males accounted for 24.9% of the criminal offenses.

TABLE 9

Subjects Who Indicated They Had a Suspension From Normal School Activities Reported by Age Range, Race, and Sex

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46) | | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142) | | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12) | | Total (N 200) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Black Male | 0 | 0 | 12 | 8.4 | 2 | 16.6 | 14 | 7.0 |
| Black Female | 2 | 4.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.0 |
| White Male | 4 | 8.7 | 18 | 12.7 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 11.0 |
| White Female | 2 | 4.3 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1.5 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 2 | 4.3 | 12 | 8.4 | 2 | 16.6 | 16 | 8.0 |
| All White | 6 | 13.0 | 19 | 13.3 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 12.5 |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |

TABLE 10

Offenses Committed by Subjects in This Investigation
Reported by Age Range, Race, Sex, and Nature of Offense

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46) | | | | | | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142) | | | | | | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12) | | | | | | Total (N 200) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Non-Adult | | Crimes Against Persons | | Crimes Against Property | | Non-Adult | | Crimes Against Persons | | Crimes Against Property | | Non-Adult | | Crimes Against Persons | | Crimes Against Property | | Non-Adult | | Crimes Against Persons | | Crimes Against Property | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Black Male | 2 | 4.3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.1 | 1 | .7 | 21 | 14.8 | 14 | 9.8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16.6 | 4 | 33.3 | 3 | 1.5 | 23 | 11.5 | 19 | 9.0 |
| Black Female | 2 | 4.3 | 1 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.0 | 2 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 11 | 23.9 | 3 | 6.5 | 8 | 17.4 | 28 | 19.7 | 28 | 19.7 | 35 | 24.6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16.6 | 3 | 25.0 | 39 | 19.5 | 33 | 16.5 | 46 | 23.0 |
| White Female | 19 | 41.3 | 1 | 2.1 | 4 | 8.7 | 13 | 9.2 | 2 | 1.4 | 3 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16.6 | 3 | 25.0 | 32 | 16.0 | 5 | 2.5 | 7 | 3.5 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.4 | 2 | 1.4 | 2 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.0 | 2 | 1.0 | 2 | 1.0 |
| Other Female | 2 | 4.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1.5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.0 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 4 | 8.7 | 1 | 2.1 | 1 | 2.1 | 1 | .7 | 22 | 15.5 | 14 | 9.9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16.6 | 4 | 33.3 | 5 | 2.5 | 25 | 11.5 | 19 | 9.5 |
| All White | 30 | 65.2 | 4 | 8.7 | 12 | 26.1 | 41 | 28.9 | 30 | 21.1 | 38 | 26.8 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 33.3 | 6 | 50.0 | 71 | 35.5 | 38 | 19.0 | 53 | 26.5 |
| All Others | 2 | 4.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2.1 | 2 | 1.4 | 4 | 2.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2.5 | 2 | 1.0 | 4 | 2.0 |

*All offenses were categorized appropriately. Multiple offenses committed by one person but falling within a particular category were recorded only one time.

TABLE 11

Previous Offenses Committed by Subjects in This Investigation Reported by Age Range, Race, Sex, and Nature of Offense* **

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N=46) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Non-adult | | Crimes Against Persons | | Crimes Against Property | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Black | | | | | | |
| Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.1 |
| White | | | | | | |
| Male | 1 | 2.1 | 2 | 4.4 | 8 | 17.4 |
| Female | 5 | 10.9 | 1 | 2.1 | 3 | 6.5 |
| Others | | | | | | |
| Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Races | | | | | | |
| All Black | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.1 |
| All White | 6 | 13.0 | 3 | 6.5 | 11 | 23.9 |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

* All offenses were categorized appropriately. Multiple offenses occurring within a single category by the same subjects were recorded only one time.

**The information provided was self-report data, hence, the information is subject to the problems incurred with self-report data.

TABLE 11
(continued)

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N=142) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Non-adult | | Crimes Against Persons | | Crimes Against Property | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Black | | | | | | |
| Male | 2 | 1.4 | 12 | 8.4 | 15 | 10.6 |
| Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White | | | | | | |
| Male | 22 | 15.5 | 13 | 9.2 | 31 | 21.7 |
| Female | 4 | 2.8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.4 |
| Others | | | | | | |
| Male | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Female | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 |
| Combined Races | | | | | | |
| All Black | 2 | 1.4 | 12 | 8.5 | 15 | 10.6 |
| All White | 26 | 18.3 | 13 | 9.2 | 33 | 23.2 |
| All Others | 2 | 1.4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .7 |

TABLE 11
(continued)

| Race and Sex of Subjects | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N=12) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Non-adult | | Crimes Against Persons | | Crimes Against Property | |
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Black | | | | | | |
| Male | 1 | 8.3 | 3 | 25.0 | 3 | 25.0 |
| Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White | | | | | | |
| Male | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 8.3 |
| Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Others | | | | | | |
| Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Races | | | | | | |
| All Black | 1 | 8.3 | 3 | 25.0 | 3 | 25.0 |
| All White | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 8.3 |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

TABLE 11
(continued)

Total N 200

| Race and Sex of Subjects | Non-adult N | Non-adult % | Crimes Against Persons N | Crimes Against Persons % | Crimes Against Property N | Crimes Against Property % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | | | | | | |
| Male | 3 | 1.5 | 15 | 7.5 | 18 | 9.0 |
| Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |
| White | | | | | | |
| Male | 24 | 12.0 | 16 | 8.0 | 40 | 20.0 |
| Female | 9 | 4.5 | 3 | 1.5 | 5 | 2.5 |
| Others | | | | | | |
| Male | 1 | .5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Female | 1 | .5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |
| Combined Races | | | | | | |
| All Black | 3 | 1.5 | 15 | 7.5 | 19 | 9.5 |
| All White | 33 | 16.5 | 19 | 9.5 | 45 | 22.5 |
| All Others | 2 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .5 |

Scholastic Achievement

A comparison of school achievement including Reading, Arithmetic, and Intelligence Quotient scores for all subjects reported by age range, race, and sex is presented in Table 12. In the age category 13-6 to 14-11, the white subjects had a higher mean IQ (87.2) than black subjects (58.4), the white subjects had a lower mean chronological age (14.2) than the black subjects (14.6), and the white subjects had higher mean Reading and Arithmetic achievement scores (6.7 & 5.2) than the black subjects (2.7 & 2.9). In the 15-0 to 17-11 age category, white subjects achieved a higher mean IQ (95.7) than the black subjects (81.9), the white subjects had a lower mean chronological age (16.4) than the black subjects (16.8), and the white subjects had higher mean Reading and Arithmetic achievement scores (8.5 & 5.7) than the black subjects (4.4 & 4.0). The pattern continues through the 18-0 to 19-11 age category, White subjects achieved a higher mean IQ (97.5) than the black subjects (80.7), mean chronological ages for black and white subjects were the same (18.1), but the mean Reading and Arithmetic achievement scores were higher for white subjects (8.1 & 5.8) than for black subjects (4.6 & 5.2).

A one way analysis of variance was computed on arithmetic scores of the subjects and crime against person offenses committed by the subjects. It was significant at the .01 level.

The point biserial was used to compare intelligence quotient and (a) race of subjects, (b) subjects from broken homes,

TABLE 12

Scholastic Achievement Including Reading, Arithmetic, and Intelligence Quotient (IQ) Scores for All Subjects Reported by Race, Sex, and Age Range

| Race and Sex of Subjects | Number of Subjects N | (N46) % | % of Subjects (N 200) | $\bar{X}$ IQ | $\bar{X}$ CA | $\bar{X}$* Read. (G.E.) | $\bar{X}$* Arith. (G.E.) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46) | | | | | | |
| Black Male | 3 | 6.5 | 1.5 | 53.7 | 14.6 | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| Black Female | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 65.5 | 14.5 | 2.7 | 3.4 |
| White Male | 18 | 39.1 | 9.0 | 91.6 | 14.2 | 7.1 | 5.6 |
| White Female | 21 | 45.6 | 10.5 | 83.3 | 14.3 | 6.4 | 4.8 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 76.0 | 13.7 | 4.9 | 6.2 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 5 | 10.9 | 2.5 | 58.4 | 14.6 | 2.7 | 2.9 |
| All White | 39 | 84.8 | 19.5 | 87.2 | 14.2 | 6.7 | 5.2 |
| All Others | 2 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 76.0 | 13.7 | 4.9 | 6.2 |
| | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142) | | | | | | |
| Black Male | 34 | 23.9 | 17.0 | 81.4 | 16.8 | 4.4 | 3.9 |
| Black Female | 1 | .7 | .5 | 96.0 | 17.3 | 5.6 | 7.4 |
| White Male | 83 | 58.5 | 41.5 | 96.2 | 16.4 | 8.4 | 5.7 |
| White Female | 16 | 11.3 | 8.0 | 93.4 | 16.2 | 8.9 | 5.4 |
| Other Male | 5 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 90.6 | 16.7 | 7.9 | 4.6 |
| Other Female | 3 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 90.7 | 16.4 | 6.5 | 4.8 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 35 | 24.7 | 17.5 | 81.9 | 16.8 | 4.4 | 4.0 |
| All White | 99 | 69.7 | 49.5 | 95.7 | 16.4 | 8.5 | 5.7 |
| All Others | 8 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 90.6 | 16.7 | 7.6 | 4.6 |
| | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12) | | | | | | |
| Black Male | 6 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 80.7 | 18.1 | 4.6 | 5.2 |
| Black Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 5 | 41.7 | 2.5 | 97.2 | 18.1 | 8.1 | 5.8 |
| White Female | 1 | 8.3 | .5 | 99.0 | 18.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 6 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 80.7 | 18.1 | 4.6 | 5.2 |
| All White | 6 | 50.0 | 3.0 | 97.5 | 18.1 | 8.1 | 5.8 |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

*Mean Reading and Arithmetic Scores are reported in grade equivalency and are based on only those subjects for which Reading and Arithmetic scores were available. There were some subjects for whom the data were not available.

(c) drug intake subjects, and (d) subjects with learning problems. Each was significant at the .01 level. The point biserial was also used to compare reading scores with (a) race of subjects and (b) subjects with learning problems; and arithmetic scores with (a) crime against person offenses and (b) subjects with learning problems. All were significant at the .01 level.

Special Learning Problems

Special learning problems of all subjects reported by age range, race, and sex are compared in Table 13. White females in the 13-6 to 14-11 age category had more learning problems (23.9%) than any other group. In the age category 15-0 to 17-11, black males and white males had identical numbers of learning problems reported. Proportionately, however, black males had more learning problems (52.9%) than white males (21.7%) in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category. For the age category 18-0 to 19-11, black males was the only group reported as having learning problems.

A chi square was computed using subjects with learning problems and drug intake subjects as the comparative variables. The chi square was significant at the .01 level.

Discrepancies Between Mean Reading and Mean Arithmetic Scores

A comparison of discrepancies between the mean Reading and mean Arithmetic achievement scores and the grade expectancy level for all subjects reported by age range, race, and sex is presented

TABLE 13

Special Learning Problems of All Subjects
Reported by Race, Sex, and Age Range

| Race and Sex of Subjects | Subjects | | $\bar{X}$ | None | | L.D.[1] | | M.R.[2] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | IQ | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| **13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Black Male | 3 | 6.5 | 53.7 | 1 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.3 |
| Black Female | 2 | 4.3 | 65.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.3 |
| White Male | 18 | 39.1 | 91.6 | 7 | 15.2 | 4 | 8.7 | 7 | 15.2 |
| White Female | 21 | 45.6 | 83.3 | 10 | 21.8 | 1 | 2.2 | 10 | 21.8 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 2 | 4.3 | 76.0 | 1 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.2 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 5 | 10.9 | 58.4 | 1 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8.7 |
| All White | 39 | 84.8 | 87.2 | 17 | 37.0 | 5 | 10.9 | 17 | 37.0 |
| All Others | 2 | 4.3 | 76.0 | 1 | 2.2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.2 |
| **15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Black Male | 34 | 23.9 | 81.4 | 16 | 11.3 | 1 | .7 | 17 | 12.0 |
| Black Female | 1 | .7 | 96.0 | 1 | .7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 83 | 58.5 | 96.2 | 65 | 45.8 | 12 | 8.4 | 6 | 4.2 |
| White Female | 16 | 11.3 | 93.4 | 14 | 9.8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.4 |
| Other Male | 5 | 3.5 | 90.6 | 5 | 3.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 3 | 2.1 | 90.7 | 3 | 2.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 35 | 24.7 | 81.9 | 17 | 12.0 | 1 | .7 | 17 | 12.0 |
| All White | 99 | 69.7 | 95.7 | 79 | 55.6 | 12 | 8.4 | 8 | 5.6 |
| All Others | 8 | 5.6 | 90.6 | 8 | 5.6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Black Male | 6 | 50.0 | 80.7 | 4 | 33.3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16.6 |
| Black Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 5 | 41.7 | 97.2 | 5 | 41.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Female | 1 | 8.3 | 99.0 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Race | | | | | | | | | |
| All Black | 6 | 50.0 | 80.7 | 4 | 33.3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16.6 |
| All White | 6 | 50.0 | 97.5 | 6 | 50.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1. L.D. refers to Learning Disabilities as a separate diagnostic category.
2. M.R. refers to Mental Retardation as a separate diagnostic category.

in Table 14. In the age category 13-6 to 14-11, black males had the greatest discrepancy in both Reading and Arithmetic scores. They achieved at a rate of -6.3 to -6.4 years below the mean grade level expectancy respectively. All groups, excluding white males and females, achieved at a rate of -3.2 or more years below mean grade level expectancy in reading. In the age category 15-0 to 17-11, black males had the greatest discrepancy in Reading and Arithmetic scores. They achieved at a rate of -6.6 to -7.1 years below mean grade level expectancy, respectively. The only groups in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category achieving at a rate greater than -3.2 years below mean grade level expectancy in reading were the white males and females. The highest mean grade level achievement attained in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category was -1.1 years below mean grade level expectancy in reading. This was accomplished by white females. Black males and white males were the only groups with reported incidence figures in the 18-0 to 19-11 age category. Black males had the greatest discrepancy in both Reading and Arithmetic scores. They achieved at a rate of -7.4 and -6.8 years below mean grade level expectancy, respectively. In contrast, white males achieved at a somewhat higher rate, achieving respective mean grade level expectancy scores of -3.9 and -6.2 in Reading and Arithmetic.

TABLE 14

Discrepancy Between the Mean Reading and Mean Arithmetic Scores and the Grade Expectancy Level for All Subjects Reported by Race, Sex, and Age Range

| Race and Sex of Subjects | $\bar{X}$ CA | $\bar{X}$ GE[1] | $\bar{X}$ Reading Discrepancy in Years[2] | $\bar{X}$ Arithmetic Discrepancy in Years[2] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months (N 46)** | | | | |
| Black Male | 14.6 | 9 | -6.3 | -6.4 |
| Black Female | 14.5 | 8 | -5.3 | -4.6 |
| White Male | 14.2 | 8 | -0.9 | -2.4 |
| White Female | 14.3 | 8 | -1.6 | -3.2 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 13.7 | 8 | -3.2 | -1.9 |
| Combined Races | | | | |
| All Black | 14.6 | 9 | -6.3 | -6.1 |
| All White | 14.2 | 8 | -1.3 | -2.9 |
| All Others | 13.7 | 8 | -3.2 | -1.9 |
| **15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months (N 142)** | | | | |
| Black Male | 16.8 | 11 | -6.6 | -7.1 |
| Black Female | 17.3 | 11 | -5.4 | -3.6 |
| White Male | 16.4 | 10 | -1.6 | -4.3 |
| White Female | 16.2 | 10 | -1.1 | -4.6 |
| Other Male | 16.7 | 11 | -3.2 | -6.4 |
| Other Female | 16.4 | 10 | -3.5 | -5.2 |
| Combined Races | | | | |
| All Black | 16.8 | 11 | -6.6 | -7.0 |
| All White | 16.4 | 10 | -1.6 | -4.3 |
| All Others | 16.7 | 11 | -3.4 | -6.4 |
| **18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months (N 12)** | | | | |
| Black Male | 18.1 | 12 | -7.4 | -6.8 |
| Black Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 18.1 | 12 | -3.9 | -6.2 |
| White Female | 18.0 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Races | | | | |
| All Black | 18.1 | 12 | -7.4 | -6.8 |
| All White | 18.1 | 12 | -3.9 | -6.2 |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1. Mean Grade Expectancy score based on the assumption that children in grade 1 have a 6.5 CA and that they progress at a rate of one grade level per year.

2. Mean Reading Discrepancy scores and mean Arithmetic Discrepancy Scores represent the difference between the obtained mean WRAT grade equivalency scores (Table 12) and the mean grade expectancy score.

Discrepancies Between the Mean Expected Grade Attainment and the Mean Actual Grade Attainment

A comparison of discrepancies between the mean expected grade attainment and the mean actual grade attainment reported by age range, race, and sex is provided in Table 15. In the 13-6 to 14-11 age category, only black males and other females had not achieved their mean grade level expectancy. In the 15-0 to 17-11 age category, only black males and other males did not achieve their mean grade level expectancy. In the 18-0 to 19-11 age category, the mean actual grade attained was commensurate with the mean grade level expectancy for those groups with subjects in this age category.

TABLE 15

Discrepancy Between the Mean Expected Grade Attainment and the Mean Actual Grade Attainment Reported by Race, Sex and Age Range

| Race and Sex of Subjects | No. | $\bar{X}$CA | $\bar{X}$GE[1] | $\bar{X}$ Actual Grade Attained | $\bar{X}$ Discrepancy |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 13 years 6 months - 14 years 11 months | | | | |
| Black Male | 3 | 14.6 | 9 | 8.7 | -.33 |
| Black Female | 2 | 14.5 | 8 | 9.0 | +1.0 |
| White Male | 16 | 14.2 | 8 | 8.4 | +.40 |
| White Female | 20 | 14.3 | 8 | 8.5 | +.50 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 2 | 13.7 | 8 | 7.0 | -1.0 |
| Combined Races | | | | | |
| All Black | 5 | 14.6 | 9 | 8.8 | -.20 |
| All White | 36 | 14.2 | 8 | 8.5 | -.50 |
| All Others | 2 | 13.7 | 8 | 7.0 | +1.0 |
| | 15 years 0 months - 17 years 11 months | | | | |
| Black Male | 22 | 16.8 | 11 | 10.9 | -.10 |
| Black Female | 1 | 17.3 | 11 | 12.0 | +1.0 |
| White Male | 55 | 16.2 | 10 | 10.1 | +.10 |
| White Female | 11 | 16.2 | 10 | 10.1 | +.10 |
| Other Male | 4 | 16.8 | 11 | 9.8 | -1.2 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Races | | | | | |
| All Black | 23 | 16.8 | 11 | 10.9 | -.10 |
| All White | 66 | 16.2 | 10 | 10.1 | +.10 |
| All Others | 4 | 16.8 | 11 | 9.8 | -1.20 |
| | 18 years 0 months - 19 years 11 months | | | | |
| Black Male | 3 | 18.1 | 12 | 12.0 | None |
| Black Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| White Male | 1 | 18.1 | 12 | 12.0 | None |
| White Female | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Male | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other Female | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined Races | | | | | |
| All Black | 3 | 18.1 | 12 | 12.0 | None |
| All White | 1 | 18.1 | 12 | 12.0 | None |
| All Others | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

1. Mean Grade Expectancy score based on the assumption that children in grade one have a 6.5 CA and that they progress as a rate of one grade level per year.

# CHAPTER FIVE

# SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

## Summary

The purpose of this investigation was to develop a descriptive profile of the adjudicated adolescent. The investigator sought to determine if predictive factors were discernable from an ex post facto analysis of data.

Six instruments were utilized in obtaining the data. All instruments were administered by a consulting psychologist to a juvenile bureau. The instruments were the (a) Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children; (b) Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised; (c) Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale; (d) Wide Range Achievement Test; (e) Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test; and (f) Rorschach Test.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data. Demographic data were analyzed first. Significant relationships were found between:

1. Subjects from broken homes and subjects who had experienced some type of drug intake immediately preceding the offense(s) for which the subjects were apprehended and adjudicated.

2. Race of subjects and grade level attained.

3. Chronological age of subjects and (a) race of subjects, (b) sex of subjects, (c) subjects who experienced some type of

drug intake, (d) grade level attained in school, (e) subjects who committed nonadult offenses, (f) subjects who committed crime against person offenses, and (g) subjects who committed crime against property offenses.

4. Arithmetic scores of subjects and subjects who committed crime against person offenses.

5. Arithmetic scores of subjects and (a) subjects adjudicated for crime against person offenses and (b) subjects with learning problems.

6. Reading scores of subjects and (a) race of subjects and (b) subjects with learning problems.

There were no statistically significant relationships determined when delinquent behavior data were compared with other variables. However, significant relationships were established when demographic and scholastic variables were compared with delinquent behavior data.

When scholastic data was analyzed, significant relationships were found between:

1. Subjects with learning problems and subjects who experienced some type of drug intake.

2. Intelligence quotient of subjects and (a) race of subjects, (b) subjects from broken homes, (c) subjects who experienced some type of drug intake, and (d) subjects with learning problems.

## Discussion

Tabular data presented previously are not all statistically significant. However, certain elements of the information are

suggestive of possible trends and deserve further consideration. In a section which follows, the investigator will relate significant tabular data to the literature and present a composite profile of the adjudicated adolescent sociopath based on information obtained from the case files of the subjects utilized in this investigation. The composite sociopathic profile should be viewed as a compilation of information and not as a statement unique to a particular group or class of individuals.

The findings of the present investigation involving home status of delinquent subjects is reflective of the increasing number of delinquents who come from broken homes. The percentage of subjects living at home with both natural parents is higher (30.5%) than the 22.1% reported by Messinger (1977), but much lower than the 50% reported by Hardy and Cull (1974).

Ullmann and Krasner (1975) relate that being male and 16 to 17 years of age seems most predictive of obtaining delinquent status. The information in Table 4 indicates that males in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category were adjudicated more than any other group utilized in this investigation.

The results of the present investigation regarding school status indicate that more subjects were enrolled in school at the time of adjudication (N 138) than were subjects classified as dropouts (N 62) at the time of the present investigation. The difference in grade level attainment for white and black males in this investigation suggest that black males who remain

in school achieve a mean grade level higher than their white male counterparts. However, the difference in chronological age for white and black males who drop out of school suggest that white male dropouts are adjudicated at an earlier age than black male dropouts. This finding supports Mauser (1974) who found delinquents to be younger and brighter than the delinquent of previous years.

For all race and age categories, black subjects had the highest mean chronological age (16.7) and white subjects had the lowest chronological age (15.7) at the time of the present adjudication. The data of this investigation supports that of Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin (1972) regarding the age at which most delinquencies start (16).

The information provided in Table 8 does not support the notion of Gold and Reimer (1972) that increased drug use would correlate with increased crime. In the present investigation, 14.0% of the sample population reported some type of drug intake just prior to committing the offense(s) for which apprehension and adjudication followed.

If the reader observes the totals of Table 10 in terms of quantity alone, the reader will see that white males, when compared with other groups, are adjudicated more frequently in each offense category. Upon closer inspection, it becomes readily apparent that black males proportionately commit more serious offenses (crime against persons) than any other group.

For the 46 black subjects, there were 25 crimes against persons committed for which black subjects had been adjudicated. Conversely, there were 38 crimes against persons reported for the white subjects. The respective percentages of offenses committed per person were 54% for black subjects and 26% for white subjects. This substantiates the findings of Ahlstrom and Havighurst (1971) and Wolfgang (1969) who found that blacks and males are more criminally aggressive than whites or females, based on the high rates of crimes against persons reported.

White subjects in this investigation were reported as having previously committed more criminal offenses than any other group. However, if the ratio of serious offenses between black and white subjects is observed, it becomes apparent that blacks were adjudicated for serious offenses at a much higher rate (32.6%) than white subjects (11.8%).

A comparison of totals for each age group gives additional clarity to the comparison between age and race achievement levels. In the 13-6 to 14-11 age category, white subjects were .4 mean years younger (14.2 - 14.6), had a grade level expectancy of one year lower (8 - 9), and were achieving at a 5.0 years higher mean rate in Reading (-1.3 to -6.3) and 3.2 years higher in Arithmetic (-2.9 to -6.1). In the 15-0 to 17-11 age category, white subjects were .4 mean years younger (16.4 - 16.8), had a grade level expectancy one year lower (10 - 11), and were achieving at a 5.0 years higher mean rate in Reading (-1.6 to -6.6) and

2.7 years higher in Arithmetic (-4.3 to -7.0). In the 18-0 to 19-11 age category, the mean chronological age and the grade expectancy were the same. However, white subjects were achieving at a 3.5 years higher mean rate in Reading (-3.9 to -7.4) and .6 years higher in Arithmetic (-6.2 to -6.8).

For the entire sample population utilized in this investigation, it was found that mentally retarded subjects were more abundant (N 49) than those subjects having learning disabilities (N 18). Collectively, there were 67 subjects (33.5% of the sample population) who exhibited special learning problems. White subjects in the 13-6 to 14-11 and 15-0 to 17-11 age categories and black subjects in the 15-0 to 17-11 age category had the highest incidence of learning problems.

Combined race totals in the 13-6 to 14-11 age category indicate a discrepancy between black and white subjects for the mean actual grade attained and the mean grade level expectancy (-.20 to -.5). In the 15-0 to 17-11 age category, black subjects and other subjects were found not to be at the mean grade level expectancy (-.10 and -1.20). There were no discrepancies in the 18-0 to 19-11 age category, probably as a result of the limited n.

Composite Sociopathic Profile

The case studies of 200 adjudicated adolescents have been analyzed in this investigation. The investigator has compiled a composite sociopathic profile based on the data from the case studies analyzed in this investigation. Although the information presented is not uniquely true, in that other groups may

exhibit similar characteristics, the information presented will provide the reader with additional insight regarding the problem presented to society by adolescent delinquents.

The sociopathic adolescent may be said to be chronically antisocial and maintains no real loyalties to any person, group, or code. The sociopath seems to find trouble wherever he goes and profits neither from experience or punishment. Further, the sociopath has no real sense of responsibility, has poor judgement, and constantly rationalizes behavior so that it appears warranted, reasonable, and justified.

Recommendations

If the present investigation were to be repeated, the following recommendations would be made: (a) secure formal court records for all subjects to determine the age at which each subject was formally introduced to the juvenile justice system, the number of times previously adjudicated, and the offenses leading to adjudication, (b) determine the chronological ages of those persons victimized by the delinquents offenses and (c) divide the sample population by intelligence rather than chronological age.

The literature repeatedly points to (a) age as being a factor in adjudication, (b) underachievement as a contributing factor in the delinquency process, and (c) race as an indicator regarding the type of criminal offense committed. Based upon the related literature and the present investigation, the following recommendations are offered:

1. All change agents-in-training should be required to complete a course of study relative to the characteristics of the adjudicated adolescent;

2. Effort should be exerted by the local school districts to develop a systematic screening procedure for the school-age population in order to ensure early identification of potential delinquents;

3. More community services need to be provided in order to ensure appropriate recreation experiences for all youth;

4. Much additional research needs to be conducted in the following areas: (a) the intellectual level of the adjudicated adolescent, (b) the types of offenses being committed by those on different intellectual levels, and (c) delinquency traits must be plotted in various sample populations so that the data could be extrapolated and viable identification, prevention and intervention programs could be enacted.

# REFERENCES

A voice in the wilderness. Oklahoma Association for Children with Learning Disabilities: Newsletter, March, 1976, 4 (5).

Achenbach, T. The historical context of treatment for delinquent and maladjusted children: Past, present, and future. Behavior Disorders, 1975, 1.

Ahlstrom, W. & Havighurst, R. 400 Losers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Allison, J., Blatt, S., & Zimet, C. The interpretation of psychological tests. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

An Oklahoma epidemic: Kids in trouble. The Oklahoma Observer, 1977, 9(15).

Andry, R. Delinquency and parental pathology. London: Methuen, 1960.

Apter, S. Applications of ecological theory: Toward a community special education model for troubled children. Exceptional Children, in press.

Arnold, P. Crime and youth. A practical guide to crime prevention. New York: Julian Messner, 1976.

Ausubel, D. Psychological factors in juvenile delinquency. Unpublished manuscript, 1965.

Baer, D., Jacobs, P., & Carr, F. Instructors ratings of delinquents after Outward Bound survival training and their subsequent recidivism.

Baker, H. The court and the delinquent child. American Journal of Sociology, 1920, 26.

Barcai, A. & Rabkin, L. A precursor of delinquency: The hyperkinetic disorder of childhood. Psychiatric Quarterly, 1974, 48(3).

Barron, M. The juvenile in delinquent society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1959.

Battered children. Newsweek, October, 1977.

Beck, S., Beck, A., Levitt, E., & Molish, H. Rorschach's test: I basic processes. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1961.

Becker, H. Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance. New York: The Free Press, 1963.

Becker, W. Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M. Koffman & L. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Becker, H. Deviance and the responses of others. In D. Cressey & D. Ward (Eds.), Delinquency, crime, and social process. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Bender, L. A visual motor gestalt test and its clinical use. New York: The American Orthopsychiatric Association, 1938.

Blatt, S. & Allison, J. The intelligence test in personality assessment. In A. Rabin (Ed.), Projective techniques in personality assessment. New York: Springer, 1968.

Blos, P. Delinquency. In S. Lorand & H. Schneer (Eds.), Adolescents: Psychoanalytic approach to problems and therapy. New York: Paul B. Hoeber, Inc., 1961.

Burnstein, A. (title omitted) In O. Buros (Ed.), The sixth mental measurements yearbook. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965.

Button, A. Some antecedants of felonious and delinquent behavior. Journal of Child Clinical Psychology, 1973, 2(3).

Caditz, S. Effect of a training school experience on the personality of delinquent boys. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23.

Caplan, N. Intellectual functioning. In H. Quay (Ed.), Juvenile delinquency: Research and theory. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1965.

Chicago Police Department, Training Bulletin, 10(8), February, 1968.

Clarizio, H. & McCoy, G. Behavior disorders in children (2nd ed.), New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1976.

Clarke, R. & Softley, P. The male/female ratio among the siblings of delinquents. British Journal of Psychiatry, 1975, 126.

Cloward, R. & Ohlin, L. Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs. New York: The Free Press, 1960.

Coates, R., Miller, A., and Ohlin, L. The labeling perspective and innovation in juvenile correctional systems. In N. Hobbs (Ed.), Issues in the classification of children (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Cohen, A. Delinquent boys. New York: The Free Press, 1955.

Cohen, D., Granger, R., Provence, S., & Solnit, A. Mental health services. In N. Hobbs (Ed.), Issues in the classification of children (Vol. 2). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Cohen, J. The factorial structure of the WISC at ages 7-6, 10-6, and 13-6. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23(4).

Conger, J. & Miller, W. Personality, social class, and delinquency. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.

Crime in the United States, 1975: Uniform Crime Reports. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Critchley, M. Developmental dyslexia. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1964.

Culbertson, R. & Schrink, J. The juvenile delinquent and his environment. In R. Hardy & J. Cull (Eds.), Psychological and vocational rehabilitation of the youthful delinquent. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

DeLissovoy, V. Child care by adolescent parents. Children Today, 1973, 2(4).

Elliott, D. Delinquency, school attendance, and dropouts. Social Problems, 1966, 13(3)

Elliott, D. & Voss, H. Delinquency and dropout. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath & Company, 1974.

Emery, R. & Marholin, D. An applied behavior analysis of delinquency: The irrelevancy of relevant behavior. American Psychologist, October, 1977.

Fontana, V. Somewhere a child is crying. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1973.

Friedenberg, E. The vanishing adolescent. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1959.

Friedman, C., Mann, F., & Friedman, A. A profile of juvenile street gang members. Adolescence, 1975, 10(40).

Ganzer, V. & Saranson, I. Variables associated with recidivism among juvenile delinquents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 40.

Garabedian, P. Changing practices of prosecuting attorneys. In M. Reidel & T. Thornberry (Eds.), Crime and delinquency: Dimensions of deviance. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

Garcia, E. Adolescent affairs committee panel presentation. Paper presented at the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities 13th International Conference on Learning Disabilities, Chicago, March, 1976.

Gibbons, D. Changing the lawbreaker. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Gilbert, J. Clinical psychological tests in psychiatric and medical practice. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1969.

Glasser, W. Mental health or mental illness. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960.

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. Unraveling juvenile delinquency. New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950.

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. Ventures in criminology. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Gold, M. Undetected delinquent behavior. In L. Radzinowicz and M. Wolfgang (Eds.), Crime and justice: Vol. 1: The criminal in society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.

Gold, M. & Reimer, D. Changing patterns of behavior among Americans 13 through 16 years old: 1967 to 1972. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 104 069).

Gold, M. & Williams, J. National study of the aftermath of apprehension. Prospectus, 1969, 3(1).

Graubard, P. Teaching strategies and techniques for the education of disruptive groups and individuals. In P. Graubard (Ed.), Children against schools, Chicago: Follett, 1969.

Guertin, W., Rabin, A., Frank, G., & Ladd, C. Research with the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Adults: 1955-1960. Psychological Bulletin, 1962, 59.

Hamner, W. The learning of social controls in juvenile antisocial personalities. (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1969). No. 70-5450, University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1969.

Hardy, R. & Cull, J. Runaway youth: Causes for runaway behavior. In R. Hardy & J. Cull (Eds.), Psychological and vocational rehabilitation of the youthful delinquent. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Hare, R. Psychopathy: Theory and research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.

Hathaway, S. & Monachesi, E. Adolescent personality and achievement. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1963.

Hertz, M. The Rorschach: Thirty years after. In D. Brower, & L. Abt (Eds.), Progress in clinical psychology (Vol. 1), New York: Grune & Stratton, 1952.

Hewitt, L. & Jenkins, R. Fundamental patterns of maladjustment: The dynamics of their origin. Springfield, Illinois: State of Illinois, 1946.

Hirschi, T. Causes of delinquency. Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1969.

Hirschi, T. & Selvin, H. Delinquency research: An appraisal of analytic methods. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Holt, R. (Ed.), Diagnostic psychological testing. New York: International University Press, 1968.

Hurd, M. Some characteristics of children apprehended by Oklahoma City Police. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1953.

Inbau, F. & Reid, J. Criminal interrogation and confessions (2nd ed.). Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Company, 1967.

James H. Children in trouble: A national scandal. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970

Jampolsky, G. & Haight, M. A picture of violence in children and the function of fantasy. Paper presented at the 51st Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, San Francisco, April, 1974 (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 104 114).

Jastak, J. & Jastak, S. Manual for the Wide Range Achievement Test, Revised Edition. Wilmington, Delaware: Guidance Associates, 1965.

Jeffrey, C. & Jeffrey, I. Delinquents and dropouts: An experimental program in behavior change. Canadian Journal of Corrections, 12, 1970.

Kinch, J. Continuities in the study of delinquent types. Journal of criminal law, criminology, and police science, 1962, 53.

Kvaraceus, W. & Miller, W. Delinquent behavior: Culture and the individual. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1959.

Lafave, W. Noninvocation of the criminal law by police. In D. Cressey & D. Ward (Eds.), Delinquency, crime, and social process. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Lemert, E. Human deviance, social problems, and social control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Litwack, L. & Hebert, D. Prediction of recidivism among juvenile delinquents. The Journal of Educational Research. 1967, 61(4).

Loble, L. & Wylie, M. Delinquency can be stopped. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Long, N. & Deem, M. The Rose demonstration school area. A community mental health center: History and rationale. Unpublished manuscript, 1975.

Lybarger, W. Positive peer culture - An alternative treatment for the disturbed and/or disturbing adolescent. Paper presented at the 54th Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Chicago, April 1976 (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 122 510).

Mangel, C. The current state of the art. In B. Kratoville (Ed.) Youth in trouble. San Rafael, California: Academic Therapy Publications, 1974.

Markley, C. The female juvenile delinquent and her behavior. In R. Hardy & J. Cull (Eds.), Psychological and vocational rehabilitation of the youthful delinquent. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Mathias, C. Juvenile justice at the crossroads. The Oklahoma Observer, 1977, 9(15).

Matza, D. & Sykes, G. Juvenile delinquency and subterranean values. American Sociological Review, 26, 1961.

Mauser, A. Learning disabilities and delinquent youth. Academic Therapy, 1974, 9(6).

McCord, W., McCord, J., & Zola, I. Origins of crime. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Mech, E. Delinquency prevention: A program review of intervention approaches. Washington, D. C.: Social and Rehabilitation Service, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 119 425).

Messinger, J. Juvenile delinquents: A relatively untapped population for special education professionals. Behavior Disorders, 1977, 2(2).

Moynihan, D. Violent crime: The challenge to our cities. New York: George Braziller, 1969.

Mukherjee, S. A typological study of school status and delinquency. University of Pennsylvania, 1971.

National Committee for Prevention of Child Abuse. 111 East Wacker Drive, Suite 510, Chicago, Illinois, 60601, 1976.

National Education Association: Research division and department of classroom teachers, High school dropouts. Discussion pamphlet No. 3. Washington, D. C. The Association, revised September, 1959.

Neumeyer, M. Juvenile delinquency in modern society. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1950.

Nir, Y. & Cutler, R. The therapeutic utilization of the juvenile court. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 1973, 130(10).

Nye, F. Child adjustment in broken and in unhappy unbroken homes. Marriage and Family Living, 1957, 19.

Ogdon, D. Psychodiagnostics and personality assessment: A handbook. (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services, 1977.

Oklahoma Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. Learning disabilities and predelinquent behavior of juveniles. LEAA grant number 72J94/08-022. September 15, 1973 - May 15, 1974.

Orlando, F. & Black, J. The juvenile court. In N. Hobbs (Ed.), Issues in the classification of children (Vol. 1), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Peterson, D., Quay, H., & Tiffany, T. Personality factors related to juvenile delinquency. Child Development, 1961, 32.

Pettigrew, T. A profile of the Negro American. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1964.

Polk, K. & Schafer, W. Schools and delinquency. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Pollack, H. On some of the problems of teaching applications of mathematics. Educational Studies in Mathematics, 1968, 1.

Pooley, R. Alternative approaches to treating children and families who exhibit behavior problems. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York: April, 1977.

Pope, B. & Scott, W. Psychological diagnosis in clinical practice. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. The challenge of crime in a free society. Washington, D. C.: U. S Government Printing Office, 1967.

Problems of juvenile delinquency. WHO Chronicle, 1974, 28.

Quay, H. The delinquent. In S. Kirk and B. Weiner (Eds.), Behavioral Research on Exceptional Children. Council for Exceptional Children, Washington, D. C., 1963. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 017 084).

Quay, H. Dimensions of personality in delinquent boys as inferred from the factor analysis of case history data. Child Development, 1964, 35.

Quay, H. Personality dimensions in pre-adolescent delinquent boys. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1966, 26.

Quay, H. Behavioral disorders in the classroom. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1978, 2(2).

Rabin, A. & McKinney, J. Intelligence tests and childhood psychopathology. In B. Wolman (Ed.), Manual of child psychopathology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Rachin, R. The male juvenile delinquent and his behavior. In R. Hardy & J. Cull (Eds.), Psychological and vocational rehabilitation of the youthful delinquent. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Radzinowicz, L. & Wolfgang, M. (Eds.), National violence commission on the causes and prevention of violence. Crime and justice Vol. 1, The criminal in society. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.

Rather, D. 60 Minutes. CBS News, 1977.

Raymaker, S. Some indices of prediction of delinquent behavior. In R. Hardy & J. Cull (Eds.), Psychological and vocational rehabilitation of the youthful delinquent. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Reiss, A. Social correlates of psychological types of delinquency. American Sociology Review, 1952, 17.

Richette, L. The throwaway children. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1969.

Roberts, A. & Erikson, R. Demographic variables, base rates, and personality characteristics associated with recidivism in male delinquents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(6).

Rosen, L. & Carl, A. The decision to refer to juvenile court for a judical hearing. In M. Reidel and T. Thornberry (Eds.), Crime and delinquency: Dimensions of deviance. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1968.

Ross, H. Emotional needs of the young child. In S. Gruenberg (Ed.), Our children today. New York: Viking Press, 1962.

Sacuzzo, D. & Lewandowski, D. The WISC as a diagnostic tool. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1976, 32(1).

Scarpitti, F. Delinquent and non-delinquent perceptions of self, values, and opportunity. Mental Hygiene, 1965, 49(3).

Schmideberg, M. Reading retardation and delinquency. In C. Wolcutt (Ed.), Tomorrow's illiterates: The state of reading instruction today. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1961.

Schreiber, D. Juvenile delinquency and the school dropout problem. Federal Probation, 1963, 27(3).

Schreiber, D. (Ed.), Guidance and the school dropout. The National Education Association, 1964.

Schreiber, D. School dropouts - the persistent problem and the search for solutions. In O. Mink & B. Kaplan (Eds.), America's problem youth. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook, 1970.

Sealey, A. & Banks, C. Social maturity, training experience, and recidivism amongst British borstal boys. British Journal of Criminology, 1971, 2(3).

Severns, G., Bell, R., & Gregnano, I. Administration of educational programs for delinquent youth. Paper presented to the 54th Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Chicago, April, 1976. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 122 509).

Shaw, O. Youth in crisis: A radical approach to delinquency. New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1966.

Short, F. Juvenile delinquency: The sociological context. In M. Hoffman & L. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of child development research (Vol. 2). New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1966.

State ex rel. Keefe v. Schniege, 28 N. W. 2nd 345, 348.

Studt, E. A conceptual approach to teaching materials. Illustrations from the field of corrections. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1965.

Tappan, P. Juvenile delinquency. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949.

Tarnopol, L. Delinquency and minimal brain dysfunction. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1970, 3(4).

Teicher, J. In P. Arnold, Crime and youth: A practical guide to crime prevention. New York: Julian Messner, 1976.

Toby, J. The differential impact of family disorganization, The American Sociological Review, 1957, 22.

Tomaino, L. Changing the delinquent: A practical approach. Austin, Texas: The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, 1969.

Trojanowicz, R. Juvenile delinquency: Concepts and control. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Tupker, H. & Pointer, J. The Iowa differential classification and treatment project, 1975, Project No. 00-702-51-001-471-72.

Tyler, R. Can intelligence tests be used to predict educability? In K. Eells (Ed.), Intelligence and cultural diversity. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Ullmann, L. & Krasner, L. A psychological approach to abnormal behavior (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. Second special report to the U.S. Congress on Alcohol and Health, from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. (DHEW Publication No. HSM-72-9099) Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Learning disabilities: The link to delinquency should be determined, but schools should do more now. Washington, D. C.: General Accounting Office, March 4, 1977, GGD-76-97.

Waldrop, K. Delinquent teen-age types. British Journal of Criminology, 1967, 7(4).

Wattenburg, W. & Saunders, F. Sex differences among juvenile offenders. Sociology and Social Research, 1954, 39.

Wechsler, D. Manual for the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1949.

Wechsler, D. Manual for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1955.

Wechsler, D. The measurement and appraisal of adult intelligence (4th ed.), Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1958.

Wechsler, D. Manual for the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised. New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1974.

Weser, D., Welsh, B., & Hunsicker, P. Better ways to help youth: Three youth service systems. Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 073 608).

Wetmore, P. Alternatives to delinquency. Minneapolis: Center for Youth Development and Research, University of Minnesota, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 058 341).

Wheeler, S. & Cottrell, L. The labeling process. In D. Cressey & D. Ward (Eds.), Delinquency, crime, and social process. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Winslow, R. The challenge of crime in a free society. (A Report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice), Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Co., Inc., 1968.

Wittman, G. My create-a-criminal-kit. Juvenile Justice, 1974, 25(3).

Wolfgang, M. Victim precipitated homicide. In D. Cressey & D. Ward (Eds.), Delinquency, crime, and social process. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Wolfgang, M. & Ferracuti, F. The Subculture of Violence. London: Travistock Publications, 1967.

Wolfgang, M., Figlio, R., & Sellin, T. Delinquency in a birth cohort. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Wolfgang, M. Victim precipitated criminal homicide. In D. Cressey & D. Ward (Eds.), Delinquency, crime, and social process. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Wolman, B. (Ed.), Manual of child psychopathology. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1972.

Wooton, B. Social science and social pathology. In T. Hirschi & H. Selvin, Delinquency research: An appraisal of analytic methods. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Yochelson, S. & Samenow, S. The criminal personality Vol. 1: A profile for change. New York: Jason Aranson, 1976.

Youth crime plague, Time, July, 1977.

## Reference Notes

1. Oklahoma County Juvenile Bureau, 1974, unpublished manuscript.

## Appendix A

### Procedures Followed in the Evaluation of Subjects Utilized in the Present Investigation

Subjects utilized in the study were all under the jurisdiction of a juvenile bureau. A juvenile bureau is that body designated by the district court having jurisdiction of any delinquent child, child in need of supervision, or dependent and neglected child who is found within the county. As part of the juvenile bureau, a detention home may be established. It is generally from this detention center that referrals from the juvenile bureau are made for subjects to be tested.

The juvenile detention center is responsible for the safe and secure handling of juveniles (a) who might not otherwise appear in court, and (b) when the seriousness of the offense might place the community in danger if the subject were free in the community. It is not, however, designed as a punishment.

All subjects in this study were referred to a licensed psychologist for comprehensive psychological, intellectual, and scholastic evaluations. The evaluations were all conducted either in the psychologist's office or at a juvenile detention center. In addition to the basic personal data information that was taken by the psychologist, several formal instruments were utilized. Each of the instruments have been delineated and discussed in the section which follows.

### Instruments Utilized by the Psychologist

The Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test (Bender, 1938) is often used as an introductory test in the test battery because

of its nonoffensive nature. The function of the test is to determine the individual capacity of each subject to experience a visual gestalt in spatial and temporal relationships. It is a recognized tool for the identification of retardation, organic brain defects, and personality deviations in children and adults.

The test itself is clinical in nature. Nine cards having various designs are presented to the subject one at a time to serve as visual stimuli. The subject is required to reproduce these drawings on a piece of unlined, white 8½" x 11" paper.

Scorer reliability was achieved by having five examiners score 30 Bender protocols independently. Computations were twofold: (a) Pearson product moment correlations (converted to Z-scores) and average inter-rater correlations were performed resulting in highly significant correlations ranging from .93 to .95.

Test score reliability was achieved through the test-retest method, the retest being administered four months following the initial administration. The resulting correlations were found to be significant at the .001 level.

Validity was achieved through a crossvalidation study on which chi-squares were computed. The results were statistically significant at the .01 level. The investigator is cognizant that the age levels on which normative data was accrued, represent only one age sample (5 to 10 years of age) of the total age distribution on which this test is used.

Rorschach

The Rorschach is a test of the subject's ability to interpret ten ink blot figures presented individually to the subject (Beck, Beck, Levitt, & Molish, 1961). The data accrued through the administration of the test is used to determine interest areas of the subject not previously realized.

The Rorschach subject is generally an individual whose age is somewhere from middle adolescence through adulthood, having average to high intelligence, and whose mental health is good. However, the Rorschach may also be effectively administered to disturbed, disordered subjects.

The primary clinical use of the Rorschach is diagnostic. Interscorer reliability, when scorers were thoroughly trained, oonsistently reached the 95% level. Test-retest reliability coefficients often show values of .80 and higher, but also have shown values of .00 thus pointing out that the administration and scoring of the Rorschach should be undertaken only by licensed psychologists.

The theoretical basis for the Rorschach Test is based on the premise that no test is better than the person using it. Hertz (1952), stated: "It is true that the Rorschach method is still without a theoretical basis" (p. 109).

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (Wechsler, 1949) is a revised form of the Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence

Scales. It is a test of general intelligence intended for use with children aged 5-0 through 15-11.

The WISC incorporates 10 subtests. The subtests are divided into Verbal and Performance sections, each having 5 tests. Supplementary tests are Digit Span and Mazes (or Coding). The intelligence quotient is ascertained through scoring of the 10 tests.

| Verbal | Performance |
|---|---|
| 1. General Information | 6. Picture Completion |
| 2. General Comprehension | 7. Picture Arrangement |
| 3. Arithmetic | 8. Block Design |
| 4. Similarities | 9. Object Assembly |
| 5. Vocabulary | 10. Coding or Mazes |

Reliability coefficients for the WISC were computed by the split-half technique and the Spearman-Brown formula. The reliability coefficients for the Verbal and Performance IQ's were based on five subtests for the Verbal Scale (excluding Digit Span) and four subtests for the Performance Scale (excluding Coding and/or Mazes). Reliability for the full scale scores was based on nine subtests (excluding Digit Span, Coding, and/or Mazes). The average coefficients for the Verbal, Performance, and Full Scale IQ's were .93, .88, and .94, respectively, thus indicating high reliability throughout the age range. Individual reliability for the Verbal tests ranged from .88 to .96 and from .86 to .90 for the Performance tests. Although precise validity coefficients are not listed, many investigators have chosen the WISC as the object of their investigations. One such investigator (Burstein, 1965) stated that the WISC is a

"well standardized, stable instrument, correlating well with other tests of intelligence" (p. 841).

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised (Wechsler, 1974) is a test of general intelligence for children aged 6-0 through 16-11 and as such gives a meaningful index of mental capacity. The instrument probes the intellectual capacity of a subject through a series of many different tasks or tests.

The WISC-R is made up of 12 subtests which are divided equally in number on Verbal and Performance Scales. It is only necessary for 10 tests to be administered for a valid score. The intelligence quotient is computed on the basis of the five Verbal and five Performance tests.

| Verbal | Performance |
|---|---|
| 1. Information | 6. Picture Completion |
| 2. Similarities | 7. Picture Arrangement |
| 3. Arithmetic | 8. Block Design |
| 4. Vocabulary | 9. Object Assembly |
| 5. Comprehension | 10. Coding |

Because of the number, variety, and qualitive components contained therein, the WISC-R is ideal for assessment (i.e., identification) of mental abilities, counseling needs, or education. However, one's ability to detect and interpret unusual test responses is generally commensurate with diagnostic skill. Part of diagnostic skill is familiarity with deviance and a thorough knowledge of the literature on a particular subject.

Reliability coefficients for the WISC-R were obtained through the split-half technique and the Spearman-Brown formula, thus providing a measure of internal consistency. The reliability coefficients for the Verbal and Performance IQ's were based on five subtests per Scale, while Full Scale IQ reliability was based on 10 subtests. The average coefficients for the Verbal, Performance, and Full Scale IQ's were .94, .90, and .96, respectively, thus indicating high reliability throughout the age range. Individual reliability for the Verbal tests ranged from .77 to .86 and from .70 to .85 for the Performance tests, thus the reliability coefficients are satisfactory.

In testing for validity the test author correlates the WISC-R tests for each of the 11 age groups. Additionally, the WISC-R was correlated with the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI). The Full Scale IQ correlation between the two intelligence tests was .82 with similar high correlations between the Verbal and Performance IQ's.

Further, the WISC-R was correlated with the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS). The correlations between the WISC-R and the WAIS Full Scale IQ's, the Verbal IQ's, and the Performance IQ's are .95, .96, and .83 respectively.

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS)

The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (Wechsler, 1955) is an extended and modified revision of the Wechsler-Bellevue Intelligence Scale, Form 1. It is a test of general intelligence for adults aged 16-0 through 64-0.

The WAIS is made up of 11 subtests which are divided into Verbal and Performance sections. There are six Verbal and five Performance tests totalling 11 tests. The intelligence quotient is computed on the basis of the scaled scores achieved on the Verbal and Performance tests.

| Verbal | Performance |
|---|---|
| 1. Information | 7. Digit Symbol |
| 2. Comprehension | 8. Picture Completion |
| 3. Arithmetic | 9. Block Design |
| 4. Similarities | 10. Picture Arrangement |
| 5. Digit Span | 11. Object Assembly |
| 6. Vocabulary | |

It is strongly suggested by the author of the WAIS that the tests be administered in the exact order presented here since the standardization sample was administered to in the exact manner.

Information in the test manual indicates that the WAIS is a reliable and valid measure of general intelligence for adults. A split-half reliability of .65 to .94 by the Spearman-Brown formula was achieved on the 11 tests comprising the WAIS. The Verbal, Performance, and Full Scale IQ's were respectively, .96, .93, and .97.

Validity was established by computing correlations among the 11 tests for the three age groups which were used to obtain the reliability coefficients. Correlations of each test with the Verbal, Performance, and Full Scale scores and of the Verbal score with the Performance score were also achieved.

The WAIS was also compared with the Stanford-Binet Scale, Form L. The Verbal, Performance, and Full Scale IQ's correlated .86, .69, and .85, respectively.

Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)

The Wide Range Achievement Test (Jastak & Jastak, 1965) is a test developed as a convenient tool for the assessment of achievement levels in the areas of Reading, Spelling, and Arithmetic. The revised edition (1965) is divided into two levels: (a) ages 5-0 to 11-11 and (b) ages 12 and up. Some of the many uses of the WRAT include (a) accurate diagnosis of reading, spelling, and arithmetic disabilities in persons of all ages; (b) determination of instructional levels in school children; and (c) establishment of degrees of literacy and arithmetic proficiency of mentally retarded persons.

Statistical conditions of reliability were satisfied on the WRAT. Split-half correlation coefficients for the three subtests for ages 9-0 to 14-11 range from .88 to .94 for Reading, .88 to .94 for Spelling, and .79 to .89 for Arithmetic. The average clinical reliability is estimated to be .93.

To test for validity, the Reading test of the WRAT was correlated with the Woody-Sangren Silent Reading Test and the New Stanford Reading Test. Three separate coefficients were made (.78, .74, and .80), all of which were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Additionally, intercorrelations between the WISC, WAIS, and the WRAT were made. The WRAT was compared on the basis of four age levels (5-0 to 7-11; 8-0 to 11-11; 12-0 to 15-11, and 16-0 and up) and the Reading, Spelling, and Arithmetic subtests.

The WISC and WAIS were compared on the basis of Verbal, Performance, and Full Scale IQ's. The intercorrelations ranged from .66 to .84 for the Reading test and Verbal IQ, .48 to .60 for the Spelling test and Performance IQ, and .60 to .76 for Arithmetic and the Full Scale IQ.

## Appendix B

### Raw Data on All Subjects

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudicated[1] Status | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 62 | B | F | 2.8 | 2.9 | Yes | 14.11 | 2/8 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 1-2 | M.R. |
| 2. | 107 | W | F | 9.6 | --- | Yes | 16.3 | 2/3 | 10 | Yes | Yes | --- | 1-2 | --- |
| 3. | 103 | W | F | --- | --- | No | 15.11 | 4/7 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 4. | 109 | W | F | --- | --- | No | 15.7 | 6/7 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 5. | 94 | W | M | 7.5 | --- | Yes | 17.2 | 1/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | --- |
| 6. | 95 | B | M | 12.8 | --- | Yes | 15.2 | 3/4 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 7. | 75 | B | M | 6.3 | --- | Yes | 15.10 | 1/8 | 10 | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | --- |
| 8. | 69 | W | F | 3.5 | 4.4 | Yes | 14.3 | 1 of 12 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 9. | 94 | W | F | 5.6 | 4.9 | Yes | 14.3 | 1/2 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 10. | 105 | W | M | 7.1 | --- | No | 16.8 | 3/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 3 | --- |
| 11. | 71 | W | F | 6.2 | --- | Yes | 14.9 | 1/1 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | M.R. |
| 12. | 96 | W | F | 9.9 | 6.3 | Yes | 14.7 | 1/1 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 13. | 108 | W | M | --- | --- | No | 16.6 | 1/3 | 10 | --- | Yes | Yes | 1 | --- |
| 14. | 99 | W | M | 6.9 | 5.7 | No | 16.2 | 5/7 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 1-3 | --- |
| 15. | 96 | W | M | 6.9 | 7.7 | Yes | 13.9 | 1/3 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 2-3 | L.D. |
| 16. | 75 | B | M | --- | --- | Yes | 16.5 | 2/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 2 | M.R. |
| 17. | 91 | W | M | 14.1 | 8.5 | No | 16.11 | 5/8 | 11 | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 18. | 82 | W | F | --- | --- | Yes | 16.6 | 1/1 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudicated[1] Status | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19. | 87 | O | M | --- | --- | No | 17.7 | 1/2 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 20. | 102 | W | M | 9.3 | 7.7 | No | 16.2 | 3/4 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 21. | 96 | W | M | 3.9 | 5.7 | Yes | 15.9 | 1/5 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 1 | L.D. |
| 22. | 91 | W | M | 6.5 | 5.7 | Yes | 15.10 | 3/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 23. | 108 | W | M | 10.8 | 3.9 | Yes | 16.6 | 1/3 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 24. | 89 | W | F | 12.4 | 6.7 | No | 17.8 | 3/5 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 25. | 115 | W | M | --- | --- | No | 15.10 | 2/5 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 26. | 66 | W | F | 5.6 | --- | Yes | 14.3 | 2/4 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | M.R. |
| 27 | 90 | W | M | 4.6 | 3.4 | Yes | 17.0 | 2/2 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 28. | 109 | W | M | 10.5 | --- | No | 15.10 | 1/4 | 11 | --- | Yes | Yes | 3 | --- |
| 29. | 78 | W | M | 6.8 | 6.1 | No | 15.0 | 4/4 | 7 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 30. | 115 | W | F | --- | --- | Yes | 13.9 | 4/4 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 31. | 109 | W | M | 13.0 | --- | Yes | 16.0 | 3/5 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 32. | 87 | W | F | 7.5 | --- | No | 15.3 | 1/3 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1-3 | L.D. |
| 33. | 100 | W | F | --- | --- | Yes | 16.3 | 3/5 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 34. | 83 | W | M | 6.9 | 4.4 | No | 16.7 | 1/5 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 35. | 71 | B | M | 3.2 | --- | Yes | 16.1 | 1 of 9 | 10 | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | --- |
| 36. | 102 | W | F | 6.8 | --- | Yes | 16.8 | 1/1 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 37. | 101 | W | F | 13.8 | 3.9 | Yes | 15.3 | 6/6 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | L.D. |

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudicated[1] Status | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 38. | 79 | B | M | 4.4 | 4.4 | No | 16.9 | 6/8 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 3 | M.R. |
| 39. | 53 | W | F | 2.2 | 1.1 | No | 14.4 | 2/2 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 40. | 96 | W | M | 6.9 | 2.3 | No | 15.2 | 1/5 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1-3 | L.D. |
| 41. | 103 | W | M | --- | --- | No | 16.2 | 4/5 | D.O. | --- | Yes | Yes | 1 | --- |
| 42. | 93 | W | M | 6.5 | 3.4 | Yes | 16.6 | 3/5 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 43. | 93 | W | M | 6.3 | 3.9 | Yes | 13.10 | 4/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 1 | L.D. |
| 44. | 91 | W | M | 7.7 | 3.9 | No | 16.0 | 1/3 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 3 | L.D. |
| 45 | 87 | W | M | 7.0 | --- | Yes | 16.1 | 1/1 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 46. | 105 | W | F | 10.2 | --- | No | 17.11 | 2/12 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 47. | 108 | W | M | 10.8 | 5.3 | No | 15.3 | 2/3 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 48. | 81 | B | M | --- | --- | Yes | 16.6 | 1 of 4 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 2 | M.R. |
| 49. | 98 | B | M | 5.4 | 5.7 | No | 18.1 | 4/6 | 12 | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2 | --- |
| 50. | 79 | B | M | 5.4 | 5.3 | Yes | 15.7 | 1 of 5 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 1 | M.R. |
| 51. | 87 | W | F | 8.8 | 6.0 | Yes | 15.6 | 2/4 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1-3 | --- |
| 52. | 66 | W | F | 4.3 | 3.4 | Yes | 14.5 | 2/3 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 53. | 74 | W | M | --- | 4.9 | Yes | 13.9 | 1/3 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 54. | 71 | B | M | 4.6 | 3.5 | Yes | 16.11 | 3/5 | 10 | --- | --- | Yes | 3 | M.R. |
| 55. | 100 | W | M | 13.0 | 7.4 | Yes | 16.8 | 1 of 6 | 11 | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 56. | 75 | W | M | 2.2 | 2.9 | Yes | 16.9 | 1 of 6 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | M.R. |
| 57. | 108 | W | M | --- | --- | No | 18.1 | 2/2 | 12 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 58. | 109 | W | M | 8.1 | --- | No | 17.11 | 1 of 7 | D.O. | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudicated Status[1] | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 59. | 68 | W | F | 4.8 | 4.4 | Yes | 15.0 | 4/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 60. | 68 | B | M | 2.6 | 3.4 | Yes | 18.1 | 1 of 10 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 3 | M.R. |
| 61. | 69 | B | F | 2.6 | 3.9 | Yes | 14.1 | 1/2 | 9 | Yes | --- | Yes | 1 | M.R. |
| 62. | 109 | W | M | 6.9 | --- | Yes | 15.6 | 4/5 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | L.D. |
| 63. | 66 | W | F | 3.2 | 3.4 | Yes | 14.2 | 3/6 | 9 | Yes | --- | --- | 1-2-3 | M.R. |
| 64. | 78 | B | M | 2.5 | 4.4 | Yes | 15.4 | 3/7 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | M.R. |
| 65. | 80 | W | M | 4.2 | 4.9 | No | 16.0 | 2/3 | D.O. | --- | Yes | Yes | 3 | --- |
| 66. | 79 | W | F | 5.8 | 5.7 | Yes | 14.5 | 3/6 | 8 | Yes | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 67. | 102 | W | M | 14.4 | --- | Yes | 16.7 | 1/2 | 11 | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 68. | 90 | W | M | 11.8 | 7.1 | No | 16.5 | 2/3 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 2-3 | --- |
| 69. | 84 | B | M | 1.7 | 3.4 | No | 17.8 | 5/6 | 12 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 70 | 115 | W | M | --- | --- | No | 17.10 | 3/4 | 13 | --- | Yes | --- | 3 | --- |
| 71. | 100 | W | M | 8.7 | --- | Yes | 17.6 | 2/4 | D.O. | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 72. | 92 | W | M | 8.7 | 4.7 | Yes | 13.9 | 2/5 | 8 | Yes | --- | --- | 1-3 | L.D. |
| 73. | 78 | W | M | 9.9 | 6.1 | Yes | 16.4 | 3/6 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 74. | 125 | W | M | 11.3 | 8.0 | No | 14.5 | 1/1 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 75. | 100 | O | M | 8.9 | 5.3 | No | 17.8 | 2/3 | 10 | --- | Yes | --- | 1 | --- |
| 76. | 91 | W | M | 6.8 | 4.4 | Yes | 16.2 | 2/5 | 10 | --- | Yes | --- | 3 | --- |
| 77. | 70 | W | M | 5.8 | 4.9 | Yes | 16.1 | 2/3 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 3 | M.R. |

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudicated[1] Status | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 78. | 83 | B | M | 2.2 | 4.4 | Yes | 16.4 | 2/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | L.D. |
| 79. | 91 | W | M | 7.1 | 4.4 | No | 17.1 | 4/4 | 10 | --- | Yes | Yes | 2 | --- |
| 80. | 102 | B | M | 9.9 | 6.7 | Yes | 16.5 | 2/3 | 11 | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | --- |
| 81. | 102 | W | M | 10.8 | 8.0 | No | 15.0 | 2/3 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 82. | 118 | W | M | 11.3 | 10.8 | Yes | 17.10 | 3/6 | 12 | Yes | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 83. | 91 | W | F | 7.1 | 7.1 | No | 13.9 | 1/2 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 84. | 112 | W | M | 13.0 | 11.3 | Yes | 15.6 | 2/4 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 85. | 81 | W | M | 6.3 | 4.9 | Yes | 16.8 | 1 of 6 | 12 | Yes | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 86. | 95 | W | M | --- | --- | No | 16.10 | 3/5 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 87. | 78 | B | M | 2.2 | 2.9 | Yes | 17.10 | 1 of 4 | 13 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | M.R. |
| 88. | 87 | B | M | 3.9 | 3.4 | Yes | 17.7 | 1 of 3 | 12 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 89. | 78 | B | M | 3.5 | 2.3 | Yes | 17.2 | 1 of 6 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | M.R. |
| 90. | 98 | W | M | 5.6 | 5.7 | No | 18.1 | 4/5 | D.O. | --- | Yes | --- | 3 | --- |
| 91. | 101 | W | M | --- | --- | Yes | 15.11 | 1/2 | D.O. | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 92. | 92 | W | M | 15.0 | 9.5 | Yes | 16.6 | 1/1 | 11 | Yes | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 93. | 69 | B | M | 1.8 | 1.0 | No | 17.4 | 2/2 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | M.R. |
| 94. | 81 | W | M | 1.8 | 3.4 | Yes | 14.6 | 1 of 8 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | M.R. |
| 95. | 97 | W | M | 7.5 | 4.9 | No | 16.10 | 2/3 | D.O. | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 96. | 65 | B | M | 2.4 | 3.4 | Yes | 15.2 | 1/2 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | M.R. |
| 97. | 90 | B | M | 1.0 | 4.4 | Yes | 17.6 | 2/3 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 98. | 75 | W | M | 2.8 | 4.4 | Yes | 14.4 | 1/2 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 1 | M.R. |

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudicated Status[1] | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 99. | 109 | W | F | 6.3 | 6.2 | Yes | 14.5 | 1 of 4 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | L.D. |
| 100. | 69 | B | M | 4.4 | 3.9 | Yes | 14.9 | 1/6 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | M.R. |
| 101. | 89 | W | F | 6.2 | 6.5 | Yes | 14.5 | 5/5 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 102. | 83 | W | M | 8.7 | 8.0 | No | 16.1 | 4/5 | D.O. | --- | Yes | --- | 3 | --- |
| 103. | 92 | W | M | 8.4 | 4.4 | Yes | 16.8 | 1/5 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 104. | 68 | O | F | 3.9 | 5.4 | No | 13.6 | 1/2 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 105. | 101 | W | M | 6.2 | 6.3 | Yes | 17.4 | 1/7 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 106. | 119 | W | M | 11.6 | --- | No | 15.5 | 1/2 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 107. | 87 | B | M | 4.8 | 5.7 | Yes | 17.0 | 1/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 108. | 84 | O | F | 5.8 | 6.9 | Yes | 13.11 | 5/9 | 6 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 109. | 109 | W | M | 8.1 | 2.9 | Yes | 17.5 | 3/8 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 110. | 81 | O | M | 6.3 | 3.4 | Yes | 15.2 | 2/4 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 3 | --- |
| 111. | 78 | B | M | 2.6 | 4.4 | Yes | 17.0 | 1 of 4 | 11 | Yes | --- | --- | 2-3 | M.R. |
| 112. | 104 | W | M | --- | --- | Yes | 16.5 | 4/4 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 113. | 98 | O | F | 6.9 | 5.7 | No | 17.10 | 5/6 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 114. | 100 | W | M | 11.9 | 6.7 | Yes | 18.2 | 1/2 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 115. | 52 | B | M | 1.8 | 2.9 | No | 14.5 | 1 of 5 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 116. | 101 | W | M | 9.3 | 5.3 | No | 15.i | 1/2 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 117. | 104 | W | M | 7.7 | 6.1 | No | 17.4 | 1/2 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | L.D. |
| 118. | 91 | W | M | 8.9 | 5.7 | Yes | 16.6 | 3/4 | 11 | Yes | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 119. | 103 | W | M | 7.9 | --- | Yes | 16.3 | 2/3 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudication Status[1] | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 120. | 74 | B | M | 2.4 | 4.4 | Yes | 17.8 | 2/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | M.R. |
| 121. | 89 | B | M | 3.5 | 3.9 | Yes | 17.2 | 6/6 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 122. | 121 | W | M | 8.9 | 6.7 | Yes | 14.10 | 3/3 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 123. | 79 | B | M | 6.6 | 6.5 | Yes | 18.2 | 2/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 124. | 73 | W | F | 8.1 | 4.4 | Yes | 13.11 | 2/2 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 125. | 94 | B | M | 6.2 | 6.1 | Yes | 17.10 | 1/3 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 126. | 92 | B | M | 11.3 | 4.9 | No | 17.9 | 1/3 | 12 | --- | Yes | --- | 3 | --- |
| 127. | 97 | W | M | 7.9 | 5.5 | Yes | 17.1 | 1/3 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 2-3 | --- |
| 128. | 92 | W | F | 9.6 | 7.1 | Yes | 15.0 | 2/3 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 1 | L.D. |
| 129. | 64 | W | F | 5.4 | 3.4 | No | 14.7 | 3/7 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 1-3 | M.R. |
| 130. | 88 | W | M | 3.5 | 4.9 | Yes | 18.2 | 3/3 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 131. | 113 | W | M | --- | --- | No | 17.2 | 1/1 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 132. | 62 | B | M | --- | --- | Yes | 18.4 | 3/3 | 13 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | M.R. |
| 133. | 105 | O | M | 8.9 | 3.9 | Yes | 17.9 | 3/3 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 2-3 | L.D. |
| 134. | 83 | B | M | 5.4 | 2.9 | No | 16.6 | 2/10 | 10 | Yes | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 135. | 109 | W | M | 10.2 | 6.9 | No | 14.6 | 3/4 | 9 | Yes | --- | Yes | 1-3 | --- |
| 136. | 90 | W | M | 9.9 | 5.7 | Yes | 15.7 | 1/2 | 10 | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | --- |
| 137. | 97 | W | M | 6.8 | 6.5 | Yes | 17.11 | 2/3 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 3 | --- |
| 138. | 94 | W | M | 4.8 | 4.9 | Yes | 16.8 | 1/3 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 2-3 | --- |
| 139. | 99 | W | F | --- | --- | Yes | 18.0 | 1/3 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 2 | --- |

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudicated[1] Status | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 140. | 83 | W | M | 7.7 | 3.9 | Yes | 15.6 | 3/4 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1-2 | --- |
| 141. | 72 | W | M | 2.2 | 2.9 | Yes | 13.6 | 8/8 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 142. | 108 | W | M | 8.9 | 6.7 | No | 17.6 | 3/5 | 12 | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 143. | 80 | O | M | 7.3 | 5.7 | Yes | 15.8 | 5/9 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 144. | 90 | B | M | 2.2 | 2.9 | Yes | 16.9 | 6/7 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 145. | 96 | B | F | 5.6 | 7.4 | Yes | 17.4 | 4/9 | 12 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 146. | 88 | W | M | 7.6 | 4.3 | Yes | 13.10 | 2/3 | 6 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 147. | 95 | W | F | 6.6 | 3.9 | Yes | 13.6 | 3/5 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | L.D. |
| 148. | 88 | W | M | 2.6 | 4.9 | No | 17.3 | 6/7 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 149. | 94 | W | F | 10.5 | 6.1 | No | 17.7 | 3/3 | 12 | Yes | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 150. | 97 | B | M | 10.2 | 3.9 | Yes | 17.1 | 3/3 | 12 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 151. | 74 | W | M | 4.8 | 4.4 | Yes | 15.6 | 2/5 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 152. | 40 | B | M | 1.8 | 1.0 | Yes | 14.8 | 9/9 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 153. | 84 | W | M | 6.2 | 5.3 | Yes | 16.2 | 4/4 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | L.D. |
| 154. | 86 | B | M | 5.2 | 5.3 | Yes | 17.9 | 7/8 | 12 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 155. | 114 | W | M | 9.6 | 5.7 | Yes | 15.0 | 4/5 | 9 | --- | Yes | --- | 3 | --- |
| 156. | 91 | W | F | 8.1 | 5.3 | No | 15.11 | 1/4 | 10 | --- | --- | Yes | 1 | --- |
| 157. | 75 | B | M | 2.8 | 2.9 | Yes | 17.7 | 1/1 | D.O. | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | M.R. |
| 158. | 83 | W | F | 5.8 | 2.9 | Yes | 14.11 | 3/5 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 1 | L.D. |

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudicated Status[1] | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 159. | 91 | W | M | 8.3 | 6.1 | No | 15.10 | 2/6 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 160. | 105 | W | M | 12.8 | 6.5 | Yes | 16.3 | 1/1 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 161. | 107 | W | F | 9.3 | 5.7 | Yes | 14.8 | 1/2 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 162. | 63 | W | M | 2.8 | 4.4 | Yes | 17.5 | 3/5 | 12 | Yes | --- | --- | 2 | M.R. |
| 163. | 95 | W | F | 11.6 | 6.5 | Yes | 14.6 | 2 of 3 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 164. | 84 | W | M | 2.8 | 3.4 | Yes | 15.4 | 1/5 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | L.D. |
| 165. | 80 | W | M | 4.4 | 4.4 | Yes | 15.7 | 5/5 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 166. | 80 | B | M | 2.8 | 2.3 | Yes | 17.5 | 4/5 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | --- |
| 167. | 95 | W | M | 8.5 | 4.4 | Yes | 17.2 | 2/4 | 9 | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 168. | 110 | W | M | 12.0 | 4.9 | Yes | 15.4 | 1/1 | D.O. | --- | Yes | --- | 2-3 | --- |
| 169. | 84 | B | M | 2.6 | 4.4 | Yes | 15.10 | 8/10 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 2-3 | --- |
| 170. | 95 | W | M | 5.6 | 4.9 | No | 17.10 | 3/5 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 3 | --- |
| 171. | 89 | W | M | 9.1 | 6.3 | Yes | 15.8 | 2/5 | 9 | Yes | --- | Yes | 3 | --- |
| 172. | 69 | W | M | 4.6 | 2.3 | Yes | 14.2 | 7/10 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | M.R. |
| 173. | 87 | B | M | 6.2 | 5.3 | No | 18.0 | 3/4 | 12 | --- | --- | Yes | 2 | --- |
| 174. | 94 | W | M | 9.9 | 5.3 | Yes | 16.4 | 2/3 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 175. | 98 | W | M | 14.4 | 13.6 | Yes | 15.10 | 3/4 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 176. | 92 | W | M | 5.6 | 5.3 | Yes | 16.4 | 2/3 | 11 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 177. | 100 | W | M | 4.2 | 6.7 | Yes | 16.7 | 1/4 | 10 | --- | --- | Yes | 1 | L.D. |

| Subjects | IQ | R | S | R | A | BH | C.A. | Siblings[2] | G | Prison | Drugs | Suspension | Adjudicated[1] Status | Learning Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 178. | 87 | O | F | 7.7 | 4.4 | Yes | 15.8 | 3/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | L.D. |
| 179. | 116 | W | M | 13.0 | 13.0 | Yes | 14.6 | 2/2 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 180. | 62 | B | M | 2.8 | 3.9 | No | 16.10 | 5/6 | 11 | Yes | Yes | --- | 3 | M.R. |
| 181. | 78 | W | F | 6.5 | 4.9 | No | 14.3 | 4/6 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 182. | 90 | B | M | 2.4 | 4.9 | Yes | 18.2 | 2/7 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 183. | 90 | W | M | 9.1 | 6.1 | Yes | 17.6 | 1/2 | D.O. | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 184. | 79 | W | M | 7.5 | 4.9 | Yes | 15.1 | 2/2 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 185. | 96 | W | M | 8.9 | 8.0 | Yes | 14.3 | 4/4 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 3 | --- |
| 186. | 110 | W | M | 12.0 | 7.1 | Yes | 16.11 | 2/2 | D.O. | --- | --- | Yes | 1 | --- |
| 187. | 72 | B | M | 1.7 | 1.5 | No | 15.9 | 1/5 | 10 | --- | --- | --- | 2 | M.R. |
| 188. | 87 | O | F | 5.0 | 4.4 | Yes | 15.10 | 3/4 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 189. | 112 | W | M | 12.6 | 6.7 | Yes | 14.6 | 2/3 | 9 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 190. | 77 | W | M | 5.0 | 3.9 | Yes | 16.11 | 1/4 | D.O. | Yes | --- | --- | 1 | M.R. |
| 191. | 51 | W | M | 3.0 | 1.0 | Yes | 14.3 | 8/8 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 2-3 | M.R. |
| 192. | 96 | W | M | 11.6 | 8.0 | Yes | 15.3 | 1/1 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 1-3 | --- |
| 193. | 85 | W | M | 5.4 | 5.7 | No | 13.7 | 4/5 | 7 | Yes | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 194. | 86 | B | M | 5.2 | 4.4 | Yes | 17.11 | 8/9 | 12 | Yes | --- | --- | 2 | --- |
| 195. | 97 | W | M | 7.7 | 6.5 | Yes | 17.3 | 3/3 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 196. | 92 | W | M | 11.3 | --- | Yes | 18.0 | 2/3 | D.O. | --- | --- | --- | 2-3 | --- |

| Subjects | IQ[1] | R[2] | S[3] | R[4] | A[5] | BH[6] | C.A.[7] | Siblings[8] | G[9] | Prison[10] | Drugs[11] | Suspension[12] | Adjudicated[13] Status | Learning[14] Problems |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 197. | 91 | W | F | 9.1 | 5.7 | No | 14.3 | 1/2 | 8 | --- | --- | --- | 1 | --- |
| 198. | 99 | W | M | 13.8 | 9.0 | Yes | 17.2 | 4/5 | 12 | --- | Yes | --- | 2 | --- |
| 199. | 94 | W | M | 5.8 | 5.7 | Yes | 14.7 | 2/2 | 9 | --- | --- | Yes | 1 | L.D. |
| 200. | 97 | W | M | 10.2 | 2.9 | Yes | 17.5 | 3/3 | D.O. | Yes | --- | Yes | 2 | --- |

1 = Intelligence Quotient

2 = Race

3 = Sex

4 = Reading Achievement Score (WRAT)

5 = Arithmetic Achievement Score (WRAT)

6 = Broken Homes

7 = Chronological Age

8 = Data presented in this column should be read as the first number representing birth order and the second number the total number of siblings in the family.

9 = Grade level attained in school (D.O. = Drop Out)

10 = Immediate family members incarcerated

11 = Drug intake immediately prior to committing the offense(s) for which the subjects were subsequently apprehended and adjudicated.

12 = A formal suspension from normal school activities

13 = Non-adult = 1; Crimes Against Persons = 2; Crimes Against Property = 3

14 = Categorical delineation of learning problems, i.e., MR = Mental Retardation; LD = Learning Disabilities

Appendix C

Contingency Table C-1 Associated with Table 2 in Text
Chi-square of independence on subjects from
broken homes and those subjects who
experienced drug intake prior to
committing the offense(s)

| | Drug Intake | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Count<br>Row Pct.<br>Col. Pct.<br>Tot. Pct. | Yes | No | Row Total |
| Broken | | | |
| Yes | 12<br>8.6<br>42.9<br>6.0 | 127<br>91.4<br>73.8<br>63.5 | 139<br>69.5 |
| No | 16<br>26.2<br>57.1<br>8.0 | 45<br>73.8<br>26.2<br>22.5 | 61<br>30.5 |
| Column Total | 28<br>14.0 | 172<br>86.0 | 200<br>100.0 |

Corrected chi square = 9.49024 w 1 degree of freedom
Significance = 0.0021

Contingency Table C-2 Associated with Table 5 in Text
Chi square of independence on race of
of subjects and grade level in school

Count
Row Pct.
Col. Pct.
Tot. Pct.

| | Dropout | Sixth | Seventh | Eighth | Ninth | Tenth | Eleventh | Twelfth | Graduate | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Race | | | | | | | | | | |
| Black | 15<br>32.6<br>24.2<br>7.5 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>2.2<br>5.6<br>0.5 | 6<br>13.0<br>13.6<br>3.0 | 7<br>15.2<br>21.2<br>3.5 | 6<br>13.0<br>30.0<br>3.0 | 9<br>19.6<br>56.3<br>4.5 | 2<br>4.3<br>66.7<br>1.0 | 46<br>23.0 |
| White | 43<br>29.9<br>69.4<br>21.5 | 1<br>0.7<br>50.0<br>0.5 | 1<br>1.4<br>100.0<br>1.0 | 16<br>11.1<br>88.9<br>8.0 | 36<br>25.0<br>81.8<br>18.0 | 25<br>17.4<br>75.8<br>12.5 | 13<br>9.0<br>65.0<br>6.5 | 7<br>4.9<br>43.8<br>3.5 | 1<br>0.7<br>33.3<br>0.5 | 144<br>72.0 |
| Other | 4<br>40.0<br>6.5<br>2.0 | 1<br>10.0<br>50.0<br>0.5 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 1<br>10.0<br>5.6<br>0.5 | 2<br>20.0<br>4.5<br>1.0 | 1<br>10.0<br>3.0<br>0.5 | 1<br>10.0<br>5.0<br>0.5 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 10<br>5.0 |
| Column Total | 62<br>31.0 | 2<br>1.0 | 2<br>1.0 | 18<br>9.0 | 44<br>22.0 | 33<br>16.5 | 20<br>10.0 | 16<br>8.0 | 3<br>1.5 | 200<br>100.0 |

Corrected chi square = 29.6756, 16df
Significance = .0198

When chronological age of the subjects was compared with (a) race, (b) sex, (c) drug intake, (d) grade level attained in school, (e) nonadult offenses, (f) crime against person offenses, and (g) crime against property offenses, the point bisereal was significant at the .01 level

Contingency Table C-3 Associated with Table 12 in Text
One way analysis of variance on arithmetic scores and crime against person offenses

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | DF | Mean Square | F | Significance of F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Main Effects | 41.984 | 1 | 41.984 | 5.821 | .017 |
| Persons | 41.984 | 1 | 41,984 | 5.821 | .017 |
| Explained | 41.984 | 1 | 41.984 | 5.821 | .017 |
| Residual | 1428.029 | 198 | 7.212 | | |
| TOTAL | 1470.012 | 199 | 7.387 | | |

The point bisereal was used to compare intelligence quotient and (a) race of subjects, (b) subjects from broken homes, (c) drug intake subjects, and (d) subjects with learning problems. Each was significant at the .01 level. The point bisereal was also used to compare reading scores with (a) race of subjects, and (b) subjects with learning problems; and arithmetic scores with (a) crime against person offenses and (b) subjects with learning problems. All were significant at the .01 level.

Contingency Table C-4 Associated
with Table 13 in Text
Chi square of independence on subjects with learning problems and those who experienced drug intake prior to committing the offense(s)

| Learning | Count / Row Pct. / Col. Pct. / Tot. Pct. | Drugs: Yes | Drugs: No | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MR | | 2<br>4.4<br>7.1<br>1.0 | 43<br>95.6<br>25.0<br>21.0 | 45<br>22.5 |
| LD | | 0<br>0.0<br>0.0<br>0.0 | 30<br>100.0<br>17.4<br>15.0 | 30<br>15.0 |
| Normal | | 26<br>20.8<br>92.9<br>13.0 | 99<br>79.2<br>57.6<br>49.5 | 125<br>62.5 |
| Column Total | | 28<br>14.0 | 172<br>86.0 | 200<br>100.0 |

Chi square = 13.09708 with 2 df
Significance = 0.0014