

72-12,586

PRESCOTT, Mary Ruth Ann, 1944-

A COMPARISON OF IDENTIFICATION IN DELINQUENTS  
AND NONDELINQUENTS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE  
FIGURE, THE COUNSELOR.

Iowa State University, Ph.D., 1971  
Education, guidance and counseling

Please Note: School lists name as Mary Ruth  
Holverson Prescott.

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

A comparison of identification in delinquents and  
nondelinquents and its relationship  
to the figure, the counselor

by

Mary Ruth Ann Prescott

A Dissertation Submitted to the  
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of  
The Requirements for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Subject: Education (Guidance and Counseling)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Area

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University  
Ames, Iowa

1971

**PLEASE NOTE:**

**Some pages have indistinct  
print. Filmed as received.**

**UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Objectives	4
Hypotheses	5
Definitions	8
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Identification	14
Delinquency and Identification	15
Identification with the Counselor	19
Counselor Sex Preference	23
METHOD OF PROCEDURE	26
Subjects	26
Instrumentation	28
Analysis of Data	30
FINDINGS	34
Introduction	34
Hypotheses and Tables--Jesness Inventory	34
Hypotheses and Tables--Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Test	49
DISCUSSION	85
Jesness Inventory Scores	85
Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Grid Identification Scores	90
Personal Constructs Attributed to the Ideal Counselor	95

	Page
Sex Preference for the Ideal Counselor	99
SUMMARY	101
Purpose	101
Procedure	101
Findings	102
Summary and Discussion	105
Recommendations and Implications for Further Study	106a
BIBLIOGRAPHY	107
APPENDIX A. DIRECTIONS AS GIVEN TO MALE AND FEMALE SUBJECTS	113
APPENDIX B. FIGURE DESCRIPTIONS AS GIVEN TO <u>MALE</u> SUBJECTS	116
APPENDIX C. FIGURE DESCRIPTIONS AS GIVEN TO FEMALE SUBJECTS	118
APPENDIX D. IMAGINARY FIGURE DESCRIPTIONS AS GIVEN TO ALL SUBJECTS	120

## INTRODUCTION

Most of the authors in the field of delinquency today emphasize the importance of not looking for a single explanatory concept for anti-social behavior. The view that delinquency is multi-determined, --the end result of many social, psychological, and physiological factors, --is accepted by this writer. This study, however, is not concerned with the manifold causes of crime nor theories of causation. Causes are of interest in as much as they are found to be related to lack of, or distortion in, the identification process.

In 1961, Lederman (38, pp. 16-17) wrote:

Although there is considerable overlap and interdependence, faulty identification is seen as leading to delinquency in three major ways: (1) disturbance in or absence of parental and authority identification, (2) the presence of anti-social identification, and (3) a basic inability to identify with anyone.

Clinicians and theorists have reported that many juvenile delinquents and adult criminals seem to have gaps or distortions in their conscience or super-ego, engendered by disturbances in the identification process. While some progress has been made in operationally defining the concept of identification and various techniques have been used in experiments concerning the process of identification itself, little research seems to have been done in validating the relationship between the process and delinquency

since Lederman's work in 1961.

Identification is defined as perceptual similarity between subject and model. The degree of similarity is best estimated by examining actual behavioral and attitudinal similarity or a subject's perception of such similarity. A person defines the self in terms of people he perceives as similar and dissimilar to himself and thus forms an identity.

This research is not concerned with the question of why a child becomes a delinquent or how he learns to identify. Rather, its basic aim is to validate the interrelationships between delinquency and identification as well as between identification and perception of the role or figure of the counselor. Differences between the identification of nondelinquent and delinquent teenagers will be investigated. All three aspects of disturbed identifications as they contribute to delinquency will be studied; i.e., lack of authority identification, identification with anti-social persons, and the basic loss of ability to identify.

The problem of the identification patterns of delinquents extends into their treatment. This study is concerned with differences in the constructs applied to the figure, counselor, with whom delinquents and non-delinquents identify as opposed to those with whom they

did not identify since the literature indicates that counselors with whom their clients identify tend to be rated as more effective (1, 41, 42, 43). Thus a study of patterns of delinquent and nondelinquent identifications may have implications for treatment.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the proposed study is twofold. First, differences between the identifications of nondelinquent and delinquent teenagers as well as the differences between the sexes in each group and between groups is examined. Second, the differences in the pattern of constructs used by delinquent and nondelinquent subjects is determined. The writer is particularly interested in the differences in constructs applied by delinquents and nondelinquents to the figure, counselor. Also, differences in constructs applied to the figure, counselor, with whom delinquents and nondelinquents identified, as opposed to those with whom they did not identify will be determined. Again, sex differences will be analyzed. The literature indicates that counselors with whom their clients identify have been found to be more effective. This is viewed as a factor sometimes overlooked. A study designed to determine identification patterns of delinquents and nondelinquents is of value to counselor educators, school counselors, as well as counselors, administrators, and personnel directors in correctional



settings as it is an attempt to make clearer the kind of person who can work most effectively in these various settings. More specifically, the traits with which delinquents and nondelinquents identify are used to build a picture of the counselor who can work most effectively with each group.

### Objectives

1. To determine if there are differences in the identification patterns of delinquents and nondelinquents as well as within and between sexes in the two samples of subjects.
2. To determine whether the constructs used by delinquents are in fact different from those used by non delinquents.
3. To determine characteristics assigned to counselors by delinquents and nondelinquents with which each group identifies.
4. To determine whether delinquents and nondelinquents differ on ability to identify with authority figures.
5. To compare delinquents and nondelinquents on tendency to identify with anti-social persons.
6. To compare delinquents and nondelinquents on basic inability to identify.

### Hypotheses

The null hypothesis is used as it provides a means of evaluation by an appropriate test of significance. The following null hypotheses are to be tested.

Hypothesis I: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents on Jesness Inventory scores.

I-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents on the A-Social Index scores.

I-B. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents on Social Maladjustment scores.

I-C. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Value Orientation scores.

I-D. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Immaturity scores.

I-E. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Autism scores.

I-F. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Alienation scores.

I-G. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Manifest Aggression scores.

I-H. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Withdrawal scores.

I-I. There is no significant difference between

delinquents and nondelinquents in Social Anxiety scores.

I-J. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Repression scores.

I-K. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Denial scores.

Hypothesis II: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in their identification with their parents and other authority figures.

II-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Av-Parent scores.

II-B. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ratio-Parent scores.

II-C. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Av-Authority scores.

II-D. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ratio-Authority scores.

Hypothesis III: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in feelings of parental rejection.

III-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Rejection scores.

Hypothesis IV: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in degree of anti-social identification and degree of socially-oriented identifications.

IV-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Del Id scores.

IV-B. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in D/ND scores.

IV-C. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Criminal Ideal scores.

IV-D. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ideal-D/ND scores.

Hypothesis V: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in their tendency to identify with people in general.

V-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Average Identification scores.

V-B. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Average Deviatonal Identification scores.

Hypothesis VI: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in their identification with the figure, the counselor.

VI-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Counselor-Ideal scores.

Hypothesis VII: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in similarity between ego ideal compared with parental and authority

figures.

VII-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ideal-vs-Parent scores.

VII-B. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ideal-vs-Authority scores.

Hypothesis VIII: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in the nature of their personal constructs.

Hypothesis IX: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in the nature of the personal constructs with which they identify in the counselor.

Hypothesis X: There is no significant difference between males and females in sex preference for the ideal counselor.

#### Definitions

1. Delinquents--Those individuals who had been adjudicated delinquent and were serving time in the Iowa Training School for Boys or the Nebraska Training School for Girls.

2. Nondelinquents--Those individuals judged by the principal or guidance counselor of Riverside High School not to possess anti-social characteristics.

Definitions 3 through 13 refer to the Jesness Inventory scores. Further information regarding the Jesness Inventory is presented on page 28.

3. A-Social Index--Asocialization refers to a generalized disposition to resolve problems of social and

personal adjustment in ways usually considered as indicative of disregard for social customs.

4. Social Maladjustment--This refers to attitudes associated with disturbed or inadequate socialization as defined by the degree to which an individual shares the attitudes of those who display an inability to meet the demands of their environment in socially approved ways.

5. Value Orientation--This refers to a tendency to share opinions and attitudes characteristic of people in lower socioeconomic classes.

6. Immaturity--This reflects an inclination to display attitudes and perceptions of self and others which are usual for persons of a younger age than the subject.

7. Autism--This refers to a tendency in thinking and perceiving to distort reality to one's personal desires or needs. This definition differs from Bettelheim's (6) concept of autism which is characterized by extreme withdrawal and emotional refrigeration.

8. Alienation--This measures the presence of estrangement and distrust in a person's attitudes toward others, especially toward those representing authority.

9. Manifest Aggression--This refers to an awareness of unpleasant feelings, especially of frustration and anger, a tendency to react readily with emotion on the part of the subject.

10. Withdrawal--This indicates a perceived lack of satisfaction with self and others and a tendency toward isolation from others.

11. Social Anxiety--This reflects a tendency toward perceived emotional discomfort associated with involvement in interpersonal relationships.

12. Repression--This refers to the exclusion from conscious awareness of feelings and emotions which the individual would be expected to experience, or his failure to label these emotions.

13. Denial--This indicates a reluctance to acknowledge unpleasant events or aspects of reality frequently encountered in daily living.

Definitions 14 through 27 refer to Role Construct Repertory Grid scores. Further information concerning this instrument begins on page 28.

14. Av-Parent--A measure of mean parental identification was obtained by taking the average of the raw identification scores with the mother and father figures on the rep test. This score is called Av-Parent.

15. Ratio-Parent--A mean of the 22 possible raw identification scores was accepted as an estimate of the subject's general ability to identify. By placing Av-Parent in ratio with this average identification score, i.e.,  $\text{Av-Parent} / \text{Average Total Identification}$ , a numerical estimate

of the subject's parental identification relative to his over-all identification level is achieved. This score is called Ratio-Parent.

16. Av-Authority--In addition to the Mother and Father figures, the figures given to the subject included "a strict teacher," "a person with authority over you," and "a policeman or probation officer". When the raw identification scores were averaged, the resulting number is an estimate of the amount of identification the subject has with authority figures in general. This is called Av-Authority.

17. Ratio-Authority--Av-Authority is placed in ratio with a subject's mean score, resulting in a numerical estimate of his identification with authority relative to his over-all ability to identify. This score is called Ratio-Authority.

18. Rejection Score--The total matches between parents and a person who does not like the subject in ratio to total matches between parents and a person who likes the subject is called the Rejection Score.

19. Delinquent Identity Score--This score is the mean identification of the subject with the delinquent figures in the protocol of Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Test.

20. D/ND--This score is obtained by placing the



subject's mean identification with delinquent peers in ratio to his mean identification with nondelinquent peers.

21. Criminal Ideal Score--The total number of check and blank matches between the Ideal Self and the Criminal Ideal estimates a subject's desire to possess the traits he has attributed to an anti-social model.

22. Ideal-D/ND Score--This score expresses the contribution made by anti-social peers to a subject's ego-ideal, relative to the contribution by nondelinquent peers. The larger the number, the more the subject wishes to be like delinquent peers rather than nondelinquent adolescents.

23. Average Identification Score--The mean of all 22 identification scores is considered to be an estimate of a subject's basic tendency to identify.

24. Average Deviational Identification Score--This score estimates a subject's ability to identify, without regard for the sign of the identification. Since 10 matches is the level of similarity that would occur by chance most often, any departure from 10 matches, whether positive or negative, is considered reflective of the degree of identification. There are 22 deviation scores each representing a subject's perceptual identification with one of the other 22 people in the protocol. If these 22 deviation scores are averaged, the resulting mean is an

estimate of the subject's over-all tendency to see himself as similar or dissimilar to other people, i.e., his general ability to identify. This score is thus called Average Deviational Identification.

25. Counselor-Ideal Score--The total number of check and blank matches between the Ideal Self and Counselor Ideal columns estimates a subject's desire to possess the traits he has attributed to this figure.

26. Ideal-vs-Parent Score--The number of matches between ideal self figures and the father was averaged with the number of matches between the ideal self figure and mother. The resulting score is a measure of the mean parental similarity with the subject's ego ideal.

27. Ideal-vs-Authority Score--By calculating the average number of matches between the ideal-self and each of the five authority figures (mother, father, teacher, authority, policeman) a score is obtained which is an estimate of the average perceived similarity between the subject's ideal and authority figures in general.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature is divided into three sections. The first section gives a review of the literature on identification and the relationship between delinquency and identification. The second investigates the effectiveness of counseling as it relates to counselor-client similarity as well as identification with the counselor. The third section includes the literature on counselor sex preference.

## Identification

The concept of identification was introduced by Freud (21, pp. 89-90) and in 1933 he wrote:

The role which the super ego undertakes in later life is at first played by an external power, by parental authority. The influence of the parent dominates the child by granting proofs of affection and by threats of punishment, which to the child mean loss of love, and which must be feared on their own account. The objective anxiety is the forerunner of the later moral anxiety; so long as the former is dominant, one need not speak of super-ego or conscience. It is only later that the secondary situation arises. . . the external restrictions are introjected, so that the super-ego takes the place of the parental functions and thence forward observes, guides, and threatens the ego in just the same way as the parents acted to the child before. . . The basis of the process is what has been called identification; that is to say, that one ego becomes like another, one which results in the first ego behaving itself in certain respects in the same way as the second; it imitates it, and as it were, takes it into itself. . .

The term identification has been generally accepted as referring to the individual's development of reaction patterns, attributes, values, and ideals similar to those

he perceives in his parents or whatever person he has taken for a model (54). That model may be very important for it is Alutto's (2) position that the various identifications of any individual are determining factors in his individuality as opposed to oppressive conformity, and normality as opposed to abnormality.

Edson's (17) study of identity from the standpoints of Sigmund Freud, Erik Erikson, Alfred Kroeber, and Paul Tillich notes that each man perceives identity as involving a highly complex interaction between the individual and society, involving affiliation needs and values. Individual interpretations by these men of the aforementioned terms differ greatly however and thus Edson emphasized the need for precise operational definitions in empirical studies of identification.

As stated in the Introduction, this study is interested in the relationship between faulty or disturbed identification and adolescent delinquency. Thus the literature regarding identification as it relates to delinquency will be sampled and reviewed.

#### Delinquency and Identification

According to Jenkins (29), the delinquent is a result of unsuccessful early parent-child relationships. Caplan (8, p. 124) states that the normal child

. . .sees the way his mother and father and siblings behave in regard to this, that, or the other situation; and he begins to copy them. He incorporates, takes into himself, and builds into the structure of his personality, ways of behavior which he sees in people around him whom he respects and loves.

The delinquent has however, a characteristic pattern of ego pathology resulting from some disruption in the identification process. Reiner and Kaufman (50) found in classifying cases in a juvenile research unit that the majority of delinquents' parents could be characterized as impulse-ridden character disorders. This finding ties in with Schulman's (53) belief that parents of delinquents frequently maintain emotional distance from their offspring thus making identification very difficult if not impossible. Jenkins (29) states that hostility and rejection by the parents are the most common reasons for disruption of the identification process and are thus major contributors to faulty socialization of youngsters.

Claiborne (12) found that mothers of delinquent boys were hostile, dominating, rejecting, less warm, and more negative toward their children while mothers of non-delinquent children did not possess these characteristics. Glueck and Glueck (24) found that only four out of every ten delinquents' fathers were found to evidence warmth, sympathy, and affection toward their sons as compared with eight in ten of the fathers of nondelinquents.

Duncan's (16) study of parental attitudes and interactions comparing delinquent females with normal adolescent girls using a revised form of the Stanford Parent Questionnaire found that parents of nondelinquent girls were different from the parents of delinquent girls in that the former group displayed a higher activity level, higher parental adjustment, less rejection, lower consistency of controls, and lower sex anxiety, but higher consistency of feelings toward themselves and their child.

In a study done by Venezia (59) on delinquency as a function of intra family relationships, delinquent boys were found to possess significantly less family information than the nondelinquent controls. This finding was interpreted as reflecting a lower degree of family involvement and identification.

Delinquent and nondelinquent adolescents were compared on degree of identification with parents and feelings of powerlessness in a study by Graff (25). Identification was defined as discrepancy between self-mother and self-father scores on the Dominance and Love scales of the Interpersonal Check List. The findings of this study indicates that those subjects who more closely identified with a parental figure, tended to perceive that parent as higher in nurturance; however there was no significant difference in the degree of identification with parents between delinquents and

nondelinquents.

Manning's (40) study of peer group and parental identification in delinquent boys using a semantic differential found no significant differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in identifications with father or in values. Use of the semantic differential was questioned with respect to its ability to tap so complex a process as identification.

Dietz (15) however, in a study comparing delinquent and nondelinquent males using a semantic differential developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (45), found that non-delinquents identify more closely with their parents than do delinquents. Iarrabee (36), also using a semantic differential, had similar findings.

Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray's (49) study of delinquent and nondelinquent boys using a questionnaire and interview technique found that isolation of self from delinquency in a high delinquency neighborhood is positively related to the strength of the nondelinquent self concept of the individual subject. Internalization, a part of the identification process, of nondelinquent values is credited by the authors with this finding.

Lederman (37, p. 86) using Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Grid in a study of difference in identification between delinquent and nondelinquent boys found that:

. . .delinquents tend to have (1) no feelings of identity with their parent and authority figures, (2) strong identifications with anti-social parents, peers, and sub-culturally-defined roles and ideals, and (3) generally low capacity or tendency to feel a kinship with anyone.

These studies and their findings are indication of the importance of the parent-child relationship and its impact on personality development. As Collins (13, p. 31) states:

. . .It is less seen, but not less important, that the child's first perception of himself (his identity) grows out of the quality of his mother's response to his expression of need.

In general, identification with parents is considered a positive attribute. Anna Freud (20, p. 193) summarizes this feeling.

Where normal emotional ties are missing, there is little incentive nor is it possible for the child to model himself on the pattern of the adult world that surrounds him. He fails to build up the identifications which should become the core of a strong and efficient super ego, act as a barrier against instinctual forces, and guide his behavior in accordance with social standards.

#### Identification with the Counselor

Adamek and Dager (1, p. 932) state that the social-psychological process of identification is an important factor in institutions of rehabilitation.

. . .personal identification signifies that type in which the model becomes a significant other to the identifier, who feels positive



affection and admiration for the model and takes on his norms and values. . . Effective socialization within the institution then, would be facilitated if an inmate personally identified with a staff member.

In a study of delinquent girls, Adamek and Dager (1) found that the degree to which individuals are changed by correctional institutions is related to the extent to which they identify with staff members, and with the institutional program.

Further examination of the social psychological literature indicates that interpersonal liking is accompanied by greater susceptibility to interpersonal influence (7, 27). Van der Veen (58) found that the therapist's behavior is a function both of the client and therapist. Likewise the client's behavior is a function of both the counselor and client.

Other studies do not relate to the correctional institution and delinquents directly, but considerable related research has been done on client-counselor personality or value similarity and its effect on the counseling relationship. This literature is presented and its implications discussed because of its relevance to the dimension of interpersonal liking and the effect it has on what transpires in a counseling relationship in any setting.

In a study of the relationship of counselor personality

and counselor-client personality similarity to counseling success, Bare (5), using the Gordon Personal Profile, the Gordon Personal Inventory, and the Edward Personal Preference Inventory found that there was agreement among counselors and clients that a counselor's effectiveness, including empathy and facilitation of a close relationship, was found highest when counselor characteristics included low achievement needs, low order needs, high vigor and high original thinking, and when counselors and clients were unlike on variables including vigor, original thinking, and responsibility.

In contrast however, a study of Tuma and Gustad (56) of the effects of client and counselor personality characteristics on client learning in counseling using the California Personality Inventory and the Self-Knowledge Inventory, found that close resemblance between clients and counselors on personality variables including dominance, social presence, and social participation resulted in relatively better client learning.

Gassner's (23) study of the relationship between patient-therapist compatibility and treatment using the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation scale found that high-compatibility matched clients had a significantly more favorable view of their counselor. However, no significant difference in amount of behavior change

between high and low compatibility clients was found.

Other studies such as those by Carson and Llewellyn (11) and Carson and Heine (10) which attempted to relate counselor-client similarity using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory found that counseling success varied significantly with the relationship being curvilinear. Cook (14), in a study of the influence of client-counselor value similarity also found a curvilinear relationship. A medium amount of value similarity was found to be associated with more positive change than high or low similarity. However, high therapist-counselee similarity was found to be associated with positive counseling outcomes in a study by Mendelsohn (42). Mendelsohn (41), in a later study using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, found that when counselor-client similarity is low, the duration of counseling is almost always short while it is of more variable length when high counselor-client similarity is present. In a later study, Mendelsohn and Geller (43, p. 214) concluded that though client-counselor similarity may facilitate communication,

. . .it may also encourage the exploration of personal or conflictual material before the client feels prepared to do so. Likewise, similarity may increase the attraction between client and counselor, but at the same time lead to an excessive involvement in the personal interaction and resulting neglect of the client's concrete objectives. . .similarity is a condition which can easily lead to ambivalence on the part of the client.

It is apparent that no single clear unifying pattern can be found among these studies. Cook (14) along with Carson and Llewellyn (11) as well as Carson and Heine (10) conclude that a medium degree of counselor-client similarity is associated with greater success than is either strong similarity or dissimilarity. Tuma and Gustad (56) found that on some variables, personality similarity may be a positively contributing factor to a good counseling relationship and subsequent therapeutic change on the part of the client. Mendelsohn and Geller (41, 42, 43) had similar findings while Gassner's (23) study found no differences in counseling effectiveness. Bare (5) however, found counselor-client dissimilarity on some characteristics to be more closely related to an effective counseling relationship.

Since counseling can be conceptualized as a form of interpersonal influence, particularly in a correctional setting as described by Adamek and Dager (1), a study of the nature of personality characteristics delinquents as compared to nondelinquents ascribe to their ideal counselor and to what extent they identify with these characteristics is one subject of the present study.

#### Counselor Sex Preference

Koile and Bird (35) conducted a study using the Mooney Problem Check List to determine whether male and female

college students indicated a preference regarding sex of counselor for different kinds of problems. The findings of this study were that both male and female students preferred a counselor of their own sex on more problems than they preferred someone of the opposite sex. The proportion of problems on which female students would consult a male counselor however was considerably larger than the proportion on which male students would prefer a female counselor.

In a study done by Fuller (22) it was found that self-referred male clients at a university counseling center expressed a preference for a male counselor significantly more often than female students on both personal and vocational problems. Existence of a sex preference was related to the nature of the problem, with personal problems leading to more frequent expression of a sex preference. A change in counselor preference was found more frequently among both male and female clients who initially indicated preference for female counselors.

The sex factor in model reinforcement counseling was investigated by Thoresen, Krumboltz, and Varenhorst (55) in a study in which the effectiveness of male and female counselors presenting male and female counselors and students on audio-tapes to high school students was tested. It was found that male students responded best when males

were in all roles and female students responded best when a male counselor presented either an all female or all male model type.

Gustafson (26) conducted a study to investigate the effects of counselee parental identification and sex role expectation on the preference for male and female counselors. It was found that attitudes toward the concepts, male counselor and female counselor, were not determinants of counselor sex preference. A significant change was found in counselee pre to post sex preference among those who did not receive a counselor of their preferred sex. Receiving or not receiving a counselor of preferred sex did not affect the counselor evaluation by counselee.

Thus the literature indicates that there is usually a preference for a counselor of the counselee's sex though females do not have the degree of preference for female counselors that males have for male counselors. Males tend to be more rigid in adhering to preference for male counselors than females are for female counselors. No explanation for possible reasons for counselor sex preference by counselees was made in these studies. However, Gustafson (26) found that parental identification and attitude toward male and female counselors did not prove to be a significant factor in preference for a male or female counselor.

## METHOD OF PROCEDURE

## Subjects

The sample for this study consisted of 190 teenagers selected at random from each of four populations. Those chosen were administered the Jesness Inventory (30) and an adaptation of Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Test (33, 34). Because of the complexity of the latter instrument, only those subjects who were at least thirteen years of age and had an IQ of 85 or higher were selected.

Delinquent males

Fifty subjects were secured at the Iowa Training School for Boys in Eldora, Iowa and were administered the two instruments between October 26 and November 4, 1970. This is a state institution to which teenage boys who have been adjudicated delinquent are sent for the purpose of rehabilitation. The average length of stay is approximately five months.

Delinquent females

Forty-five subjects were obtained at the Nebraska Training School for Girls in Geneva, Nebraska. Only 45 of the girls at the Training School met the intelligence criteria and thus the smaller number of females included as subjects. These subjects were tested between November 7 and 12, 1970. This is a state institution to which girls

who have been adjudicated delinquent are sent for rehabilitation. The average length of stay is approximately one year.

#### Nondelinquent males and females

Ninety-five control subjects were secured at Riverside Junior-Senior High School in Sioux City, Iowa and were administered the Jesness and Repertory Grid between December 8 and 18, 1970. Subjects meeting the intelligence criteria were selected through perusal of their academic files. These names were then screened by the principal and/or guidance counselor with the request that they choose subjects who, to their knowledge, did not demonstrate delinquent behavior or attitudes. The Jesness Inventory was then administered to those selected in order to determine whether the Riverside students did in fact possess attitudes different from those of the delinquent subjects tested.

#### Matching

In order to approximately equate the socio-economic level of the delinquent and nondelinquent subject, control subjects were chosen from a school in a neighborhood with high delinquency rates compared to the other areas of Sioux City. The Riverside neighborhood reflects low to low-middle living standards, when surveyed by the writer using Warner's (60) classification system with regard to dwellings in



the area. Since both groups, delinquent and nondelinquent came from similar surroundings, it was assumed that their socio-economic levels were approximately equivalent.

### Instrumentation

#### The Jesness Inventory

The Jesness Inventory (30, p. 3) is an instrument designed for use in the classification of disturbed children and adolescents.

The Jesness Inventory consists of 155 true-false items, designed to measure the reactions of young people to a wide range of content. A first objective was to include items that would distinguish disturbed or delinquent children from others; a second objective was to include items covering a variety of attitudes and sentiments about self and others in order to provide the basis for a personality typology meaningful for use with children and adolescents. . . .

The Jesness provides scores on 11 personality characteristics. The scores are named and defined in numbers 3 through 13 of the definitions.

#### The Role Construct Repertory Test

Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Test (33, 34) is an instrument designed for eliciting personal constructs and for measuring perceptual similarity. Its purpose for the latter use has been validated by Jones (31), Lederman (37, 38), and Morse (44). Without cognizance of what he is producing, a subject produces a protocol from which can be derived his perceived identifications (similarity

between the self and important others as the subject see it) in terms of what Kelly (33, p. 105) calls "personal constructs".

A construct is a way in which some things are construed as being alike and yet different from others.

Constructs thus are unique dimensions along which a subject views significant others and his relationships with them.

The procedures for the Role Construct Repertory Test differs from most experiments on perceived similarity in that the subject does not fill out a test once for himself and once as he thinks the hypothesized model would, but instead rates both himself and the model in terms of personal constructs; i.e., personality dimensions significant to him. This procedure produces measures of identification with individuals, classes of people, and even with hypothetical ideals.

The instructions and form of the Role Construct Repertory Test administered to subjects in this study are found in the Appendices. The procedure used in this instrument elicits 20 dichotomous personality traits, interest, attitudes, values, etc. that are of significance to the individual subject. The terms evoked are those the subject actually uses in thinking about and describing people. Each subject thus goes through the process of indicating on which end of his personal constructs

(SIMILARITY or CONTRAST) each of the 20 real and 3 hypothetical people falls. The more frequently the "self" and another person are determined by the subject to have the same trait or attitude (to fall on the same end of the personality dimension or construct), the greater is the degree of similarity perceived by the subject between himself and that person. Thus the measure of identification is obtained from this degree of perceived similarity.

The Role Construct Repertory Test provides scores on 14 identification variables. These scores are named and defined in numbers 14 through 27 of the definitions.

#### Analysis of Data

The statistical analysis for Hypothesis I, the Jesness Inventory scores, was a multiple classification analysis of variance for unequal frequencies with the following model:

$$Y_{m,ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + (\alpha\beta)_{ij} + e_{ijk}.$$

$Y_1$  = Age

$Y_2$  = Intelligence

$Y_3$  = A-Social Index scores

$Y_4$  = Social Maladjustment scores

$Y_5$  = Value Orientation scores

$Y_6$  = Immaturity scores

$Y_7$  = Autism scores

$Y_8$  = Alienation scores  
 $Y_9$  = Manifest Aggression scores  
 $Y_{10}$  = Withdrawal scores  
 $Y_{11}$  = Social Anxiety scores  
 $Y_{12}$  = Regression scores  
 $Y_{13}$  = Denial scores

$\alpha$  = sex of subject

$\beta$  = delinquency or nondelinquency of subject

$i$  = 1, 2

$j$  = 1, 2

$k$  = 1, 2, ...,  $n_{ij}$  where  $n_{ij}$  = 50, 50, 45, 45

The statistical analysis used for Hypotheses II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII, the Role Construct Repertory Test scores, was a multiple classification analysis of variance for unequal cell frequencies with the following model:

$$Y_{m,ijk} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + (\alpha\beta)_{ij} + e_{ijk}.$$

$Y_1$  = Av-Parent scores

$Y_2$  = Ratio-Parent scores

$Y_3$  = Av-Authority scores

$Y_4$  = Ratio-Authority scores

$Y_5$  = Rejection scores

$Y_6$  = D/DN scores

- $Y_7$  = Criminal Ideal scores  
 $Y_8$  = Ideal-D/ND scores  
 $Y_9$  = Average Identification scores  
 $Y_{10}$  = Average Deviational Identification scores  
 $Y_{11}$  = Counselor-Ideal scores  
 $Y_{12}$  = Ideal-vs-Parent scores  
 $Y_{13}$  = Ideal-vs-Authority scores  
 $\alpha$  = sex of subject  
 $\delta$  = delinquency or nondelinquency of subject  
 $i$  = 1, 2  
 $j$  = 1, 2  
 $k$  = 1, 2, 3, ...,  $n_{ij}$  where  $n_{ij}$  = 50, 50, 45, 45

Scheffé's (18) test for differences was used for making a posteriori comparisons of means.

For Hypothesis IX, the APTERYX program for factor analysis was used. Discussion of the model and its assumption is found in Hemmerle (28). Each of the 190 subject's twenty by twenty grids was individually factor analyzed. Constructs listed by subjects on the original data collection grid form were then sorted into categories indicated by the factor loadings. These categories were then named by what were determined by two independent judges to be the dominant themes of the constructs in

that factor. The five factors for each subject were then sorted into the categories established in this way.

The computer program used to solve the multiple classification analysis of variance for unequal n's was a multiple linear regression program used at the Iowa State University Statistical Laboratory. Because of unequal cell size the Sums of Squares in the analysis of variance tables do not equal the Total Sum of Squares.

## FINDINGS

## Introduction

Scores from the Jesness Inventory have been detailed first followed by data on the Role Construct Repertory Test. Each hypothesis is first stated in general form. Some of the concepts studied in the Role Construct Repertory Test may be operationally defined in several ways, and each of these definitions results in a slightly different Role Construct Repertory Test score. A brief description of the derivation of the Role Construct Repertory Test scores is included. The subhypotheses are thus stated separately followed by an operational statement of the hypothesis and results.

## Hypotheses and Tables--Jesness Inventory

Hypothesis I: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents on Jesness Inventory scores.

I-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents on the A-Social Index score.

Hypothesis I-A was rejected. The data on Table 1 reports an F value of 95.76 for delinquency or non-delinquency of subjects as a main effect in analysis of variance for A-Social Index scores which is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean A-Social Index score for delinquents was 67.05 (S.D. = 13.59) while the mean for

Table 1. Analysis of variance for A-Social Index scores<sup>a</sup>

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	140.31	140.31	.93	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	14388.94	14388.94	95.76**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	144.88	144.88	.96	> .05
Error	186	27949.00	150.26		
Total	189	42511.00			

<sup>a</sup>The reader is cautioned that the Sums of Squares in all analysis of variance tables do not equal the Total Sum of Squares because of unequal cell size.

\*\* .01 level of significance.

of subject nor the interaction between sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject approached the .05 level of significance.

The means and standard deviations by sex and delinquency versus nondelinquency are found in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. Means and standard deviations for each of the four groups of subjects, i.e., nondelinquent males, delinquent males, nondelinquent females, delinquent females, are found in Table 4.

I-B. There is no significant difference between



Table 2. Means and standard deviations on Jesness scores by delinquency versus nondelinquency

	<u>Nondelinquents</u>		<u>Delinquents</u>	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Social Maladjustment	50.54	9.14	65.49	10.29
Value Orientation	47.92	9.42	55.40	10.01
Immaturity	52.45	9.04	51.06	9.42
Autism	50.67	8.32	56.71	9.25
Alienation	46.85	10.03	52.94	11.07
Manifest Aggression	49.78	10.09	54.65	12.23
Withdrawal	52.41	9.38	56.06	8.24
Social Anxiety	53.08	9.06	51.44	9.99
Repression	50.73	10.11	47.99	9.60
Denial	49.94	11.86	44.45	9.94
A-Social Index	49.72	10.60	67.05	13.59

delinquents and nondelinquents on Social Maladjustment scores.

Hypothesis I-B was rejected. The data on Table 5 reports an F value of 114.05 for delinquency or non-delinquency of subjects in an analysis of variance for Social Maladjustment scores which is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean Social Maladjustment score for delinquents was 65.49 (S.D. = 10.29) while the mean for

Table 3. Means and standard deviations on Jesness scores by sex

	<u>Male subjects</u>		<u>Female subjects</u>	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Social Maladjustment	59.12	12.02	56.79	12.43
Value Orientation	52.57	10.07	50.64	10.69
Immaturity	51.77	9.13	51.74	9.40
Autism	53.76	8.99	53.61	9.61
Alienation	51.31	11.43	48.32	10.26
Manifest Aggression	52.29	10.98	52.13	12.00
Withdrawal	54.34	10.27	54.12	7.38
Social Anxiety	52.04	9.72	52.51	9.41
Repression	48.84	10.73	49.93	8.97
Denial	47.15	10.86	47.24	11.74
A-Social Index	59.20	15.76	57.48	13.95

nondelinquents was 50.54 (S.D. = 9.14). Neither the sex of subject nor the interaction between sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject approach the .05 level of significance.

I-C. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents on Value Orientation scores.

Table 4. Means and standard deviations on Jesness scores

	Riverside males nondelinquent	
	Mean	Standard deviation
Social Maladjustment	52.62	9.25
Value Orientation	50.30	9.20
Immaturity	52.88	8.56
Autism	51.80	8.31
Alienation	50.06	9.84
Manifest Aggression	51.82	11.07
Withdrawal	52.30	10.39
Social Anxiety	51.74	9.29
Repression	49.38	10.90
Denial	48.40	11.11
A-Social Index	51.36	11.85

Iowa Training School male delinquents		Riverside females nondelinquent		Nebraska Training School female delinquents	
Standard		Standard		Standard	
Mean	deviation	Mean	deviation	Mean	deviation
65.62	10.91	48.22	8.42	65.36	9.56
54.84	10.39	45.27	8.94	56.02	9.53
50.66	9.53	51.98	9.53	51.51	9.27
55.72	9.22	49.42	8.15	57.80	9.13
52.56	12.71	43.71	8.99	53.36	8.89
52.76	10.87	47.51	8.31	56.76	13.28
56.38	9.73	52.53	8.11	55.71	6.17
52.34	10.12	54.58	8.56	50.44	9.76
48.30	10.53	52.22	8.92	47.64	8.42
45.90	10.45	51.64	12.43	42.84	9.06
67.04	15.29	47.89	8.66	67.07	11.42

Table 5. Analysis of variance for Social Maladjustment scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	257.31	257.31	2.72	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	10752.88	10752.88	114.05**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	202.31	202.31	2.15	> .05
Error	186	17537.94	94.28		
Total	189	28625.00			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

Hypothesis I-C was rejected. The data on Table 6 reports an F value of 29.76 for delinquency or non-delinquency of subjects in an analysis of variance for Value Orientation scores which is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean Value Orientation score for delinquents was 55.40 (S.D. = 10.01) while the mean for non-delinquents was 47.92 (S.D. = 9.42). The sex of subject as a main effect was not significant. However, the interaction between sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject was significant at the .05 level ( $F_{1,186} = 4.91$ ).

Table 6. Analysis of variance for Value Orientation scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	175.56	175.56	1.88	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	2770.50	2770.50	29.76**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	457.50	457.50	4.91*	< .05
Error	186	17313.25	93.08		
Total	189	20606.81			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

\* .05 level of significance.

I-D. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Immaturity scores.

Hypothesis I-D could not be rejected. Table 7 represents an analysis of variance for Immaturity scores by sex of subject, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject, and the interaction between these two main effects. All of the values failed to reach the .05 level of significance.

I-E. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Autism scores.

Hypothesis I-E was rejected. The data on Table 8 shows an F value of 23.06 for delinquency or nondelinquency

Table 7. Analysis of variance for Immaturity scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	0.06	0.06	.0007	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	85.50	85.50	.98	> .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	36.44	36.44	.42	> .05
Error	186	16150.94	86.83		
Total	189	16278.94			

of subjects as a main effect in analysis of variance for Autism scores. This value is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean Autism score for delinquents was 56.71 (S.D. = 9.25) while the mean for nondelinquents was 50.67 (S.D. = 8.32). Neither the sex of subject nor the interaction of the two main effects approach the .01 level of significance.

I-F. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Alienation scores.

Hypothesis I-F was rejected. Table 9 represents an analysis of variance for Alienation scores. For the main

Table 8. Analysis of variance for Autism scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	1.06	1.06	.01	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	1790.94	1790.94	23.06**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	235.31	235.31	3.03	> .05
Error	186	14444.38	77.66		
Total	189	16408.69			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

effect, sex of subject, an F value of 3.91 which is significant at the .05 level was reached. The mean Alienation score for male subject was 51.31 (S.D. = 11.43) while the mean for female subjects was 48.32 (S.D. = 10.26).

For the main effect, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject, an F value of 17.29 which is significant beyond the .01 level was obtained. The mean Alienation score for delinquents was 52.94 (S.D. = 11.07) while the mean for nondelinquents was 46.85 (S.D. = 10.03).

The interaction between the two main effects was



Table 9. Analysis of variance for Alienation scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	422.88	422.88	3.91*	< .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	1870.13	1870.13	17.29**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	678.06	678.06	6.27*	< .05
Error	186	20110.81	108.12		
Total	189	22969.94			

\*\*.01 level of significance.

\*.05 level of significance.

significant beyond the .05 level ( $F_{1,86} = 6.27$ ).

I-G. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Manifest Aggression scores.

Hypothesis I-G was rejected. The data on Table 10 represents an analysis of variance for Manifest Aggression scores which shows an F value of 9.89 for the main effect, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject, which is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean Manifest Aggression score for delinquents was 54.65 (S.D. = 12.23) while the mean for nondelinquents was 49.78 (S.D. = 10.09).

Table 10. Analysis of variance for Manifest Aggression Scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	1.00	1.00	.008	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	1228.25	1228.25	9.89**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	816.63	816.63	6.58*	< .05
Error	186	23078.44	124.07		
Total	189	25024.19			

\*\*.01 level of significance.

\*.05 level of significance.

The other main effect, sex of subject, was not significant. However, the interaction of the two main effects was significant beyond the .05 level ( $F_{1,186} = 6.58$ ).

I-H. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Withdrawal scores.

Hypothesis I-H was rejected. The data on Table 11 reports an F value of 7.82 for the main effect, delinquency or nondelinquency of subjects in analysis of variance for Withdrawal which is significant beyond the

Table 11. Analysis of variance for Withdrawal scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	2.19	2.19	.027	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	623.75	623.75	7.82**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	9.63	9.63	.12	> .05
Error	186	14807.00	79.61		
Total	189	15452.38			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

.01 level. The mean Withdrawal score for delinquents was 56.06 (S.D. = 8.24) while the mean for nondelinquents was 52.41 (S.D. = 9.38). Neither the sex of subject nor the interaction of the two main effects approached the .05 level of significance.

I-I. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Social Anxiety scores.

Hypothesis I-I could not be rejected. Table 12 represents an analysis of variance for Social Anxiety scores by sex of subject, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject and the interaction between these two main

Table 12. Analysis of variance for Social Anxiety scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	10.44	10.44	.11	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	147.81	147.81	1.61	> .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	265.31	265.31	2.99	> .05
Error	186	17021.13	91.51		
Total	189	17424.88			

effects. All of the F values failed to reach the .05 level of significance.

I-J. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Repression scores.

Hypothesis I-J could not be rejected. Table 13 represents an analysis of variance for Repression scores by sex of subject, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject and the interaction of these two main effects. All of the F values failed to reach the .05 level of significance though the F value for delinquency or non-delinquency of subject approached that.

I-K. There is no significant difference between

Table 13. Analysis of variance for Repression scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	56.50	56.50	.57	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	379.06	379.06	3.85	> .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	144.88	144.88	1.47	> .05
Error	186	18254.69	98.36		
Total	189	18811.69			

delinquents and nondelinquents in Denial scores.

Hypothesis I-K was rejected. The data on Table 14 reports an F value of 12.62 for delinquency or non-delinquency of subjects as a main effect in analysis of variance for Denial. This F value is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean Denial score for delinquents was 44.45 (S.D. = 9.94) and for nondelinquents, 49.94 (S.D. = 11.86). The F value for the main effect, sex of subject, did not approach a significance. However, the interaction of the two main effects resulted in an F value of 3.92 which is significant at the .05 level.

Table 14. Analysis of variance for Denial scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	0.31	0.31	.002	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	1512.13	1512.13	12.62**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	470.00	470.00	3.92*	< .05
Error	186	22280.94	119.79		
Total	189	24179.81			

\*\*.01 level of significance.

\*.05 level of significance.

#### Hypotheses and Tables--Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Test

Hypothesis II: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in their identification with their parents and other authority figures.

II-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Av-Parent scores.

A measure of mean parental identification was obtained by computing the average of the raw identification scores with the father and mother figures. This is called the Av-Parent score.

Hypothesis II-A was rejected. The data on Table 15 reports an F value of 13.29 for delinquency or nondelinquency of subjects as a main effect in an analysis of variance for Av-Parent scores which is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean Av-Parent score for delinquents was 11.22 (S.D. = 3.27) while the mean for nondelinquents was 13.02 (S.D. = 3.63). Neither the sex of subject nor the interaction between sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject approached the .05 level of significance.

The means by sex and by delinquency versus nondelinquency are found in Tables 16 and 17 respectively. Means for each of the four groups of subjects, i.e., nondelinquent males, delinquent males, nondelinquent females, and delinquent females, are found in Table 18.

II-B. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ratio-Parent scores.

The Ratio-Parent score is derived by placing the Av-Parent score in ratio with the Average Identification score which is the mean of the 22 possible raw identification scores. This is a numerical indicator of a subject's parental identification as compared to his over-all identification level.

Hypothesis II-B was rejected. Table 19 reports an F value of 9.73 for delinquency or nondelinquency of subject.

Table 15. Analysis of variance for Av-Parent scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	0.01	0.01	0.001	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	160.56	160.56	13.29**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	21.97	21.97	1.82	> .05
Error	186	2247.29	12.08		
Total	189	2424.09			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

This is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean Ratio-Parent score for delinquents was 0.94 (S.D. = 0.22) while the mean for nondelinquents was 1.04 (S.D. = 0.24).

Neither the sex of subject nor the interaction between sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject approached the .05 level of significance.

II-C. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Av-Authority scores.

In the figure description, five authority figures are included: mother, father, a strict teacher, a person with authority over you, and a policeman or probation officer.



Table 16. Means and standard deviations on Role Construct Repertory Test scores by sex

	Males		Females	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Av-Parent	12.11	3.40	12.13	3.75
Ratio-Parent	0.99	0.22	0.99	0.25
Av-Authority	11.20	2.58	11.39	3.04
Ratio-Authority	0.92	0.15	0.93	0.18
Rejection	0.70	0.29	0.89	1.12
Delinquent Identity	11.94	3.21	12.06	3.55
D/ND	0.97	0.34	1.14	0.77
Criminal-Ideal	7.54	4.73	6.06	4.81
Ideal-D/ND	0.89	0.36	1.10	1.49
Av-Identity	12.11	1.65	12.16	1.67
Average Deviatonal Identity	2.18	1.72	2.18	1.81
Counselor-Ideal	16.35	2.76	16.66	2.98
Ideal-vs -Parent	13.35	3.01	13.43	3.90
Ideal-vs-Authority	11.86	2.01	12.11	2.30

Table 17. Means and standard deviations on Role Construct Repertory Test scores by delinquency versus nondelinquency of subject

	Delinquents		Nondelinquents	
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
Av-Parent	11.22	3.27	13.02	3.63
Ratio-Parent	0.94	0.22	1.04	0.24
Av-Authority	10.61	2.48	11.96	2.96
Ratio-Authority	0.89	0.16	0.96	0.16
Rejection	0.85	0.60	0.73	0.96
Delinquent Identity	12.89	2.92	11.10	3.57
D/ND	1.19	0.68	0.90	0.44
Criminal-Ideal	8.00	5.13	5.67	4.19
Ideal-D/ND	1.11	1.12	0.86	0.98
Av-Identity	11.85	1.65	12.42	1.62
Average Deviatonal Identity	0.91	3.59	2.01	4.38
Counselor-Ideal	16.23	2.98	16.76	2.73
Ideal-vs-Parent	12.93	3.40	13.84	3.46
Ideal-vs-Authority	11.75	2.07	12.21	2.22

Table 18. Means and standard deviations of Role Construct  
Repertory Test scores

	Male nondelinquents	
	Mean	Standard deviation
Av-Parent	12.69	3.62
Ratio-Parent	1.03	0.23
Av-Authority	11.48	2.73
Ratio-Authority	0.93	0.16
Rejection	0.65	0.27
Delinquent Identity	11.34	3.17
D/ND	0.89	0.32
Criminal-Ideal	6.66	4.48
Ideal-D/ND	0.83	0.33
Av-Identity	12.26	1.58
Average Deviatonal Identity	2.32	1.64
Counselor-Ideal	16.08	3.02
Ideal-vs-Parent	13.57	3.26
Ideal-vs-Authority	11.92	2.22

Male delinquents		Female nondelinquents		Female delinquents	
Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
11.53	3.06	13.39	3.61	10.87	3.46
0.96	0.19	1.06	0.24	0.92	0.25
10.92	2.39	12.50	3.11	10.28	2.53
0.91	0.15	0.98	0.17	0.87	0.16
0.74	0.30	0.81	1.37	0.96	0.79
12.54	3.15	10.84	3.95	13.28	2.59
1.05	0.33	0.92	0.53	1.35	0.89
8.42	4.80	4.58	3.54	7.53	5.43
0.95	0.38	0.91	1.38	1.30	1.56
11.97	1.71	12.60	1.65	11.72	1.57
2.03	1.78	2.66	1.80	1.71	1.69
16.62	2.44	17.51	2.13	15.80	3.43
13.13	2.73	14.14	3.65	12.71	4.01
11.80	1.78	12.53	2.17	11.69	2.35

Table 19. Analysis of variance for Ratio-Parent scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	0.0006	0.0006	0.012	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	0.51	0.51	9.73**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	0.06	0.06	1.06	> .05
Error	186	9.82	0.05		
Total	189	10.37			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

The average of the raw identification scores for these five figures results in a numerical estimate of a subject's degree of identification with authority figures in general. This score is called Av-Authority.

Hypothesis II-C was rejected. The data on Table 20 reports an F value of 12.34 for delinquency or nondelinquency of subjects as a main effect in an analysis of variance of Av-Authority which is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean Av-Authority score for delinquents was 10.61 (S.D. = 2.48) while the mean for nondelinquents was 11.96 (S.D. = 2.96). The sex of subject as a main

Table 20. Analysis of variance for Av-Authority scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	1.72	1.72	0.23	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	91.67	91.67	12.34**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	32.72	32.72	4.40*	< .05
Error	186	1382.07	7.43		
Total	189	1502.74			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

\* .05 level of significance.

effect was not significant. However, the interaction between sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject was significant at the .05 level ( $F_{1,86} = 4.40$ ).

A Scheffé test of means found that the difference between male delinquents ( $\bar{X} = 10.92$ ) and female non-delinquents ( $\bar{X} = 12.50$ ) as well as between female non-delinquents ( $\bar{X} = 12.50$ ) and female delinquents ( $\bar{X} = 10.28$ ) was significant at the .05 level ( $F_{3,86} = 5.41$ ).

II-D. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ratio-Authority scores.

The Ratio-Authority score is derived in a manner similar to Ratio-Parent. That is, Av-Authority is placed in a ratio with the subject's mean identification scores, resulting in a numerical indication of his identification with authority relative to his general over-all ability to identify.

Hypothesis II-D was rejected. Table 21 reports an F value of 8.24 for delinquency or nondelinquency of subject as a main effect in an analysis of variance for Ratio-Authority scores. This value is significant at the .01 level. The mean Ratio-Authority score for delinquents was 0.89 (S.D. = 0.16) while the mean for nondelinquents was 0.96 (S.D. = 0.16). Neither the sex of subject nor the interaction between sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject was significant.

Hypothesis III: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in feelings of parental rejection.

III-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Rejection scores.

The Rejection score is computed as a ratio of total matches between parents and a person who does not like the subject to total matches between parents and a person who likes the subject.

Hypothesis III-A could not be rejected. Table 22

Table 21. Analysis of variance for Ratio-Authority scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	0.002	0.002	0.08	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	0.21	0.21	8.24**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	0.10	0.10	3.87	> .05
Error	186	4.78	0.03		
Total	189	5.08			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

represents an analysis of variance for Rejection scores by sex of subject, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject and the interaction between these two main effects. All three of the F values failed to reach the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis IV: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in degree of anti-social identifications and degree of socially-oriented identifications.

IV-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Delinquent Identity scores.



Table 22. Analysis of variance for Rejection scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	1.77	1.77	2.72	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	0.71	0.71	1.10	> .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	0.04	0.04	0.06	> .05
Error	186	120.66	0.65		
Total	189	123.15			

The Delinquent Identity score is a numerical estimate of a subject's identification with the three delinquent peers included in the figure descriptions.

Hypothesis V-A was rejected. Table 23 represents an analysis of variance for Delinquent Identity scores and reports an F value of 14.67 for the main effect delinquency or nondelinquency of subject which is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean Delinquent Identity score for delinquents is 12.89 (S.D. = 2.92) while the mean for non-delinquents was 11.10 (S.D. = 3.57). Neither the sex of subject nor the interaction between sex of subject and

Table 23. Analysis of variance for Delinquent Identity scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	0.67	0.67	0.06	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	157.72	157.72	14.67**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	18.19	18.19	1.69	> .05
Error	186	1999.28	10.75		
Total	189	2170.69			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

delinquency or nondelinquency of subject was significant.

IV-B. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in D/ND scores.

D/ND scores were obtained by computation of a ratio of the mean antisocial-peer identification scores to the mean nondelinquent peer scores. Thus a measure of a subject's identification with delinquent peers relative to his identification with nondelinquent peers was obtained.

Hypothesis IV-B was rejected. Table 24 presents an analysis of variance for D/ND scores. For the main effect, sex of subject, an F value of 4.03 which is significant at

Table 24. Analysis of variance for D/ND scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	1.29	1.29	4.03*	< .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	4.13	4.13	12.88**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	0.88	0.88	2.75	> .05
Error	186	59.59	0.32		
Total	189	65.70			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

\* .05 level of significance.

the .05 level was reached. The mean D/ND score for male subjects was 0.97 (S.D. = 0.34) while the mean for female subjects was 1.14 (S.D. = 0.77).

For the main effect, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject, an F value of 12.88 which is significant beyond the .01 level was obtained. The mean D/ND score for delinquents was 1.19 (S.D. = 0.68) while the mean for nondelinquents was 0.90 (S.D. = 0.44). The interaction between the two main effects was not significant.

IV-C. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Criminal Ideal scores.

A numerical estimate for the Criminal Ideal score is obtained by computing the total number of check and blank matches between the Ideal Self and the Criminal Ideal. This estimates a subject's desire to possess the traits he has attributed to an anti-social model.

Hypothesis IV-C was rejected. Table 25 indicates that for the main effect, sex of subject, an F value of 4.80 was obtained. This is significant at the .05 level. The mean Criminal Ideal score for males was 7.54 (S.D. = 4.73) and for females, 6.06 (S.D. = 4.81).

For the main effect, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject, an F value of 12.11 was obtained. This is significant beyond the .01 level. The mean for delinquents was 8.00 (S.D. = 5.13) and for nondelinquents it was 5.67 (S.D. = 4.19). The interaction between these two main effects was not significant.

IV-D. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ideal-D/ND.

Ideal-D/ND is an indication of the contributions made by delinquent or anti-social peers to a subject's ego-ideal as compared to that contribution made by non-delinquent peers. The larger the number, the more the subject prefers to be like delinquent peers as opposed to nondelinquent peers. Thus, this score is computed in a manner similar to the D/ND score except that the ideal

Table 25. Analysis of variance for Criminal Ideal scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	104.38	104.38	4.80*	< .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	263.33	263.33	12.11**	< .01
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	16.93	16.93	0.78	> .05
Error	186	4043.58	21.74		
Total	189	4421.94			

\*.05 level of significance.

\*\*.01 level of significance.

self figure is substituted for actual self.

Hypothesis IV-D could not be rejected. Table 26 presents an analysis of variance for Ideal-D/ND scores by sex of subject, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject and the interaction between these two main effects. All three of the F values failed to reach the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis V: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in their tendency to identify with people in general.

Table 26. Analysis of variance for Ideal-D/ND scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	2.18	2.18	1.94	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	3.05	3.05	2.72	> .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	0.87	0.87	0.78	> .05
Error	186	208.59	1.12		
Total	189	214.53			

V-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Average Identification.

The Average Identification score is the over-all mean of all 22 identification scores.

Hypothesis V-A was rejected. The data on Table 27 reports an F value of 5.96 for delinquency or nondelinquency of subject in an analysis of variance for Average Identification scores. This value is significant at the .05 level. The mean Average Identification score for delinquents was 11.85 (S.D. = 1.65) while the mean for nondelinquents was 12.42 (S.D. = 1.62). Neither the sex of subject nor the interaction between the two main effects

Table 27. Analysis of variance for Average Identification scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	0.13	0.13	0.46	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	16.13	16.13	5.96*	< .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	4.18	4.18	1.55	> .05
Error	186	503.63	2.71		
Total	189	523.27			

\*.05 level of significance.

approached the .05 level of significance.

V-B. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Average Deviational Identification scores.

The Average Deviational Identification score gives a numerical indication of a subject's ability to identify, without regard for the sign of identification. Ten matches is the level of similarity that could occur by chance. Thus any variation from ten matches whether positive or negative is considered reflective of the degree of identification. The score is computed by averaging these

22 deviation scores. This results in an estimate of a subject's over-all ability to see himself as similar or dissimilar to others.

Hypothesis V-B was rejected. Table 28 presents an analysis of variance for Average Deviational Identification scores with an F value of 6.00 for delinquency or non-delinquency of subjects as a main effect. This value is significant beyond the .05 level. The mean Average Deviational Identification score for delinquents was 0.91 (S.D. = 3.59) while the mean for nondelinquents was 2.01 (S.D. = 4.38). Neither the sex of subject nor the interaction of the two main effects approached the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis VI: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in their identification with the figure, the counselor.

VI-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Counselor-Ideal scores.

The Counselor-Ideal score gives a numerical estimate of a subject's desire to possess the traits he has attributed to the figure, the ideal counselor. It was obtained by computing the total number of check and blank matches between the Ideal Self and the Counselor Ideal.

Hypothesis VI-A was rejected. Table 29 reports an analysis of variance for Counselor-Ideal score with an F



Table 28. Analysis of variance for Average Deviatonal Identification scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	.003	.003	.0008	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	18.30	18.30	6.00*	< .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	5.32	5.32	1.75	> .05
Error	186	566.82	3.05		
Total	189	589.46			

\*.05 level of significance.

value of 7.51 as the interaction effect between sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject. This value is significant beyond the .01 level. A Scheffé test of differences among the means for the four groups of subjects found that the differences between female nondelinquents ( $\bar{X} = 17.51$ ) and female delinquents ( $\bar{X} = 15.80$ ) was significant at the .05 level ( $F_{3,186} = 3.24$ ). Neither of the main effects, sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject reached the .05 level of significance.

Table 29. Analysis of variance for Counselor Ideal scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	4.42	4.42	0.55	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	16.24	16.24	2.03	> .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	60.01	60.01	7.51**	< .01
Error	186	1485.90	7.99		
Total	189	1563.49			

\*\* .01 level of significance.

Hypothesis VII: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in similarity between ego ideal compared with parental and authority figures.

VII-A. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ideal-vs-Parent scores.

The Ideal-vs-Parent score gives a numerical indication of the mean parental similarity with the subject's ego ideal.

Hypothesis VII-A could not be rejected. Table 30 presents an analysis of variance for Ideal-vs-Parent scores

Table 30. Analysis of variance for Ideal-vs-Parent scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	0.29	0.29	0.02	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	41.56	41.56	3.47	> .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	11.68	11.69	0.98	> .05
Error	186	2225.97	11.97		
Total	189	2277.32			

by sex of subject, delinquency or nondelinquency of subject, and the interaction between these two main effects. All of the F values failed to reach the .05 level of significance although the F value for delinquency or nondelinquency of subject approached that.

VII-B. There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ideal-vs-Authority scores.

The Ideal-vs-Authority score is a composite obtained by computing the average number of matches between the ideal-self and each of the five authority figures. This score is an indication of the average perceived similarity

between the subject's ideal and authority figures.

Hypothesis VII-B could not be rejected. Table 31 represents an analysis for Ideal-vs-Authority scores by the two main effects and their interaction, sex of subject and delinquency or nondelinquency of subject. All of the F values failed to reach the .05 level of significance.

Hypothesis VIII: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in the nature of their personal constructs.

Hypothesis VIII was rejected. The nature of the personal constructs of delinquents as compared to non-

Table 31. Analysis of variance for Ideal-vs-Authority scores

Sources	df	SS	MS	F	P
Sex of subject	1	2.99	2.99	0.64	> .05
Delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	11.20	11.20	2.41	> .05
Sex of subject x delinquency or nondelinquency of subject	1	6.08	6.08	1.31	> .05
Error	186	864.87	4.65		
Total	189	884.32			

delinquents is shown in Table 32. Examination of this table revealed a relationship between delinquency or nondelinquency of subject and the nature of a subject's personal constructs.

The nature of personal constructs of male subjects as compared to female subjects is shown in Table 33. Examination of this data revealed a relationship between sex of subject and the nature of the subject's personal constructs.

Table 34 shows a breakdown of personal constructs for each of the four groups of subjects, i.e., delinquent males, nondelinquent males, delinquent females, nondelinquent females.

Hypothesis IX: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in the nature of the personal constructs with which they identify in the counselor.

The results of this hypothesis are shown in Table 35 which indicates the percentage of subjects in each of the four groups, i.e., delinquent males, nondelinquent males, delinquent females, nondelinquent females, that attribute one or the other of the polar opposites or dichotomies of the 26 constructs to the figure, the ideal counselor.

Statistical analysis of differences among subject regarding constructs attributed to the ideal counselor was contaminated by the results of the preceding hypothesis,

Table 32. Personal constructs categorized by delinquency or nondelinquency of subject

	Delinquents	Non delinquents	Total
SMART--DUMB	29	29	58
FRIENDLY NATURE--NOT FRIENDLY NATURE	70	66	136
HAVE BEEN IN TROUBLE--HAVEN'T BEEN IN TROUBLE	51	36	87
UNDERSTANDING--NOT UNDERSTANDING	53	60	113
LOUD, OUTGOING--QUIET, RESERVED	27	27	54
THINK THE SAME--THINK DIFFERENTLY	25	24	49
AUTHORITY--NOT AUTHORITY	26	18	44
STRICT--LENIENT	22	29	51
DRINK--DON'T DRINK	17	10	27
CLOSE TO ME--NOT CLOSE TO ME	22	12	34
HARD WORKING--LAZY	16	11	27
LIKE DRUGS--HATE DRUGS	13	0	13
NICE--NOT NICE	18	22	40
WORK FOR A LIVING--DON'T WORK FOR A LIVING	9	3	12
GOOD APPEARANCE--POOR APPEARANCE	14	15	29
LIKE MUSIC--DON'T LIKE MUSIC	4	2	6
LEADER--FOLLOWER	4	8	12
MATURE--IMMATURE	6	3	9

Table 32. (Continued)

	Delinquents	Non delinquents	Total
TRUSTING--NONTRUSTING	6	5	11
RELIGIOUS--NOT RELIGIOUS	3	4	7
EASY TO GET ALONG WITH--NOT EASY TO GET ALONG WITH	8	28	36
FUN TO BE WITH--NOT FUN	5	23	28
PRO SPORTS AND CARS--NOT INTERESTED IN SPORTS AND CARS	0	20	20
NERVOUS--NOT NERVOUS	1	6	7
CARE FOR ME--DON'T CARE ABOUT ME	18	14	32
JAZZY, HIP--HONKY, SQUARE	8	0	8
Total	475	475	950

Table 33. Personal constructs categorized by sex of subject

	Males	Females	Total
SMART--DUMB	35	23	58
FRIENDLY NATURE--NOT FRIENDLY NATURE	71	65	136
HAVE BEEN IN TROUBLE--HAVEN'T BEEN IN TROUBLE	52	35	87
UNDERSTANDING--NOT UNDERSTANDING	53	60	113
LOUD, OUTGOING--QUIET, RESERVED	31	23	54
THINK THE SAME--THINK DIFFERENTLY	30	19	49
AUTHORITY--NOT AUTHORITY	27	17	44
STRICT--LENIENT	30	21	51
DRINK--DON'T DRINK	17	10	27
CLOSE TO ME--NOT CLOSE TO ME	19	15	34
HARD WORKING--LAZY	15	12	27
LIKE DRUGS--HATE DRUGS	7	6	13
NICE--NOT NICE	23	17	40
WORK FOR A LIVING--DON'T WORK FOR A LIVING	6	6	12
GOOD APPEARANCE--POOR APPEARANCE	16	13	29
LIKE MUSIC--DON'T LIKE MUSIC	6	0	6
LEADER--FOLLOWER	7	5	12
MATURE--IMMATURE	5	4	9



Table 33. (Continued)

	Males	Females	Total
TRUSTING--NONTRUSTING	3	8	11
RELIGIOUS--NOT RELIGIOUS	3	4	7
EASY TO GET ALONG WITH--NOT EASY TO GET ALONG WITH	18	18	36
FUN TO BE WITH--NOT FUN	5	23	28
PRO SPORTS AND CARS--NOT INTERESTED IN SPORTS AND CARS	19	1	20
NERVOUS--NOT NERVOUS	2	5	7
CARE FOR ME--DON'T CARE ABOUT ME	0	32	32
JAZZY, HIP--HONKY, SQUARE	0	8	8
Total	500	450	950

Table 34. Personal constructs used by each group of subjects

	Delinquent males	Non- delinquent males	Delinquent females	Non- delinquent females
SMART--DUMB	22	13	7	16
FRIENDLY NATURE--NOT FRIENDLY NATURE	41	30	29	36
HAVE BEEN IN TROUBLE--HAVEN'T BEEN IN TROUBLE	29	23	22	13
UNDERSTANDING--NOT UNDERSTANDING	26	27	27	33
LOUD, OUTGOING--QUIET, RESERVED	17	14	10	13
THINK THE SAME--THINK DIFFERENTLY	16	14	9	10
AUTHORITY--NOT AUTHORITY	15	12	11	6
STRICT--LENIENT	13	17	9	12
DRINK--DON'T DRINK	10	7	7	3
CLOSE TO ME--NOT CLOSE TO ME	14	5	8	7
HARD WORKING--LAZY	10	5	6	6
LIKE DRUGS--HATE DRUGS	7	0	6	0
NICE--NOT NICE	6	17	12	5
WORK FOR A LIVING--DON'T WORK FOR A LIVING	5	1	4	2

Table 34. (Continued)

	Delinquent males	Non- delinquent males	Delinquent females	Non- delinquent females
GOOD APPEARANCE--POOR APPEARANCE	6	10	8	5
LIKE MUSIC--DON'T LIKE MUSIC	4	2	0	0
LEADER--FOLLOWER	3	4	1	4
MATURE--IMMATURE	3	2	3	1
TRUSTING--NONTRUSTING	2	1	4	4
RELIGIOUS--NOT RELIGIOUS	1	2	2	2
EASY TO GET ALONG WITH--NOT EASY TO GET ALONG WITH	0	18	8	10
FUN TO BE WITH--NOT FUN	0	5	5	18
PRO SPORTS AND CARS--NOT INTERESTED IN SPORTS AND CARS	0	19	0	1
NERVOUS--NOT NERVOUS	0	2	1	4
CARE FOR ME--DON'T CARE ABOUT ME	0	0	18	14
JAZZY, HIP--HONKY, SQUARE	0	0	8	0
Total	250	250	225	225

Table 35. Number and percentage of subjects who attribute these dimensions of the constructs to the figure, the ideal counselor

	Delinquent males	Non- delinquent males	Delinquent females	Non- delinquent females
SMART	21 = 42%	10 = 20%	7 = 15.56%	16 = 35.56%
FRIENDLY	37 = 74%	30 = 60%	25 = 55.56%	35 = 77.78%
IN TROUBLE	2 = 4%	1 = 2%	4 = 8.89%	3 = 6.67%
UNDERSTANDING	26 = 52%	24 = 48%	27 = 60.00%	33 = 73.33%
LOUD, OUTGOING	11 = 22%	8 = 16%	5 = 11.11%	5 = 11.11%
THINK THE SAME	12 = 24%	7 = 14%	9 = 20.00%	7 = 15.56%
AUTHORITY	6 = 12%	5 = 10%	10 = 22.22%	1 = 2.22%
STRICT	6 = 12%	9 = 18%	4 = 8.89%	5 = 11.11%
DRINK	3 = 6%	0 = 0%	1 = 2.22%	0 = 0%
CLOSE TO ME	11 = 22%	5 = 10%	8 = 17.78%	6 = 13.33%
HARD WORKING	9 = 18%	3 = 6%	6 = 13.33%	6 = 13.33%
LIKE DRUGS	2 = 4%	0 = 0%	2 = 4.44%	0 = 0%
NICE	6 = 12%	16 = 32%	12 = 26.67%	5 = 11.11%
WORK FOR A LIVING	5 = 10%	0 = 0%	4 = 8.89%	2 = 4.44%

GOOD APPEARANCE	5 = 10%	9 = 18%	6 = 13.33%	5 = 11.11%
LIKE MUSIC	3 = 6%	1 = 2%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
LEADER	2 = 4%	4 = 8%	1 = 2.22%	4 = 8.89%
MATURE	3 = 6%	2 = 4%	3 = 6.67%	1 = 2.22%
TRUSTING	2 = 4%	1 = 2%	3 = 6.67%	4 = 8.89%
RELIGIOUS	1 = 2%	0 = 0%	1 = 2.22%	2 = 4.44%
EASY TO GET ALONG WITH	0 = 0%	15 = 30%	8 = 17.78%	10 = 22.22%
FUN TO BE WITH	0 = 0%	5 = 10%	3 = 6.67%	14 = 31.11%
PRO SPORTS	0 = 0%	12 = 24%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
NERVOUS	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	1 = 2.22%
CARE FOR ME	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	17 = 37.78%	14 = 31.11%
JAZZY, HIP	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	5 = 11.11%	0 = 0%
Total	173	167	171	179

---

Table 35. (Continued)

	Delinquent males	Non- delinquent males	Delinquent females	Non- delinquent females
DUMB	1 = 2%	3 = 6%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
NOT FRIENDLY	4 = 8%	0 = 0%	4 = 8.89%	1 = 2.22%
HAVEN'T BEEN IN TROUBLE	27 = 54%	22 = 44%	18 = 40.00%	10 = 22.22%
NOT UNDERSTANDING	0 = 0%	3 = 6%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
QUIET, RESERVED	6 = 12%	6 = 12%	5 = 11.11%	8 = 17.78%
THINK DIFFERENTLY	4 = 8%	7 = 14%	0 = 0%	3 = 6.67%
NOT AUTHORITY	9 = 18%	7 = 14%	1 = 2.22%	5 = 11.11%
LENIENT	7 = 14%	8 = 16%	5 = 11.11%	7 = 15.56%
DON'T DRINK	7 = 14%	7 = 14%	6 = 13.33%	3 = 6.67%
NOT CLOSE TO ME	3 = 6%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	1 = 2.22%
LAZY	1 = 2%	2 = 4%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
HATE DRUGS	5 = 10%	0 = 0%	4 = 8.89%	0 = 0%
NOT NICE	0 = 0%	1 = 2%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
DON'T WORK FOR LIVING	0 = 0%	1 = 2%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%

POOR APPEARANCE	1 = 2%	1 = 2%	2 = 4.44%	0 = 0%
DON'T LIKE MUSIC	1 = 2%	1 = 2%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
FOLLOWER	1 = 2%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
IMMATURE	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
NONTRUSTING	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	1 = 2.22%	0 = 0%
NOT RELIGIOUS	0 = 0%	2 = 4%	1 = 2.22%	0 = 0%
NOT EASY TO GET ALONG WITH	0 = 0%	3 = 6%	0 = 0%	0 = 0%
NOT FUN	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	2 = 4.44%	4 = 8.89%
NOT INTERESTED IN SPORTS	0 = 0%	7 = 14%	0 = 0%	1 = 2.22%
NOT NERVOUS	0 = 0%	2 = 4%	1 = 2.22%	3 = 6.67%
DON'T CARE FOR ME	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	1 = 2.22%	0 = 0%
HONKY, SQUARE	0 = 0%	0 = 0%	3 = 6.67%	0 = 0%
	77	83	54	46

number VIII in which highly significant differences between delinquents and nondelinquents as well as males and females, was found. Thus the findings for hypothesis IX are to be discussed in terms of the percentage of subjects who attributed each pole of the 26 constructs to the figure, the ideal counselor.

Hypothesis X: There is no significant difference between males and females in sex preference for the ideal counselor.

Hypothesis X was rejected. A chi square test for ideal counselor sex preference is shown in Table 36. This test indicates a significant relationship between the sex of subject and his preference for a male or female counselor: 82% of delinquent male subjects and 64% of nondelinquent male subjects indicated a preference for a male counselor, while 71.11% of delinquent females and 62.22% of nondelinquent females indicated a preference for a female counselor.



Table 36. Chi square test of preference by subjects for male or female counselors

	<u>Preferred male counselor</u>			<u>Preferred female counselor</u>			Total
	Observed	Expected	Per-centage	Observed	Expected	Per-centage	
Delinquent males	41	27.11	82%	9	22.89	18%	50
Nondelinquent males	32	27.11	64%	18	22.89	36%	50
Delinquent females	13	24.39	28.89%	32	20.61	71.11%	45
Nondelinquent females	17	24.39	37.78%	28	20.61	62.22%	45
Total	103			87			190
$\chi^2 = 33.97$ , significant beyond .01 level							

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the differences between delinquents and nondelinquents with regard to patterns of identification and to determine what constructs delinquents and nondelinquents attribute to the figure, the ideal counselor. The discussion is organized in four sections: 1) differences in attitudes between delinquents and nondelinquents as measured by the Jesness Inventory, 2) differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in identification patterns as measured by the Role Construct Repertory Grid, 3) differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in personal constructs attributed to the figure, the ideal counselor, and 4) differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in preference for a male or female counselor.

## Jesness Inventory Scores

Hypothesis I dealt with attitudinal differences between delinquents and nondelinquents as assessed by the Jesness Inventory. The Asocialization Index is the Jesness score which is almost closely related to and predictive of delinquency. Table 1 reported an analysis of variance for A-Social Index scores in which the F value ( $F_{1,186} = 95.76$ ) was significant beyond the .01 level. This score is a summary score for the Inventory

and measures tendency to disregard social customs and rules when resolving problems. There were highly significant differences between the samples of delinquents and nondelinquents in the anticipated direction. Thus, the samples were indeed different from each other and were reflective of attitudes attributable to delinquents and nondelinquents respectively.

Analysis of variance of the ten other Jesness scores resulted in significant differences between delinquents and nondelinquents for seven for these scores: 1) Social Maladjustment, 2) Value Orientation, 3) Autism, 4) Alienation, 5) Manifest Aggression, 6) Withdrawal, and 7) Denial. The mean scores for delinquents were higher in all cases with the exception of the Denial score as is shown in Table 2.

The difference in Social Maladjustment scores is interpreted by Jesness (30) as indicating the delinquent tends toward a negative self-concept, distrust of authority, feeling misunderstood, and blaming others for his problems though he often maintains an unrealistic, overly generous evaluation of his parents. The delinquent is also sensitive to criticism which suggests lack of ego strength. Uneven development of conscience can be inferred from the fact that much behavior which is generally regarded as anti-social is considered acceptable

to the delinquent according to Jesness.

The difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in Value Orientation scores as shown in Tables 2 and 6 indicates that the delinquents tend to have values similar to those of lower-class culture including the gang orientation, interest in trouble, luck and thrill motifs, and the desire for early adulthood.

Jesness (30, p. 12) states that the individual who scores high on the Autism scale

. . . sees himself as self-sufficient, smart, good-looking, and tough, while at the same time he expresses concern about 'hearing things,' feels there is something wrong with his mind, likes to daydream, prefers to be alone, is fearful, and expresses many somatic complaints. The picture is that of a most inappropriate facade of self-adequacy covering a very insecure person.

Delinquents were found significantly higher in presence of autistic thinking than nondelinquents as shown in Tables 2 and 8.

Delinquent subjects were found to be significantly higher (Tables 2 and 9) on the Alienation scale than were nondelinquents. Thus delinquents were more critical, skeptical, and hostile toward others, particularly those in authority whom they generally tend to perceive as domineering, unfair, and not to be trusted. One high on the Alienation scale tends to project many of his own feelings to others.

The differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in Manifest Aggression scores as shown in Tables 2 and 10 indicate that the high scorers, the delinquents, are more aware of their own unpleasant feelings, particularly anger, and experience discomfort regarding their presence and control.

Delinquents were found to have higher Withdrawal scores than nondelinquents as shown in Tables 2 and 11. High Withdrawal scores are reflective of a tendency to resolve a personal dissatisfaction with self and others by passive escape or isolation. Jesness (30, p. 14) states:

The individual who scores high perceives himself as depressed, dissatisfied with himself, sad, misunderstood; although preferring to be alone, he feels lonesome.

As shown in Table 2, delinquents had lower Denial scores than nondelinquents. Nondelinquents, the high scorers, tend to see their parents as without fault and admit to no conflict with them. They also tend to deny personal inadequacy as well as unhappiness and frequently are unwilling to criticize others. Low scores indicate the existence of family conflict and a willingness to admit this and other problems.

No differences between delinquents and nondelinquents were found for these three Jesness scores: 1) Immaturity, 2) Social Anxiety, and 3) Repression. The Immaturity scores indicate that both the delinquent and nondelinquent

subjects tend to share attitudes and perceptions that would be usual and accepted for someone of a younger age. They are both naive and lack insight.

As shown in Table 12, the Social Anxiety scores for delinquents and nondelinquents were not significantly different. Both groups tend to experience some emotional discomfort associated with interpersonal relationships.

Repression scores, as shown in Tables 2 and 13, were not significantly different for delinquents and nondelinquents. Both groups tend to exclude from awareness feelings such as anger, rebellion or dislike and are generally uncritical of self and others.

That there were no significant differences between delinquents and nondelinquents on these three scores, Immaturity, Social Anxiety, and Repression, may have some implications for counselors working with delinquents. Perhaps adolescents in general are immature, socially anxious in relationships, and repressive of some feelings. If this is the case, delinquents should not be treated as though they were different from their adolescent peers in these regards. Many adolescents may lack insight as well as the perceptiveness to assess their own and others' motivations accurately and may experience nervous tension and self-consciousness in interpersonal relationships.

Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Grid  
Identification Scores

Hypotheses II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII dealt with differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in patterns of identification as measured by Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Grid. Fourteen separate identification scores were computed and significant differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in degree of identification were found for nine of these scores: 1) Av-Parent, 2) Ratio-Parent, 3) Av-Authority, 4) Ratio-Authority, 5) Delinquent Identity, 6) D/ND, 7) Criminal Ideal, 8) Average Identification, and 9) Average Deviatonal Identification. For five of the identification scores, no significant differences between delinquents and nondelinquents were found: 1) Rejection, 2) Ideal-D/ND, 3) Counselor-Ideal, 4) Ideal-vs-Parent, and 5) Ideal-vs-Authority.

Hypothesis II dealt with differences in identification with parents and authority figures using the Av-Parent, Ratio-Parent, Av-Authority, and Ratio-Authority scores. Nondelinquents had significantly higher identification score means than delinquents for all four scores as shown in Table 17. The Jesness Alienation scores support this finding in regard to authority figures. The finding that nondelinquents tend to identify more strongly with parents and authority figures is also in agreement with

the results of earlier studies by Lederman (37), Dietz (15), and Larrabee (36).

Hypothesis III tested differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in feelings of parental rejection. The larger number denotes a great degree of parental rejection. Inspection of Table 17 shows that delinquents experience a greater degree of feelings of parental rejection. However, as shown in Table 22, the differences between delinquents and nondelinquents were not significant. Nevertheless, the direction of these differences is in agreement with the findings of studies by Claiborne (12) and Glueck and Glueck (24).

Hypothesis IV dealt with differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in degree of anti-social identification as compared to socially-oriented identification. Inspection of the means shown on Table 17 indicates that delinquents had a higher degree of anti-social identification as measured by the Delinquent Identity score, the D/ND score, and the Criminal Ideal score. With these means in mind, the F values on Tables 23, 24, and 25 indicate that the delinquent subjects had significantly higher anti-social identifications than the nondelinquents. Though delinquent subjects had a higher mean Ideal-D/ND score, indicating a stronger preference than nondelinquent subjects to be like



delinquent peers, no significant difference was found. The preference to be like delinquent peers was low for both groups.

Hypothesis V dealt with differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in tendency to identify with people in general. The means for the Av-Identification and Average Deviation Identification score as shown in Table 17 are higher for nondelinquents indicating a stronger inclination to identify with people in general than delinquents. Examination of the F values on Tables 27 and 28 indicate significant differences.

Hypothesis VI dealt with differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in their identification with the ideal counselor. Though no significant differences between delinquents and nondelinquents were found, inspection of the means on Table 17 indicate there was a very high degree of identification for both delinquents and nondelinquents between the ideal self and the ideal counselor. Both groups of subjects scored 16+ out of a possible identification score of 20. This finding indicates that both delinquent and nondelinquent subjects would like a counselor very similar to their ideal self. These findings are different from those of Cook (14), Carson and Llewellyn (11), Carson and Heine (10), Bare (5), and Gassner (23) but do not refute them as the personality

characteristics involved are not the same.

Hypothesis VII was concerned with differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in similarity between the ideal self as compared with parental and authority figures. Though no significant differences were found, the means for Ideal-vs-Parent and Ideal-vs-Authority scores as shown in Table 17 were higher for nondelinquents than delinquents indicating a higher degree of similarity between the ideal self of nondelinquents as compared to parental and authority figures.

The generally positive results found for the identification hypotheses are interpreted as indication that identification is a valuable concept in the study of delinquency as has been indicated by Stokes (54), Alutto (2), Jenkins (29), Reiner and Kaufman (50), and Schulman (53). Lack of parental and authority identifications found in delinquents have been utilized as a rationale in understanding the absence of a strong socially-oriented conscience. When one does not identify with a person, there is no feeling of closeness with or accountability to that person and thus the delinquent, lacking internal controls follows the dictates of his anti-social impulses and aggresses against society.

Absence of identification is considered a predisposing factor in delinquency. Lack of identification with other

models leads to identification with delinquent peers and criminal or anti-social ideals which in turn produce an anti-social conscience that approves delinquent acts. Delinquent peers become a group to which the individual belongs and certain behaviors are required for continued membership. Thus the delinquent subculture perpetuates itself.

Those one perceives himself as similar to determine his identification. If an individual identifies with delinquent peers and their ideals, his self concept is composed of delinquent attributes. If his models are normal adults and peers who handle themselves in more socially acceptable ways, the individual develops a more socially constructive and positive self concept. Kelly (33, 34) the author of this test, theorizes that all behavior is designed to validate the hypotheses that one holds about himself. A person with a delinquent self concept will act in ways to validate his own hypotheses about himself. Likewise, an individual with a nondelinquent self concept will behave in ways to validate the hypotheses he has about himself. This theory is supported by the findings of a study by Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray (49) in which isolation of self from delinquency in a high delinquency neighborhood was found to be positively related to the strength of the nondelinquent self concept

of the individual subject.

Identification appears to be a useful concept in the study of delinquency. Discussion of its meaning with regard to treatment is included in the section regarding identification with the ideal counselor.

#### Personal Constructs Attributed to the Ideal Counselor

In discussing the findings regarding differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in the nature of their personal constructs and in the constructs attributed to the figure, the ideal counselor, the reader is cautioned that each subject originally listed 20 constructs on the Role Construct Repertory Grid protocol and that these 20 constructs were factor analyzed so that each subject's constructs became five factors. Five factors for each subject were compiled and their frequency counts are reported for each subject on the 26 two-dimensional constructs. This data are found in Tables 32, 33, 34, and 35. Each subject did not rate the ideal counselor on each pole of the 26 constructs derived from the factor analysis. This clarifies the percentage sizes presented in Table 35.

Hypothesis VIII dealt with differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in the nature of their personal constructs. Inspection of Table 32 indicates that delinquents have a tendency to use the following constructs more than nondelinquents: 1) have been in

trouble--haven't been in trouble, 2) authority--not authority, 3) close to me--not close to me, 4) like drugs--hate drugs, 5) jazzy, hip--honky, square. Nondelinquents, however, tend to use the following constructs more than delinquents: 1) easy to get along with--not easy to get along with, 2) fun to be with--not fun to be with, and 3) pro sports and cars--not interested in sports and cars.

Significant differences between males and females in the nature of personal constructs were also found. Inspection of Table 33 indicates that males tend to use the following constructs more than females: 1) smart--dumb, 2) have been in trouble--haven't been in trouble, 3) think the same--think differently, 4) authority--not authority, 5) strict--lenient, and 6) pro sports and cars--not interested in sports and cars. Females however, tend to use the following constructs more than males: 1) fun to be with--not fun, 2) care for me--don't care about me, and 3) jazzy, hip--honky, square.

Hypothesis IX dealt with differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in the nature of personal constructs they attribute to the figure, the ideal counselor. Inspection of Table 35 indicates that there are nine poles of the 26 constructs which are consistently attributed to the figure, the ideal counselor, by each of the four groups of subjects. These are: 1) smart,

2) friendly, 3) haven't been in trouble, 4) understanding, 5) think the same, 6) close to me, 7) hard working, 8) nice, and 9) easy to get along with. In addition to these, the construct, care for me, was used by female subjects.

On three of the constructs, loud, outgoing--quiet, reserved, authority--not authority, and strict--lenient, inspection of the table shows that subjects were balanced as to preference for each pole of these constructs.

The nine characteristics attributed to the ideal counselor by each of the four groups of subjects are in part reminiscent of some of the necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change as described by Carl Rogers (52, p. 96). Rogers speaks of "two persons in psychological contact" while the subjects of this study describe the ideal counselor as someone friendly who would be close to them. Rogers further states that "the therapist experiences an empathetic understanding of the client's internal frame of reference and endeavors to communicate this experience to the client." In this regard the subjects mention the two constructs, understanding and think the same.

Carkhuff and Berenson (9) also mention empathy as a primary core dimension essential to the establishment of a facilitative relationship. Similarly, in Patterson (46), both Thorne and Williamson mention the importance of

friendliness and understanding in establishing a therapeutic relationship. Tyler (57) includes acceptance, understanding, and sincerity as the essential component attitudes. The characteristics the four groups of subjects consistently attribute to the figure, the ideal counselor, thus appear to be similar to those emphasized by a number of counseling authorities.

What do these findings mean with regard to treatment? Adamek and Dager (1) emphasize, and their findings support, the importance of acceptance of correctional institution staff members as significant others by delinquents if the staff is to be successful in its task of facilitating change in delinquents. Lederman (37) notes that part of the definition of identification is the notion that the individual has a good interpersonal relationship with the model for that identification. Others such as Brown (7) and Harvey, Hunt, and Schroeder (27) have found that interpersonal liking is positively related to greater susceptibility to interpersonal influence. Findings by Tuma and Gustad (56) support the notion that close resemblance between clients and counselors on some personality variables results in better client learning.

Inspection of the findings for Hypothesis IV indicate that the ideal self of both delinquents and nondelinquents was identified quite strongly with the characteristics

they attributed to the ideal counselor. Discussion of Hypothesis IX indicated that these characteristics were generally similar to some of those considered essential to facilitative counseling by experts in the field. If staff members possessed these traits and were able to form the desired facilitative relationship in which positive identification and growth occurred, positive changes in terms of realization of characteristics attributed to the ideal self might be expected to occur.

However, some difficulties are inherent in the institutional setting where an individual lives in constant association with other delinquents. Thus associations with the socially-oriented staff would have to be numerous in order for identification to shift from the delinquent subculture to the socially-oriented models. However, the findings of this study indicate that the characteristics attributed to the ideal counselor are generally in the direction of personality traits the subjects themselves wish to possess. This indicates potential for a nondelinquent self concept which according to Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray (49) could be expected to lead to insulation of the self against delinquent identifications.

#### Sex Preference for the Ideal Counselor

Hypothesis X dealt with differences between males and females in sex preference for the ideal counselor. The



findings in Table 36 indicate that both delinquents and nondelinquents prefer a counselor of their own sex. However, a higher percentage of both male and female delinquents as compared to male and female nondelinquents preferred a counselor of the same sex.

Explanation of the meaning of this finding and its application is difficult. The results of the present investigation are in general agreement with other findings by Gustafson (26), Koile and Bird (35), and Fuller (22). Several questions however remain unanswered: Should males be assigned to male counselors and females to female counselors? Is assignment by sex more important to delinquents than nondelinquents? Is sex of counselor a limiting factor in the counseling relationship?

This author sees the like sex response as expression of identification with one's own sex and acceptance of one's sex role. From this study, the quality or effectiveness of the counseling relationship and its relationship to counselor sex and counselee sex preference is unascertainable.

## SUMMARY

## Purpose

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in patterns of identification, and to determine what constructs delinquents and nondelinquents attribute to the figure, the ideal counselor. Additional investigation was made to determine that the delinquent and nondelinquent subjects did in fact possess attitudes characteristic of their respective groups and to determine subject's sex preference for their ideal counselor.

## Procedure

The sample for the study consisted of 50 delinquent males, 50 nondelinquent males, 45 delinquent females, and 45 nondelinquent females.

Differences in attitudes between delinquents and nondelinquents were assessed using the Jesness Inventory in order to verify that subjects were in fact representative of attitudes typical of delinquency and nondelinquency respectively.

An adaptation of Kelly's Role Construct Repertory Grid was used to measure differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in identification patterns and to determine what characteristics were attributed by each group to the

figure, the ideal counselor. Finally, each subject was asked to indicate his sex preference for the figure, the ideal counselor.

The statistical analyses used were multiple classification analysis of variance for unequal cell frequencies, factor analysis, a chi square test, and a Scheffé test.

### Findings

Hypothesis I: There are no significant differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in Jesness Inventory scores. Differences between delinquents and nondelinquents were found on 8 of the 11 scores with delinquents significantly higher for 7 of these 8 scores. Delinquent subjects were found to have significantly more delinquent attitudes than nondelinquents. Therefore, Hypothesis I was rejected.

Hypothesis II: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in their identification with their parents and other authority figures. Nondelinquents had significantly higher identification score means than delinquents for Av-Parent, Ratio-Parent, Av-Authority, and Ratio-Authority scores as shown in Table 17. Therefore, Hypothesis II was rejected.

Hypothesis III: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in feelings of parental rejection. No significant differences between

delinquents and nondelinquents in Rejection scores was found. Therefore, Hypothesis III could not be rejected.

Hypothesis IV: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in degree of anti-social identifications and degree of socially-oriented identifications. Inspection of the means for the Delinquent Identity score, the D/ND score, and the Criminal Ideal score as shown in Table 17 indicates that delinquents had a higher degree of anti-social identification than nondelinquents. No significant differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in Ideal-D/ND scores were found however. Hypothesis IV was rejected.

Hypothesis V: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in their tendency to identify with people in general. The means for the Av-Identification and Average Deviational Identification as shown in Table 17 are higher for nondelinquents indicating a stronger inclination to identify with people in general than delinquents. Therefore, Hypothesis V was rejected.

Hypothesis VI: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in their identification with the figure, the ideal counselor. Though no significant differences between delinquents and non-delinquents were found, inspection of the means on Table 17

indicates there was a very high degree of identification for both delinquents and nondelinquents between the ideal self and the ideal counselor. Hypothesis VI could not be rejected.

Hypothesis VII: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in similarity between ego ideal compared with parental and authority figures. Though no significant differences were found, the means for Ideal-vs-Parent and Ideal-vs-Authority scores as shown in Table 17 were higher for nondelinquents than delinquents indicating a higher degree of similarity between the ideal self of nondelinquents as compared to parental and authority figures. Hypothesis VII could not be rejected.

Hypothesis VIII: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in the nature of their personal constructs. Inspection of Table 32 indicates that delinquents have a tendency to use the following constructs more than nondelinquents: 1) have been in trouble--haven't been in trouble, 2) authority--not authority, 3) close to me--not close to me, 4) like drugs--hate drugs, 5) jazzy, hip--honky, square. Nondelinquents, however, tend to use the following constructs more than delinquents: 1) easy to get along with--not easy to get along with, 2) fun to be with--not fun to be with, and

3) pro sports and cars--not interested in sports and cars. Hypothesis VIII was rejected.

Hypothesis IX: There is no significant difference between delinquents and nondelinquents in the nature of the personal constructs with which they identify in the counselor. Hypothesis IX could not be tested statistically. However, inspection of Table 35 indicates that delinquents and nondelinquents tend to attribute similar characteristics to the figure, the ideal counselor.

Hypothesis X: There is no significant difference between males and females in sex preference for the ideal counselor. Inspection of Table 36 indicates that both males and females tend to prefer a counselor of their own sex. Hypothesis X was rejected.

#### Summary and Discussion

The results of this study indicate that identification is a valuable concept in the study of delinquency and its treatment. Since interpersonal liking is related to greater susceptibility to interpersonal influence, counselors possessing the facilitative characteristics included by the subjects in their personal constructs attributed to the figure, the ideal counselor, may potentially serve as effective socially-oriented models in correctional institutions. The degree of identification between the ideal self of subjects and the figure,

the ideal counselor, indicates considerable openness to these characteristics and thus to a more nondelinquent self-concept which he may attempt to validate in socially approved ways. Thus these findings have implications for treatment of some delinquents.

#### Recommendations and Implications for Further Study

The findings presented on Table 4 indicate that for the Jesness Inventory, the Social Maladjustment and A-Social Index scores are the only 2 scales of the 11 which for delinquents were more than one full standard deviation above the mean scores for nondelinquents. Thus the author questions the use of the other Jesness scores to discriminate between delinquents and nondelinquents on an individual basis. Another study might use only these two scores as they discriminate the most effectively between delinquents and nondelinquents.

The greater variability for delinquents on these two scores indicates that a bi-modal distribution may exist. That is, this indicates there may be two distinct groups within the delinquent sample who could be respectively described as concerned with giving the socially desirable or "right answer" as opposed to those who were honest with their response.

Differences between delinquents and nondelinquents in degree of identification with parents were significant.

However, inspection of Table 18 indicates the differences in means on the Av-Parent and Ratio-Parent scores was not large. A future study might investigate differences in constructs attributed to parents by delinquents and non-delinquents and degree of identification with these. Collection of background information regarding parental anti-social versus socially-oriented behavior would add an interesting dimension.

Differences between constructs used by delinquents and nondelinquents as well as by males and females provide another area of interest for future research. The implications of these differences are unclear and without further study one can only speculate as to their meaning. The relationship of these differences may have meaning for counselors working with these groups. For example, both delinquent and nondelinquent females attributed the construct, care for me, to their ideal counselor figure while this construct was not used by either group of male subjects. This may indicate different expectations of counseling and other relationships by females as compared with males.

Differences between characteristics attributed to the counselor by the subjects of this study as compared to those enumerated by experts in the field of counseling provide a possibility for a comparative study of a similar selection of subject constructs. Rather than eliciting



the constructs of the subjects themselves a standard set of constructs might be constructed and presented to subjects for their response. This would provide results of a more uniform nature which could be analyzed for differences.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adamek, Raymond J. and Dager, Edward Z. Social structure, identification and change in a treatment-oriented institution. *American Sociological Review* 33: 931-970. 1968.
2. Alutto, Joseph A. Identification: State and process considerations. *Cornell Journal of Social Relations* 2: 45-60. 1967.
3. Baker, John W. and Spielberg, Mimi J. A descriptive personality study of delinquency-prone adolescents. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency* 7: 11-23. 1970.
4. Bannister, D. and Mair, J. M. M. The evaluation of personal constructs. New York, N.Y., Academic Press. 1968.
5. Bare, Carole E. Relationship of counselor personality and counselor-client personality similarity to selected counseling success criteria. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 14: 419-425. 1967.
6. Bettelheim, Bruno. The empty fortress. New York, N.Y., The Free Press. 1967.
7. Brown, R. Model of attitude change. In, *New directions in psychology*. New York, N.Y., Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. 1962.
8. Caplan, Gerald. Ingredients of personality and personality development. In Alice H. Collins, ed. *The lonely and afraid*. Pp. 113-126.
9. Carkhuff, Robert R. and Berenson, Bernard G. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York, N.Y., Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. 1967.
10. Carson, R. C. and Heine, R. W. Similarity and success in therapeutic dyads. *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 26: 38-43. 1962.
11. Carson, R. C. and Llewellyn, C. W., Jr. Similarity in therapeutic dyads. *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 30: 458. 1966.

12. Claiborne, R. B. A study of mother attitudes in juvenile delinquency: An evaluation of mother attitudes toward their sons as a factor in the delinquent behavior of the sons. Dissertation Abstracts 14: 1803-1804. 1954.
13. Collins, Alice H. The lonely and afraid. New York, N.Y., Odyssey Press. 1969.
14. Cook, Thomas E. The influence of client-counselor value similarity on change in meaning during brief counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology 13: 77-81. 1966.
15. Dietz, George E. A comparison of delinquents with non-delinquents on self-concept, self-acceptance, and parental identification. The Journal of Genetic Psychology 115: 285-295. 1969.
16. Duncan, Pam. Parental attitudes and interactions in delinquency. Dissertation Abstracts 29B: 769-770. 1968.
17. Edson, W. Doyle. An analysis of identity from the standpoint of Erikson, Freud, Kroeber, and Tillich. Dissertation Abstracts 29B: 2631-2632. 1969.
18. Ferguson, George A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York, N.Y., McGraw-Hill. 1966.
19. Fisher, Robert M. Acquiescent response set, the Jesness Inventory, and implications for the use of 'foreign' psychological tests. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology 6: 1-10. 1967.
20. Freud, Anna. Certain types and stages of social maladjustment. In K. R. Eissler, ed. Searchlights on delinquency. Pp. 193-204. New York, N.Y., International University Press. 1949.
21. Freud, Sigmund. New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis. New York, N.Y., Norton. 1933.
22. Fuller, Frances F. Preferences for male and female counselors. Personnel and Guidance Journal 42: 463-467. 1964.

23. Gassner, Suzanne Marie. Relationship between patient-therapist compatibility and treatment effectiveness. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 34: 408-414. 1970.
24. Glueck, Sheldon and Glueck, Eleanor. *Delinquents in the making*. New York, N.Y., Harper and Brothers. 1952.
25. Graff, Richard Lee. Identification as related to perceived parental attitudes and powerlessness in delinquents and normals. *Dissertation Abstracts* 29B: 369. 1968.
26. Gustafson, John Alfred. Selected factors in counselee preference for male and female counselors. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Ames, Iowa, Library, Iowa State University of Science and Technology. 1968.
27. Harvey, O. J., Hunt, D. and Schroeder, H. *Conceptual systems of personality organization*. New York, N.Y., Wiley. 1961.
28. Hemmerle, W. J. *APTERYX* (FACTOR loadings, specific variances, communalities, maximum likelihood estimates, least squares estimates, alternately principal axis estimates): Reference Manual. Iowa State University, Statistical Laboratory, Numerical Analysis-Programming Series, No. 4. 1964.
29. Jenkins, R. L. Guilt feelings--their function and dysfunction. In M. L. Reymert, ed. *Feeling and emotions*. Pp. 353-361. New York, N.Y., McGraw Hill. 1950.
30. Jesness, Carl F. *The Jesness Inventory manual*. Palo Alto, California, Consulting Psychologists Press. 1966.
31. Jones, R. E. Identification in terms of personal constructs. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Columbus, Ohio, Library, Ohio State University. 1954.
32. Kelly, Francis J. and Baer, Daniel J. Jesness Inventory and self-concept measures for delinquents before and after participation in outward bound. *Psychological Reports* 25: 719-724. 1969.

33. Kelly, George A. The psychology of personal constructs. Vol. I. New York, N.Y., Norton. 1955.
34. Kelly, George A. The psychology of personal constructs. Vol. II. New York, N.Y., Norton. 1955.
35. Koile, Earl A. and Bird, Dorothy J. Preference for counselor help on freshman problems. Journal of Counseling Psychology 3: 97-106. 1956.
36. Iarrabee, Larry Leroy. The nature of the identification of Negro and white delinquents. Dissertation Abstracts 27B: 4127. 1967.
37. Lederman, D. G. Delinquency and the concept of identification. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Pullman, Washington, Library, Washington State University. 1961.
38. Lederman, D. G. Sexual identification on the Role Construct Repertory Test. Unpublished M.S. thesis. Columbus, Ohio, Library, Ohio State University. 1957.
39. Liff, Z. A. A comparison of interpersonal attitudes to male and female authority figures among delinquent and nondelinquent institutionalized boys. Dissertation Abstracts 15: 1901-1902. 1955.
40. Manning, Nancy Groves. Peer group and parental identification and delinquent boys. Dissertation Abstracts 28B: 1168. 1967.
41. Mendelsohn, Gerald A. Effects of client personality and client-counselor similarity on the duration of counseling: a replication and extension. Journal of Counseling Psychology 13: 228-234. 1966.
42. Mendelsohn, Gerald A. Effects of counselor-client similarity on the outcome of counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology 10: 71-77. 1963.
43. Mendelsohn, Gerald A. and Geller, Marvin H. Similarity, missed sessions, and early terminations. Journal of Counseling Psychology 14: 210-215. 1967.
44. Morse, Edwin Lewis. An exploratory study of identity based on the psychology of personal constructs. Dissertation Abstracts 27B: 3291-3292. 1967.

45. Osgood, C., Suci, G. and Tannenbaum, P. The meaning of measurement. Urbana, Illinois, University of Illinois Press. 1957.
46. Patterson, C. H. Theories of counseling and psychotherapy. New York, N.Y., Harper and Row. 1966.
47. Pilravin, Irving M., Vadum, Arlence C. and Hardyck, Jane Allyn. Delinquency, personal costs and parental treatment: A test of a reward-cost model of juvenile criminality. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 60: 165-172. 1969.
48. Popham, W. James. Educational statistics. New York, N.Y., Harper and Row. 1967.
49. Reckless, W. C., Dinitz, S. and Murray, E. Self-concept as an insulator against delinquency. *American Sociological Review* 21: 744-746. 1956.
50. Reiner, Beatrice S. and Kaufman, Irving. Character disorders in the parents of delinquents. In Alice H. Collins, ed. *The lonely and afraid*. Pp. 168-177. New York, N.Y., Odyssey Press. 1969.
51. Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person. Boston, Mass., Houghton Mifflin. 1961.
52. Rogers, Carl R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 21: 95-103. 1957.
53. Schulman, I. Dynamics and treatment of anti-social psychopathology in adolescents. *Nervous Child* 11: 35-41. 1955.
54. Stokes, S. M. An inquiry into the concept of identification. *Journal of Genetic Psychology* 76: 163-189. 1950.
55. Thoresen, Carl E., Krumboltz, John D. and Varenhorst, Barbara B. Sex of counselors and models: Effect on client career exploration. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 14: 503-508. 1967.
56. Tuma, Abdul H. and Gustad, John W. The effects of client and counselor personality characteristics on client learning in counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 4: 136-141. 1957.

57. Tyler, Leona. The work of the counselor. 2nd ed. New York, N.Y., Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1960.
58. Van der Veen, F. Effects of the therapist and the patient on each others therapeutic behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology 29: 19-26. 1965.
59. Venezia, Peter S. Delinquency as a function of intra-family relationships. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 5: 148-173. 1968.
60. Warner, W. Lloyd. Social class in America. Chicago, Illinois, Science Research Associates, Inc. 1949.

APPENDIX A. DIRECTIONS AS GIVEN TO MALE  
AND FEMALE SUBJECTS

This test is designed to help the examiner understand you and some of the people who have played a part in your life. Please use each name only once (first names only are usually satisfactory). If you do not know anyone who exactly fits the description, write the name or initials of a person who comes closest to the descriptions. Be sure to fill each blank. Then put an M for male or an F for female in the boxes under each person's name indicating his or her sex. Tell your supervisor when you have all 20 names listed.

For each of the groups of three people (represented by those with circles), you are to think of an important way in which two of these three people are alike, and, at the same time, different from the third. Be sure to think of only an important way in which two of the people are alike. Avoid obvious ways in which they are alike, such as age, sex, nationality, birthplace, etc.

When you have decided what it is that makes two people alike, write a word or phrase which states or describes the way they are alike in the space provided in the column headed SIMILARITY.

Next, in the space under CONTRAST, write a word or phrase which is the opposite of the word or phrase which



you wrote under SIMILARITY. Do this for each item. DO NOT write a word or phrase which describes the person who is different from the other two. Write a word or phrase which is the opposite of the one you wrote under SIMILARITY.

Then place an X in the circles under the names of the two people you saw as having the characteristics you wrote under the column labeled SIMILARITY.

Be sure to complete each item.

On the separate grid, you are to rate each person on it, using the word or phrases (A through T) which you have written on it. Use the following system in making your ratings.

If you think the word or phrase you wrote under SIMILARITY is appropriate for describing the person in question, you would place an X on the grid at the intersect for that particular person and that construct dimension. If, on the other hand, you think the word or phrase you wrote under CONTRAST is appropriate for describing the person in question, you would leave that intersect on the grid blank. Make no mark if the word or phrase you wrote under CONTRAST is appropriate.

EVALUATE AND RATE each person listed from 1 to 20 on each construct dimension. When you have finished, turn this page and read the IMAGINARY FIGURE DESCRIPTIONS found there. Then use the rating system described above. Thus,

if you think the word or phrase you wrote under SIMILARITY is appropriate for describing the imaginary person in question, you would place an X on the grid at the intersect for that particular person and that construct dimension. Make no mark if the word or phrase you wrote under CONTRAST is appropriate.

APPENDIX B. FIGURE DESCRIPTIONS AS GIVEN TO MALE SUBJECTS

This test is designed to help the examiner understand you and some of the people who have played a part in your life.

Please use each name only once (first names only are usually satisfactory). If you do not know anyone who exactly fits the description, write the name or initials of a person who comes closest to the descriptions.

Be sure to fill each blank. Then put an M for male or an F for female in the boxes under each person's name indicating his or her sex.

1. Write your own name.
2. Your mother. If you haven't lived with your own mother in recent years, write the name of the woman who was most like a mother to you during most of your life.
3. Your father. If you haven't lived with your own father in recent years, write the name of the man who was most like a father to you during most of your life.
4. Brother nearest your age. If you have no brother, write the name of a boy near your own age who was most like a brother to you during most of your life.
5. Sister nearest your age. If you have no sister, write the name of a girl near your own age who was most like a sister to you during most of your life.
6. Your closest male friend.
7. Your closest female friend.
8. Adult who doesn't like you. Write the name of an adult who, for some reason, doesn't seem to like you at all.
9. A strict teacher.
10. Adult who likes you. Write the name of an adult who, for some reason, seems to like you very much.
11. Write the name of a counselor you know personally. If you do not know any such person, write the name of an adult you do know who, in your opinion, would make a good counselor.

12. Write the name of a boy near your own age who you know fairly well and who has been in trouble with the authorities (or at least has done things against the law, even if he hasn't been caught).
13. Write the name of a boy near your age who never gets in trouble with the law or does things against the law that would get him in trouble if he were caught.
14. Write the name of another boy, just like the last one.
15. Write the name of another boy, just like No. 12.
16. Write the name of a girl near your age who has never been in trouble with the law or does things against the law that would get her in trouble if she were caught.
17. Write the name of a girl who has been in trouble with the law, or who would be if all her activities were known.
18. Write the name of an adult who at some time in the recent past has had authority over you. This might be a teacher, scoutmaster, employer, etc.
19. Write the name of a boy near your age who has been in trouble with the police, or would be, if his activities were known to them.
20. Write the name of a policeman or probation officer you know personally. If you do not know any such person well, write the name of an adult you do know who, in your opinion, would make a good policeman.

TELL YOUR SUPERVISOR WHEN YOU HAVE ALL 20 NAMES LISTED.

APPENDIX C. FIGURE DESCRIPTIONS AS GIVEN TO FEMALE SUBJECTS

This test is designed to help the examiner understand you and some of the people who have played a part in your life.

Please use each name only once (first names are usually satisfactory). If you do not know anyone who exactly fits the description, write the name or initials of a person who comes closest to the description.

Be sure to fill each blank. Then put an M for male or an F for female in the box under each person's name indicating his or her sex.

1. Write your own name.
2. Your mother. If you haven't lived with your own mother in recent years, write the name of the woman who was most like a mother to you during most of your life.
3. Your father. If you haven't lived with your own father in recent years, write the name of the man who was most like a father to you during most of your life.
4. Brother nearest your age. If you have no brother, write the name of a boy near your own age who was most like a brother to you during most of your life.
5. Sister nearest your age. If you have no sister, write the name of a girl near your own age who was most like a sister to you during most of your life.
6. Your closest female friend.
7. Your closest male friend.
8. Adult who doesn't like you. Write the name of an adult who, for some reason, adoesn't seem to like you at all.
9. A strict teacher.
10. Adult who likes you. Write the name of an adult, who for some reason, seems to like you very much.
11. Write the name of a counselor you know personally. If you do not know any such person, write the name of an adult you do know who, in your opinion, would make a good counselor.

12. Write the name of a girl near your own age who you know fairly well and who has been in trouble with the authorities (or at least has done things against the law, even if she hasn't been caught).
13. Write the name of a girl near your age who never gets in trouble with the law or does things against the law that would get her in trouble if she were caught.
14. Write the name of another girl, just like the last one.
15. Write the name of another girl, just like No. 12.
16. Write the name of a boy near your age who has never been in trouble with the law or does things against the law that would get him in trouble if he were caught.
17. Write the name of a boy who has been in trouble with the law, or who would be if all his activities were known.
18. Write the name of an adult who at some time in the recent past has had authority over you. This might be a teacher, scoutleader, employer, etc.
19. Write the name of a girl near your age who has been in trouble with the police, or would be, if her activities were known to them.
20. Write the name of a policeman or probation officer you know personally. If you do not know any such person well, write the name of an adult you do know who, in your opinion, would make a good policeman.

TELL YOUR SUPERVISOR WHEN YOU HAVE ALL 20 NAMES LISTED.

APPENDIX D. IMAGINARY FIGURE DESCRIPTIONS  
AS GIVEN TO ALL SUBJECTS

A. THE KIND OF PERSON YOU WOULD LIKE TO BE:

If you would have your free choice of being any kind of person you wanted, and had the power to change yourself by snapping your fingers, which of these traits would you wish to have?

B. A SUCCESSFUL CRIMINAL:

Think of an imaginary person who has had a rough life. There are times when he feels that the whole world is against him. When he was a boy, he set out to get even with the world by doing things that are against the law. He is smart enough to outwit the police and he succeeds in causing a great deal of trouble for the authorities without getting caught. He makes a very good living in crime and has everything he wants. If there were such a person, which of these traits would he have?

C. A GOOD COUNSELOR:

Think of an imaginary person who would make a good counselor--one that you would like to know and with whom you'd like to talk. If there were such a person, which of these traits would he have?