AN EMPIRICAL TEST OF NORM-CONTAINMENT THEORY AS APPLIED TO CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

by

Clemente Ignacio Rohde

THESIS

Submitted to the Faculty of Arts

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

Lakehead University

Thunder Bay, Ontario, Canada

February 1976

ABSTRACT

Norm-containment theory (Reckless, 1961a, 1961b, 1962, 1967; Reckless and Dinitz, 1967; Reckless and Shoham, 1963) postulates that there are two containing buffers which steer the individual away from delinquency: inner-containment and outer-containment. Inner-containment is a form of internal control exercised by the individual over himself; the theory states that the internal control is essentially composed of a 'good' self-concept and also a high degree of self-control, tolerance, and a high sense of responsibility. Outer-containment refers to the degree of external control exercised over the individual by the family; the latter is more effective when the family provides the individual with an opportunity for acceptance and belongingness. The hypotheses that norm-containment theory advances in the explanation of criminal behavior were examined.

Seventy two male university students were administered the delinquency proneness (socialization) scale of Gough's (1969) CPI. Those Ss scoring in the upper and the lower quartiles formed the group of non-delinquent prones and delinquent prones. The self-concept (Sa), self-control (Sc), tolerance (To), and responsibility (Re) scales of the CPI, and Rotter's (1966) internal-external locus of control scale were used to measure the degree of inner-containment among the non-delinquent prones and the delinquent prones. A modified version of the Role Behaviour Test -RBT- (Foa, 1966) was used to measure the degree of the containing power of the family -outer-containment- as

perceived by the Ss.

Eighteen male ex-convicts under the care of the John Howard Society formed a comparison group designated as 'true' delinquents. This group was also administered the So, Sa, To, and Re, CPI scales, and the I-E locus of control scale as measures of inner-containment, as well as the modified version of the RBT.

Comparisons were made among the mean scores of the three groups. Since the mean scores on the self-concept (Sa scale) were not statistically different it was indicated that criminal behavior is not the result of a 'poor' self-concept. However, the results indicated that self-control, tolerance, and resposibility are the factors which determine the strength of inner-containment. Because the elements of inner-containment were significantly related to the Ss' locus of control in a negative direction, a 'locus of control' hypothesis of inner-containment is proposed. The findings on the measures of inner-containment are discussed in relation to those obtained on the measure of outer-containment (RBT)..The results indicated that discrimination between parents is associated with effective containment. The present study suggests also that treatment by parents, as perceived by delinquents and non-delinquents, is associated with the development of locus of control. The possibilities of applying these findings for the development of preventive programs and programs of rehabilitation are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank his supervisor, Dr. H. N. McLeod, for his efforts and valuable assistance in the present endeavour. Sincere thanks to Dr. J. F. Evans and Dr. P. Wesley for their guidance and constructive criticism during the completion of the present study.

Thanks to Ms. Sandra Sideen from the John Howard Society of Ontario, who helped in the collection of some data. I would also like to thank Dr. K. Wood and Dr. M. Dilley for allowing me to recruit students from their classes.

I also thank my fellow students, Jamie Arthur, Pat Wilner and Bob McGowan, for their encouragement and understanding.

Man, as a social unit, is limited in his range of behavior by the conventional agreements upon which his social group is structured. In this respect Taft and England (1964) have stated that "in nearly all societies life and property are valued, to steal and to kill are therefore rated as [criminal, or delinquent, behavior]" (p.5).

The concept of criminal, or delinquent, behavior is not a psychological concept but is a legal term outlined in the statutes of the criminal law (cf. Schafer, 1969; Taft and England, 1964). Thus, the criminal law is the instrument responsible for making, interpreting, and enforcing the rules of socially approved behaviors (Quinney, 1965).

Although it has been observed above that criminal, or delinquent, behavior is a legal concept, "some writers have used the term indiscriminately to denote anti-social, immoral, or sinful behavior" (Sellin, 1937, p. 564). Of interest here is that many investigators assume that all criminals, or delinquents, are "of a deviant personality type" (Vold, 1958, p. 41). It appears that in many instances one of the basic assumption in the study of criminal, or delinquent, behavior is that conduct in violation of the criminal law also represents deviations from other norms (cf. Davis, 1962). This assumption seems to be present irrespective of the definitional approach used to describe what constitutes criminal, or delinquent, behavior. Although crime or delinquency can be defined within a legalistic framework as a form of behavior forbidden by the criminal law and punished by the state (cf. Sellin, 1937; Sutherland, 1947; Tappan, 1960), or within a sociological perspective as behavior against which the social group reacts in a condemnatory manner in order to restrain the

individual from further involvement in such an act (cf. Barnes and Teeters, 1964; Lindesmith and Dunham, 1941; Reckless, 1940), there is no agreement "as to what is crime, and even as to what is the proper subject matter of criminology" (Jefferey, 1956, p. 658).

Whether criminal, or delinquent, behavior is defined from a legal or from a sociological approach it should be noted that such a definition is not an adequate description of behavior (Reckless, 1961b). There is, however, little doubt that from a historical perspective, society's reaction to "such conventional crimes as murder, larceny, and robbery find support in public opinion" (Quinney, 1965, p. 134).

Because of the controversies mentioned above and in conjunction with the fact that the differentiating factor between criminal and delinquent behaviors lies in the legal age of the individual involved in such behavior, the term criminal behavior will be used here as interchangeable with delinquent behavior.

Although several attempts have been made to develop a theory that would account for and determine the factors or causes that motivate the individual to violate certain principles highly valued by society (cf. Taft and England, 1964), there has existed

> ... a dual problem of explanation — that of accounting for the behavior as behavior, and equally important, accounting for the definitions by which specific behavior comes to be considered crime or non—crime (Vold, 1958, p. vi).

Added to the problem mentioned above, controversies exist concerning the validity of the factors or causes considered as responsible for the development of criminal behavior by different theories.

The present investigation attempts to clarify this issue by examining the

validity of the hypotheses proposed by a contemporary theory of criminal behavior. Specifically, this study is concerned with the validity of the propositions stated by norm-containment theory (Reckless, 1961a, 1962, 1967; Reckless and Shoham, 1963). The following review outlines the propositions advanced by some theories of criminal behavior as well as the hpyotheses proposed by norm-containment theory.

Theories of Criminal or Delinquent Behavior

The theories that have attempted to explain the 'causes' for the development of criminal behavior are herein discussed under five main headings: 1) anthropological theories, 2) biological theories, 3) psychological theories, 4) sociological theories, and 5) socio-psychological theories. This classification, although arbitrary, appears useful in examining how different theories claim to provide an adequate explanation of the factors 'responsible' for the development of criminal behavior or delinquent conduct. With the exception of the theory with which this study is concerned, no other theory is reviewed in complete detail, rather some theories are briefly described in order to illustrate some of the main hypotheses that each theory proposes according to the classification outlined above.

Anthropological Theories

The search for an explanation of criminal behavior can be considered as old as mankind. Historical records show that in addition to the demonological theories that characterized the European thought during the Middle Ages, the naturalistic explanations of crime that emphasized the influence of constitutional factors on the development of behavioral patterns can be traced as

far back as Hippocrates and Aristotle (Haskell and Yablonski, 1971; Vold, 1958).

During the nineteenth century the anthropological work of Broca and Gall, Pinel's contributions in psychiatry, and the theories of moral degeneracy proposed by Morel gave rise to the anthrobiological dogma that characterized the Positive or Italian School of Criminology (Gibbons, 1968; Johnson, 1968; Schafer, 1969; Taft and England, 1964; Tappan, 1960; Vold, 1958).

Anthropological theories of criminal behavior reflect the influence of the Darwinian doctrine that permeated the thought of the supporters of the Positive School of Criminology (cf. Schafer, 1969; Schur, 1969). These theories propose that criminals are 'born', not made, and that they possess certain biological and physical characteristics that distinguish them from the rest of the population (Ferri, 1881, 1928; Garofalo, 1914; Lombroso, 1911).

Lombroso's (1911) theory, for example, states that the criminal is characterized by an "atavistic [constitution that] reproduces in his person the ferocious instincts of primitive humanity and the inferior animals" (p. xiv). This theory states also that the "atavistic criminal" can be easily identified by certain noticeable behavioral and morphological characteristics or "degenerate stigmata" which impede him in his adjustment to modern civilization. In emphasizing that the criminal is a throwback or a biological reversion Lombroso's theory suggests that criminal behavior is mostly a function of the criminal's atavism and that it is largely independent of environmental conditions.

Contrary to the above consideration, but consistent with the view that inherited predispositions for crime exist, Ferri's (1928) theory proposes

that "Crime, like any other human action, is the effect of multiple causes, which, although always interlaced in an indissoluble net, can nevertheless be separated ...[into] ...anthropological..., physical.., and social, [factors]" (pp.17-18).

A similar view is presented by Garofalo's (1914) theory proposing that criminal behavior is the result of psychic or moral anomalies that characterize certain inferior races. The theory states that the development of crime in more civilized societies takes place when the "basic altruistic sentiment of pity and probity [are violated and that there are certain behaviors which] no civilized society can refuse to recognize as criminal [or attempt to avoid by eliminating the criminal from society]" (p.33).

At this point it should be stated that as the attention on the theoretical analysis of criminal behavior began to focus on a wider constitutional base and on inherited predispositions toward repetitive criminality rather than upon specific anatomical or skeletal characteristics, the anthropological theories of criminal behavior gradually lost their earlier relevance and the biological approach toward an explanation of criminal and delinquent conduct began to dominate the thought of behavioral scientists.

Biological Theories

The biological theories state that the criminal is an inferior individual due to "his somatic or psychic abnormalities" (Schafer, 1969, p. 183). In addition to the propositions that emphasize the physical or psychic abnormalities of the criminal, a third approach proposes that criminal behavior is the result of both physical and psychic aberrations.

In the following section the theories of physical inferiority and the theories of psychic and somatic abnormalities will be discussed. The theories that emphasize the psychic abnormality of the criminal will be discussed under the heading of "Psychological Theories".

The theories that emphasize the physical inferiority propose that the criminal belongs to a somatic or physical category distinct from other human beings. Examples of this proposition are found in Goring's (1913) theory as well as in the assumptions held by current biological research.

Goring's (1913) theory states that in every individual there exists a physical predisposition to commit crime; his theory proposes that there is an innate character of "criminal diathesis—...a constitutional proclivity... present to some degree in all men, but so potent in some as to determine for them, the fate of [crime]" (p.26). Added to the view quoted above the theory states that "Crime is only to a trifling extent the product of social inequalities, or of other ...circumstances" (Goring, 1913, p.371). Thus, Goring's theory disregards the effects of socio-environmental factors in the development of criminal behavior.

In the empirical examination of the influence of biological factors in the development of criminal conduct, recent researchers have considered a variety of hereditary components as the independent variables of their investigations; they have, however, failed to look at the importance of socio-environmental conditions.

For example, studies have examined the influence of heredity in the development of criminal traits among fraternal (dizygotic) and identical (monozygotic) twins. Although there is evidence to the contrary (Borgestroem,

1939; Christiansen, 1967; Lange, 1930; Legras, 1932; Rosanoff, 1934), Kranz (1939) has shown that there is no difference in comparing the degree of concordance of criminal traits between fraternal and identical twins (Cortés and Gatti, 1972). It should be emphasized that because of the confounding of common genotype and experiential factors among twin pairs, an interpretation of studies of this nature becomes a difficult task (Cortés and Gatti, 1972).

The development of more advanced techniques in biological research has facilitated the investigation of the relationship between hereditary chromosomal abnormalities and criminal behavior. While some of the existing evidence suggest that males with an abnormal chromosomal complement—XXY constitution—are genetically more predisposed to criminal behavior than males with the normal XY chromosomal complement (Goodman, Smith, and Migeon, 1967; Griffiths and Zaremba, 1967; Telfer, Baker, Clark, and Richardson, 1968), other findings indicate that criminal behavior is related to the XYY chromosomal make-up (Casey, Segall, Street, and Blank, 1966; Court, Brown, Price, and Jacobs, 1968; Daly, 1968; Jacobs, Brunton, Melville, Brittain, and McClemont, 1965).

Despite the existing evidence on the relationship between chromosomal abnormalities and criminal behavior the significance of such relationship seems unclear in the analysis of criminal behavior. Some of the investigations mentioned above have been strongly criticized because of their sampling bias. For example, while some investigators have limited their research to specific types of criminals (eg., tall individuals), others have failed to account for the effects of variable incidence among different ethnic groups (Hook, 1973; McWhirter, 1970). However, it is expected that future research would control for the limitations mentioned above in order to provide clear additional

evidence for the behavioral significance of an abnormal chromosomal constitution in the development of criminal predispositions (Owen, 1972).

It was stated earlier that the biological research along with Goring's (1913) theory emphasizes only the physical, or biological, abnormalities of criminals in their explanation of the factors contributing to the development of criminal behavior. The hypotheses outlined below present a more complex analysis of criminal behavior by emphasizing that it develops from physical as well as from the psychological aberrations of the individual.

The theories of 'psychic and somatic' inferiority hold that criminal behavior develops from a combined effect of psychological and physical malfunctioning (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Sheldon, 1949).

In the above respect Sheldon's (1949) theory states that if an

> Interpretation or explanation of personality...is undertaken against the...description of the physical constitution...[then] We find no break— no discrimination— between what is physical and what is mental... We find only structure and behavior, which seem to make a functional continuum (Vol. 1, p. 4)*.

On the basis of the views quoted above, Sheldon (1949) proposed the theory of the body-temperamental structure of the criminal. This theory is based on Sheldon's (1940, 1942) propositions about the relationship between the basic elements of the criminal's physique and the primary components of his temperament. The theory's proposition about the mesomorphic-somatotonic structural pattern that characterizes the criminal (Sheldon, 1949) has been supported by some empirical evidence (Conger, Miller, and Walsmith, 1970; Cole and Hall, 1966; Cortés and Gatti, 1972; Parnell, 1958).

The Gluecks (1950) have stated, however, that Sheldon's theory serves only as a partial explanation of some of the criminal's structural characteristics that seem to be related to the development of criminal behavior. In

---

*Original emphasis

this respect the Gluecks' (1956) theory proposes that criminal behavior develops from "some sort of disharmony" (p.221) between the individual's structural characteristics (body-termperament) and other factors of an attitudinal, psychological, and sociocultural nature. Although the Gluecks' theory developed from research findings considered as highly suggestive evidence of an association between somatotype and temperament, Gibbons (1968) has argued that this alleged relationship is essentially a reflection of the process whereby the delinquent subcultures investigated by the supporters of the body-temperament propositions select their members rather than a definite cause of criminal behavior.

Psychological Theories

The psychological theories state that criminal behavior is the result of an inferior intelligence or of functional disorders which have no known organic basis and are, therefore, likely to be due to conflict or emotional stress.

The notion that predispositions to feeblemindedness are the determining factors of criminal behavior developed from the classical studies of 'family trees'. Examples of this proposition are the surveys of families that showed a long history of correlates between criminal behavior and feeblemindedness (Estabrook and Davenport, 1912; Estabrook, 1916; Goddard, 1912, 1914).

With the development of psychological tests the alleged relationship between feeblemindedness and criminal behavior began to be measured on the basis of intelligence scores rather than by the unsophisticated analysis of psychopathological background in the family.

The most comprehensive review (Sutherland, 1931) of 342 psychometric studies that compared the intelligence scores of criminals and noncriminals has shown

that between the years 1910 and 1928 the proportion of feebleminded criminals, as determined by intellingence tests, decreased from fifty to twenty percent. Woodward's (1955) analysis of the psychometric studies conducted between the years 1931-1950 has also shown that during this period the mean intelligence scores of criminals increased from 71 to over 92 IQ points.

Investigations conducted after the latter mentioned review are also contradictory. For example, while some investigators have reported that criminals scored lower on test of intelligence than noncriminals (Richardson and Surko, 1956), other studies have found that criminals and noncriminals do not differ in intelligence scores (McCord and McCord, 1959; Naar, 1965; Prentice and Kelly, 1963). Before attempting to draw any conclusion on the suggested relationship between criminal behavior and intelligence, as determined by psychometric measures of intelligence, the controversial nature of the findings in this area of research should be seriously considered. The issue of the applicability of IQ tests with reference to the social factors that characterize the background of criminal samples has been severely criticized. In this respect West (1967) stated that criminals always perform below average on tests involving scholastic skills, and Ferentz (1964) pointed out that the over-representation of socially deprived and emotionally backward persons in criminal institutions should be used as a warning against assuming a causal relationship between intelligence scores and criminal behavior. Furthermore, Ferentz (1954) has suggested that the process of socialization should be examined more closely in the investigation of criminal behavior and its alleged causes.

Freud's (1925) views on the significance that early socialization has in shaping the development and structure of personality laid the groundwork for the dynamic explanations of criminal behavior. For example, Adler(1931) considered criminal behavior to be the expression of an inferiority complex resulting from the individual's desire to belong to a group and obtain recognition within it. Another theorist (Eissler, 1949) viewed criminal behavior as an abnormal form of aggression against the system of values that prevail in the social group to which the individual belongs. Friedlander (1947) stated that frustration resulting from unfavourable factors in the social environment predisposes the person of antisocial character to indulge in criminal acts. A similar view is presented by Alexander and Shapiro (1952) who proposed that criminal behavior develops from a state of anxiety experienced by the individual.

Consistent with the views outlined above other theorists have suggested that criminal behavior is the result of serious emotional problems experienced by the individual during childhood (Gibbons, 1970).

In the investigation of the causes responsible for the emotional problems attached to the development of criminal conduct, a great deal of emphasis has been placed on the type of parent-child relationships. While early evidence suggested that maternal deprivation may be the factor responsible for the development of criminal behavior during the individual's adolescence or adulthood (Ainsworth, 1962; Bowlby, 1947, 1950, 1951; Glueck and Glueck, 1952; Nye, 1958), other studies have proposed that paternal deprivation is the cause responsible for the development of criminal conduct (Anderson, 1965; Bennet, 1960; Gregory, 1965; Seashore, 1961). Still other studies have suggested

that crime is more closely linked with parental neglect than with actual parental separation (Bandura and Walter, 1958; Lewis, 1954; Wardle, 1961).

On the basis of the propositions advanced by the studies cited above, Andry (1960) and other researchers (Chilton and Markel, 1972; Grygier, Chesley, and Wilson, 1969; Stephenson, 1973) have stated that parental deprivation, physical and/or psychological, is related to the development of criminal behavior.

Another approach which makes reference to the functional disorders of the criminal states that criminal behavior is the result of some form of mental pathology (cf. Gibbons, 1970). The supporters of this view hold that criminal behavior is the result of sociopathic or psychopathic characteristics that developed during childhood.

The propositions about the sociopathic, or antisocial, personality of the criminal state that upbringing by unloving, erratic, and neglectful parents results in the development of the unformed and weak superego that characterizes the criminal person (Argyle, 1961; Eron, 1963; Loban, 1963; Sears, MacCoby, and Levin, 1957; Silver, 1963; Yablonsky, 1962).

Within the same area of research some studies have shown that criminals respond consistently to two different clusters of personality items; one cluster consists of responses indicative of psychopathic characteristics, and the second cluster indicative of neurotic traits (Peterson, Quay, and Tiffany, 1961; Quay, 1964). In this respect Eysenck's (1964) theory holds that the criminal is an extraverted neurotic individual whose psychopathic behavior develops from his poor social conditioning. Although the latter propositions have been supported by numerous investigations concerned with the neuroticism-extraversion dimension among criminals (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1970, 1970; Hathaway and Monachesi, 1956; Sanocki, 1969; Trasler, 1962), other evidence

(Eysenck and Eysenck, 1971b; Little, 1963) have suggested that Eysenck's theory is partly incorrect because the items representative of the 'extraverted' dimension are not positively correlated with criminal behavior. Added to the above comment, Hoghughi and Forrest's (1970) analysis of the existing research on the neurotic-extraversion dimension of the criminal personality points out that "the results of the studies consistently suggest that, contrary to predictions from Eysenck's theory, persistent offenders are significantly more introverted than the normative samples or selected control groups" (p.247).

On the basis of the above views it should be stated that although the propositions about the sociopathic, or psychopathic, characteristics of the criminal may be correct in recognizing the need for knowledge of personality attributes in order to explain the etiology of criminal behavior, these theories have ignored the influence of other socio-environmental factors that may contribute to the development of criminal conduct. The effects of multiple socio-environmental variables have, nevertheless, been considered in detail by the sociological theories of criminal behavior.

Sociological Theories

The sociological theories of criminal behavior are mainly concerned with the conditions under which an individual, or group of individuals, in a social community violate the values upon which society is structured (West, 1967).

Merton's (1938) theory, for example, states that criminal behavior is the result of unachieved goals in a society structured on success. His theory proposes that a 'state of anomie', or normless state, develops when socially determined goals cannot be attained through socially approved means. In this respect the theory states that the socioeconomic and

educationally handicapped have to rely on a variety of illegitimate means in order to acquire the materialistic symbolic status and expected success emphasized in modern society. Merton (1938) argued that as a result of the circumstances mentioned above criminal behavior predominates in the deprived areas of society.

The notion that criminal behavior results from a state of social disorganization in the underprivileged areas of society is emphasized by the ecological theories (Shaw, 1930; Shaw and McKay, 1942; Thrasher, 1963). These theories state that the social instability predominant in the slums does not permit an effective way for exercising social control; this lack of social enforcement, in turn, contributes to the development of criminal behavior.

Some investigations on the proposed relationship between criminality and ecological factors have found that variables such as social disorganization (Lander, 1954), home ownership (Bordua, 1959), and economic conditions, transiency, and poor housing (Chilton, 1964) seem to be associated with the rates of criminal behavior. In opposition to the latter suggestions other investigators have argued that the alleged relationship between economic status, social disorganization, and ethnic affiliation with rates of crime is spurious and that such variables are not necessarily related to criminal behavior (Gordon, 1967; Rosen and Turner, 1967).

As an alternative to the above controversies other theories hold that some working class individuals whose code of conduct deviates from or rejects the core values of society, gather in groups that constitute a structured delinquent subculture with its own values (Cloward and Ohlin, 1960; Cohen,

1955; Miller, 1958, Toby, 1967). In this respect Short (1968) has stated that certain groups concentrated in working class neighborhoods exhibit characteristic patterns of criminal behavior.

Similar views to those presented above are proposed by Cohen's (1955) theory which states that criminal behavior, as a way of life, represents a social movement among lower class boys: "the crucial condition for the emergence of new cultural forms is the existence, in effective interaction with one another, of a number of actors with similar problems of adjustment" (p. 59).* His theory further states that the main motive behind the criminal's expression of anti-social behavior is the protection of his self esteem against the degrading expectations and demands from the respectable social status system.

A modified version of Cohen's propositions has been presented by Miller (1958). Miller's theory states that criminal behavior, rather than being a protest against middle class values, is the traditional way of life among lower class groups. This theory holds that criminal behavior develops from a malicious sense of material and social deprivation which, added to the family structure characteristic of the lower class, constitutes the basic criminal attitude of the lower class subcultures. However, part of the review to follow points out to the doubtful validity of Miller's (1958) theory.

Consistent with the above hypotheses Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) theory states that lower class individuals indulge in criminal behavior in order to achieve some economic success which would allow them to acquire a higher status within their own subculture. This theory proposes that because of their limited opportunities lower class individuals depend on a variety of criminal resources in order to achieve the need for success that they share with their middle class

---

* Original emphasis

counterparts. Cloward and Ohlin further state that because the opportunity structure differs among different segments of society, some lower class subcultures have established a well defined traditional criminal community.

Although the above theories seem to be supported by some evidence suggesting the existence of delinquent subcultures in lower class communities (Miller, 1962; Reiss and Rhodes, 1961; Robin, 1964; Short, 1964; Spergel, 1961, 1963, 1967), it should be noted that other studies have indicated that criminal behavior is more common among higher class adolescents than among their lower class counterparts (Gold, 1966; La Mar and Erickson, 1966; Palmore and Hammond, 1964; Voss, 1966). Thus, because the findings reported by the studies mentioned above are very inconsistent the inference that criminal behavior is typical of lower class neighborhoods can be considered as an extreme position, at least the existing evidence seems to point in this direction.

The sociological theories reviewed here have attempted to explain the development of criminal behavior in reference to the circumstances under which criminal behavior is exhibited. In other words, the hypotheses proposed by the sociological theories are mainly concerned with 'where' and 'when' the patterns of criminal behavior emerge rather than with the 'how process' that characterizes the development of criminal conduct.

Sociopsychological Theories

The sociopsychological theories state that "the criminal is a normal human being reared in a normal society, whose criminal behavior is learned in the process of symbolic communication with other human beings" (Hartung, 1955, p. 654).

This view is consistent with Lemert's (1951) and Becker's (1963) notions about criminal behavior being the combined result of forces operating in the individual's social environment and in the individual's self components.

Generally speaking, the sociopsychological theories propose that the development of criminal behavior is contingent on the degree to which specific social groups modify the behavior of the individual (Reckless, 1961a, 1961b; Sutherland, 1934; Sutherland and Cressey, 1967).

Sutherland's (1934) theory is essentially a sociological learning theory; it states that criminal behavior develops when the individual is exposed to the influences of criminal groups during his process of socialization. The theory states that "A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to violation of law over definitions unfavourable to violation of law" (Sutherland and Cressey, 1967, p. 398). However, since most individuals in society are exposed to both definitions that are favourable and definitions that are unfavorable to violation of the law, the theory states that the development of criminal behavior is also a function of the duration, variation, priority, and intensity of the individual's association with patterns of criminal behavior can be attributed to factors such as poverty, mental illness, and biological inferiority, as was held by previous theories, but seem to be related in some cases to the association with criminal patterns. Sutherland (1949) stated that in order to formulate a theory of crime causation, the theory should recognize that criminal behavior reflects the prevalence of illegal conduct in all social groups.

Because the empirical evidence has indicated that the development of criminal behavior is only moderately correlated with the individual's

association with patterns of criminal conduct (Ball, 1957; Matthews, 1968; Short, 1960; Voss, 1964) and since the findings reported by other studies (Lemert, 1953; Marshall, 1952; Reiss and Rhodes, 1964) concerned with Sutherland's propositions are inconsistent, the validation of differential-association theory (Sutherland, 1934) has been rather difficult. In this respect it has been argued that the problem in validating Sutherland's theory is due to the difficulty of operationalizing the concept of differential association (cf. DeFleur and Quinney, 1966). One attempt to operationalize the proposition held by Sutherland has taken the form of Differential-Reinforcement theory (Burgess and Akers, 1966); however, empirical evidence to support the above alternative to differential-association theory as an adequate explanation of the development of criminal behavior is yet to come.

A thorough analysis of the research accompanying the theoretical positions outlined above is beyond the scope of this review. Nevertheless, the indications that have been outlined on the basis of the research cited above indicate that the existing evidence does not fully support the propositions stated by the theories.

In order to account for the shortcomings encountered by the theories of criminal behavior Reckless (1962) proposed the formulation of "hypotheses about or explanation of delinquent and criminal behavior which do not require the concept of cause or a combination of causes [as the alternative for developing a theory of criminal conduct]" (p. 131). In account of the former proposition Reckless (1961a, 1961b, 1962; Reckless and Shoham, 1963) presented "Norm-Containment Theory" as a substitute for the causal theories of criminal behavior.

Reckless (1961a) outlined norm-containment theory as a middle range theory

of criminal behavior. He states that his theory does not explain the extreme cases of criminal conduct resulting from inner pushes or those that are part of the social repertoire in a given community. His theory, however, explains the middle range of criminal behavior in terms of norm-violation.

This theory states "that there is a containing external social structure which holds individuals in line and that there is also an internal buffer which protects people against deviation of the social and legal norms" (Reckless, 1962, p. 131).

Norm-containment theory proposes that the internal buffer represents a form of internal control exercised by the individual over himself. The theory states that this internal buffer is the inner-containment aspect of the factors that may be in operation during the development of criminal behavior. The inner-containment is composed of "self—control, good self—concept,...high frustration tolerance, ...[and] high sense of responsibility" (Reckless, 1961a, pp. 44-45). The theory states also that the individual's "awareness of being an inner directed,..person [determines] the strength of the self as an operating person" (Reckless, 1962, p. 132).* Accordingly, the theory states that the development of inner containment is dependent on the degree of external control, or outer-containment, exercised over the individual by the family and other supportive groups in the social environment. The latter refers to the "presentation of a consistent moral front to the person, institutional reinforcement of his norms,...opportunity for acceptance, identity, and belongingness" (Reckless, 1961a, p. 45). Thus, the outer containment must provide the individual with an "opportunity...to achieve status,...[and] identification" (Reckless, 1962, p. 132).

---

*Emphasis added

As noted above, norm containment theory states that there are internal and external controls which steer the individual away from delinquency and that each form of control is characterized by specific elements. Though, "If the containing factors are strong, then normally delinquent behavior would not ensue" (Marshall, 1973, p. 227). From this perspective it would be expected that if either form of control is weak, then deviant dispositions may emerge in the form of criminal behavior. Reckless (1962) stated, however, that he

> ...is quite prepared to admit that of the two containing buffers against deviation, the inner containment is the more important in the mobile, industrialized...society. This is because individuals in such societies spend much of their time away from the family and other supportive groups which can contain them. As a result they must rely on their own inner strength to function competently (p. 132).

Consistent with the above line of reasoning containment theorists (Dinitz, Scarpitti, and Reckless, 1962; Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray, 1956) hold that the non-delinquent learns to rely on his own "inner strength" as a result of a favorable process of socialization. Reckless et al. (1956) have suggested that "as an outgrowth of discovery in social experience playing the part of a good boy and remaining a good boy bring maximun satisfactions (of acceptance) to the boy himself" (p. 746).*

It seems, thus, that containment theorists have explained the development of the non-delinquent's inner strength according to a concept emphasized in social learning theory (cf. Rotter, 1954). That is, the behavior of the non-delinquent is directed toward environmental conditions that are considered as "maximun satisfactions". However, containment theorists have not elaborated on the significance that the environment may acquire when the individual fails to remain 'good'. In other words, toward what kind of environmental situations does the individual direct his behavior when his conduct ceases to bring

---

*Emphasis added

"maximun satisfactions"? A tentative explanation would be that when the prevailing behavioral conditions cease to bring maximun satisfactions the individual seeks for new relationships in his environment which are likely to lead to occasional reinforcement or maximun satisfactions. However, in many cases it may be that the new maximun satisfactions are derived from criminal acts.

In spite of the above and other shortcomings to be outlined in the remaining part of the present review, the author feels that on the basis of the propositions held by norm-containment theory and in comparison to the other theories of criminal behavior herein reviewed, norm-containment theory offers some tentative hypotheses about the sociopsychological elements that may be in operation when the individual is involved in criminal behavior.

The propositions stated by norm-containment theory have been investigated in several studies. Some findings have suggested that, regardless of race and socioeconomic status, 'good'boys have a significantly higher self-concept, are less prone to delinquency, are more socially responsible, have a higher concept of their parents, and present a more positive view of their family life than 'bad' boys (Donald and Dinitz, 1964; Lively, 1959; Lively, Dinitz, and Reckless, 1962; Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray, 1956, 1957; Reckless, Dinitz, and Kay, 1957; Simpson, Dinitz, Kay, and Reckless, 1960).

A review of the literature reveals, however, that the above suggestions have been developed from studies that placed their major emphasis on the self-concept variable. The evidence which most strongly seems to support the propositions held by containment theorists, especially in reference to the self-concept hypotheseis, are the follow-up studies (Dinitz, Scarpitti, and Reckless, 1962; Scarpitti, Murray, Dinitz, and Reckless, 1960) conducted in a high

delinquency area four years after the original investigations (Reckless, Dinitz, and Kay, 1957; Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray, 1956).

In the studies cited above the investigators "examined" the behavior of two groups of 16 year-old boys who four years previously had been judged by their teachers as 'likely' or 'unlikely' to fall into delinquent ways.

In the first follow-up study (Scarpitti et al., 1960) the group of boys previously nominated as good (Reckless et al., 1956) showed "less veering toward delinquency and better socialization" (Scarpitti et al., 1960, p. 557) as determined by the Socialization (So) scale and the Responsibility (Re) scale of Gough's (1969) California Psychological Inventory. These boys also maintained a high self-concept as determined by responses to a questionnaire "with one set of items arbitrarily labelled 'the self concept'" (Jensen, 1973, p. 465). Added to the above characteristics the good boys continued to express acceptance of and satisfaction with their school and home life. Scarpitti et al. (1960) concluded that these findings "may be interpreted to mean that once a favorable self—image has been internalized by pre—adolescents...there is every reason to believe that it is as difficult to alter as a delinquent self—image" (p. 558).

The results and indications outlined above seem to be supported by the findings of the second follow-up study (Dinitz et al., 1962) on the previously nominated group of "bad" boys (Reckless et al., 1957). In this follow-up study the boys previously nominated as 'bad' showed no change in their scores on the So scale, maintained an unfavourable self-concept(determined by the same procedure used among the 'good' boys), and have had more involvement in delinquent acts.

Dinitz et al. (1962) compared the results obtained in the two follow-up studies cited above and concluded that the findings reflect a "notable cohort stability in self orientation over time...indicative of a residual favorable socialization and a strong inner self which in turn steers the person away from [delinquencey and] toward middle class values" (pp. 516-517).

In spite of the evidence presented above supporting the self-concept hypothesis held by containment theorists, serious objections have been raised against the interpretations derived from such studies (Jensen, 1972, 1973; Tangri and Schwartz, 1965, 1967; Schrag, 1967).

Tangri and Schwartz (1967) argued that because no data from a control group of 'bad boys' have been presented it is unlikely that the results obtained by containment theorists differentiated delinquents from non-delinquents. Consistent with the latter view the two authors stated that containment theorists have

> ...not made quite clear...whether the conclusions with regard to self—concept are based on the Gough (DE and RE) CPI scales, or whether the conclusion is based on the boys' answers to questions about their expectations of getting into trouble,...whether it had to do with their descriptions of their home life or the degree to which they and their mothers...seemed to agree (Tangri and Schwartz, 1967, p. 188).

A similar objection to the one outlined above has been presented by Jensen (1973) who in his analysis of the items (See Appendix A) used by Reckless and his associated to measure the self concept variable stated that

> Encompassed in their sixteen items is a measure of exposure to delinquent peers (13) and a measure of outer containment (15). In short, they measure some aspects of environmental pressures and pulls—outer containment and inner containment—with one set of items arbitrarily labelled 'the self concept' (p. 465).

In opposition to the association between self-concept and delinquency held by containment theorists, but supported by others (Quinney, 1970) who have objected to such causal relationship, some evidence (Jensen, 1972) seems to support Tangri and Schwartz's(1967) argument that "a delinquent self—concept is not necessarily a negative concept" (p. 184). Jensen (1972) has found, for example, that while delinquents seem to have a lower self-esteem than non-delinquents, this relationship is determined by the individual's sociocultural environment. Marshall (1973) has presented similar indications to those provided by Jensen. Marshall replicated the self-concept instrument developed by Reckless and Dinitz to measure future delinquency involvement. Marshall (1973) found that among British youngsters the self-concept, as a predictive measure of delinquency, yielded significant results "only when the external or social pressures of the child are in conflict...[and that] social pressures towards anti—social behaviour therefore seem to be dominant" (p. 235).

The results of the studies cited above, thus, seem to be contradictory to those obtained by containment theorists. In respect to this controversy it may be suggested that containment theorists have, perhaps, considered 'good' or 'bad' behavior as a reflection of 'good' or'bad' self-concept. By this is meant that since the teachers nominated the boys as 'likely' or 'unlikely' to get into trouble with the law on the basis of the boys' 'good' or 'bad' behaviors (Reckless et al., 1956, 1957), the latter were considered as synonymous with 'good' or 'bad' self-concept.

It should be noted that the above indication seems to be implicit in Reckless and Dinitz' (1967) comment that

> Because the De scale of the CPI...and the RE scale ... are standardized scales, with national and even some international norms, the authors felt that the convincingly and significantly more favorable showing of the good, and the more unfavorable showing of the bad—boy sample, tended to validate the teacher's nomination (p. 516).

It has been noted above that containment theorists have, supported by evidence indicating that delinquent behavior is related to lack of internalized control (Nye, 1958) or to weakness in personal control (Reiss, 1951), suggested that the strength of the non-delinquent's inner-containment depends on his sense of inner-direction. Although some evidence (Miller, 1969) has indicated that the non-delinquent has more self-control and holds an internal direction of control, it appears as if containment theorists have considered "inner-direction", or inner-control, as a quality of 'good' self-concept rather than as a separate psychological element. The point is that containment theorists (Dinitz et al., 1962; Reckless, 1962) have made repeated reference to the non-delinquent's sense of inner-direction without defining what it means.

In relation to the studies portraying the description of the inner-directed non-delinquent it was suggested earlier that containment theorists have explained the development of inner-direction according to social learning theory. That is, containment theorists have used the term inner-direction to refer to the non-delinquent's awareness that the "maximum satisfactions" (Reckless, 1956, p. 746) that he gets from the environment are contingent on his own actions (responsibility) and under his personal control (self control). Conversely, the delinquent's lack of inner-direction represents his belief that the "maximum satisfactions" that he gets from the environment are unrelated to his actions and beyond his control.

It seems from the perspective outlined above that containment theorists have used the term inner-direction to refer to a construct (cf. Rotter, Seemen, and Liverant, 1962) that represents Rotter's (1966) internal-external locus of control dimension. In other words, Rotter's locus of control dimension may be used to describe the non-delinquent and the delinquent in relation to the degree to which they accept responsiblity for what happens to them as an outcome of their behavior. However, the literature reveals that Rotter's construct has not been used in testing the inner-direction hypothesis that containment theorists hold in their explanation of criminal behavior.

It was stated earlier that norm-containment theory states that family relationships are, as a source of outer-containment, the reinforcers that facilitate the development of inner-containment (Reckless, 1961a, 1962, 1967; Reckless and Shoham, 1967). In this respect Reckless et al. (1956) have reported that the 'good' boys "tried to conform to the expectations of their parents, teachers, and others" (p. 745) . Likewise, Foster, Dinitz, and Reckless (1972) have emphasized the containing power of the family by observing that

> Parents who regard their sons as troublesome...expect their boys to get into trouble. The parents who consider their children basically good...express confidence that their children will turn out well, even though they have been in some trouble with the police (p.204).

In line with the above indications Reckless and Shoham (1963) have suggested that the good, or poor, containing power of the family is reflected in the individual's "perception of the degree of awareness of the amount of belongingness [or rejection], unity, support, and re-enforcement [that is or was] manifested within the family circle" (p. 641). It should be noted that

the latter suggestion is consistent with Rotter's (1954) indication that the importance that other people have for an individual "lies in their relationships in terms of such psychological goals as recognition, love, and dependence" (p. 119). Thus, within this line of reasoning and supported by existing evidence (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Nye, 1958; Robins, 1960), the individual's perception of his family relationships may be considered as one of the indicators of the containing power of the family.

In the above respect Reckless et al., (1956) have found that there are no differences between the 'good' and the 'bad' boys' perception of family interaction. Reckless et al., found, however, that the 'good' boys can not differentiate between the behaviors of father and mother towards them, as compared to the 'bad' boys. The authors concluded that these differences in "perception may largely reflect age, sex, and role differences in expectations" (Reckless, et al., 1956, p. 746).

The findings cited above have been supported by other studies reporting that the non-delinquent differentiates less between the behaviors of father and mother than the delinquent (Deitz, 1969; Donnenwerth, Teichman and Foa, 1973; Teichman, 1971).

Added to the above findings a study by Donnenwerth et al. (1973) on comparable groups of delinquent and non-delinquent girls has indicated that the former also differentiates less between the behaviors of self and the behaviors of her parents than the latter, and that for the delinquent girl the differentiation between self and father is very low. Donnenwerth et al. (1973) concluded that these differences in perceptions can be traced to the cognitive structure of the individual and that they may develop from inconsistency of parental behavior toward the delinquent person.

It has been noted that containment theorists hold that family relationships are the reinforcers for the development of non-delinquent behavior or favorable socialization (Dinitz et al., 1962; Reckless, 1961a, 1962, 1967; Reckless et al., 1956, 1957; Reckless and Shoham, 1963). It has been noted also that containment theorists hold that a favorable socialization is reflected in the individual's conformity to the expectations of his parents (Dinitz et al., 1958; Reckless et al., 1956, 1957; Scarpitti et al., 1960). However, the question arises as to how the delinquent's behavior is determined. A tentative explanation would be that the elements of favorable socialization - love, recognition, and dependence - are not reinforced in the family of the delinquent. Consequently, the individual may depend on behaviors directed toward securing reinforcement in terms of love, recognition, and dependence from and on his peers (cf. Rotter, 1954). However, as was suggested earlier, some of the individual's peers may include companions who are already involved in criminal acts. The latter, in turn, become reinforcing agents of criminal behavior for the individual seeking temporary reinforcement.

It was stated earlier that norm-containment theory offers some tentative hypotheses about the sociopsychological elements that may be in operation during the individual's involvement in criminal acts. Although the existing evidence seems to indicate that some of the theory's propositions are valid, numerous objections have been outlined. These objections refer to the vague definitions attached to the variables investigated as well as to the distinctiveness of the samples studied. Thus, an empirical test of norm-containment theory is needed in order to clarify some of the existing controversies.

Purpose of the Present Study

The present study proposes to test the validity of the hypotheses advanced by norm-containment theory in its explanation of criminal behavior. Specifically, if the theory's propositions are valid then non-delinquents would be expected to differ from delinquent prones and a control group of 'true' delinquents on the following measures of inner-containment: (1) self-concept or sense of personal worth, (2) sense of self-control, tolerance, responsibility, and (3) locus of control. The measures of self-control, tolerance, responsibility, and locus of control would be expected to vary together. Furthermore, delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents would be expected to describe the interaction with their parents more negatively and to discriminate more between the behaviors of father and mother than non-delinquents.

The present study proposed to use high school students and incarcerated youngsters as subjects. However, because the matter of identifying, through school auspices, individuals having criminal records was an area in which principals wished to have no part (McDonald, 1973), university students rather than high school pupils were used as subjects of this research. Furthermore, because it was felt that the inmates would be subjected to a lengthy testing procedure (Lambert, 1974), ex-convicts on parole rather than incarcerated juveniles were used for the control group.

It has been noted that containment theorists (Dinitz et al., 1962; Donald and Dinitz, 1964; Lively, 1959; Lively et al., 1962; Reckless et al., 1956, 1957; Scarpitti et al., 1960) argue that a 'good' self-concept acts as the insulator against delinquency. Several authors (Jensen, 1972, 1973; Schrag. 1967; Tangri and Schwartz, 1965) have criticized such a conclusion because of the method by which containment theorists measured the self-concept variable. Further objections (Tangri and Schwartz, 1967) have arisen because of the lack of supporting results from

a control group of 'true' delinquents. If the self-concept hypothesis proposed by containment theorists is valid, non-delinquents would be expected to score significantly higher on a standardized measure of self-concept than delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents.

It has been noted also that containment theorists (Reckless, 1961a, 1962, 1967; Reckless and Shoham, 1963) proposed that the non-delinquent's inner-containment is characterized by a high sense of self-conctrol, tolerance, and responsibility. If the proposition outlined above is valid, non-delinquents would be expected to score significantly higher on these measures of inner-containment than delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents.

Containment theorists have defined a 'good' self-concept or sense of inner-direction (Reckless, 1962; Reckless et al., 1956, 1957), inner strength (Reckless, 1962), or inner-self (Dinitz et al., 1962) as the "internal control" that acts as the insulator against delinquency. Although there may be a relationship between the individual's self-concept, as measured by his sense of personal worth, and his degree of internal control, it is proposed that these elements are two separate entities in the psychological repertoire of the individual.

There may be differences in the dynamics behind the characteristic defined as internal control as compared to self-concept. It is proposed that the differentiating factor between the delinquent's and the non-delinquent's inner-containment lies in the area of locus of control (Rotter, 1966) and not in the self-concept. Specifically, the weakness of the delinquent's inner-containment may represent his belief that certain aspects relevant to his behavior are under the control of external forces. Conversely, the strength of the non-delinquent's inner-containment may reflect is belief that gratification of his behaviour is contingent on his own attributes (cf. Rotter, 1966).

If, as suggested above, the non-delinquent is internally controlled and his delinquent counterpart is externally controlled, then an inverse relationship would be expected to exist between locus of control and the remaining elements of inner-containment. Specifically, the non-delinquent's internal locus of control may reflect a high sense of self-control, tolerance, and responsibility. The converse of these relationships may be said to hold for the delinquent.

It has been noted also that norm-containment theory (Reckless, 1962) proposes that the family, as a source of outer-containment, must provide the individual with love and status. Containment theorists (Reckless and Shoham, 1963) suggest that effective outer-containment is associated with the individual's perception of family interaction. Some evidence (Donnenwerth et al, 1973) indicates that delinquent girls differentiate less between the behavior of self and the corresponding parental behavior, and more between the behavior of father and mother than non-delinquent girls. If discrimination between parental behavior is associated with effective outer-containment, non-delinquent males would be expected to perceive their parents more positively than delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents.

The present study examines the degree of inner-outer-containment among non-delinquent prones, delinquent prones, and 'true' delinquents.

METHOD

Subjects

Seventy-two male students, mean age 19.8 years, enrolled in two introductory psychology courses at Lakehead University, volunteered to participate in the study. These Ss formed the original 'compared' population. Each S received one mark toward his final grade for participating in the investigation. The nature of the research was not disclosed when requesting the Ss' participation; Ss were told that disclosing information about the purpose of the study before all the data were collected could bias the results. However, confidentiality was emphasized and the Ss were promised by the investigator that the results and the purpose of the study would be explained upon individual request after the data were collected.

Eighteen male ex-convicts herein referred to as 'true' delinquents, with a mean age of 20.6 years and an average educational level of grade nine, under the care of the John Howard Society were asked by their caseworker to volunteer for the study. These Ss formed the 'comparison' group and each S received $5.00 for his participation. All these Ss had been released from prison where they served sentences ranging from three months to three years on charges of breaking and entering, theft, drug trafficking, assault causing bodily harm, and rape. To ensure confidentiality and the collaboration of these Ss the collection of their data was conducted by the caseworker. The Ss were informed of the purpose of the study

after they completed the questionnaires.

Material

Four measures were obtained: 1) the degree of delinquency proneness (socialization), 2) the degree of inner-containment (self-control, tolerance, and responsibility), 3) the directionality of control (locus of control), and 4) the S's perceptions of relationships in his family (outer-containment).

Delinquency Proneness: The Socialization (So) scale (Appendix C) of Gough's (1969) CPI was used to measure the degree of delinquency proneness. This paper-and-pencil scale consists of 54 items and the S indicates whether he agrees (T) or disagrees (F) with the content of each item. In his manual Gough (1969) has presented the norms for different samples and the information on the validity of the scale. Test-retest correlations for a sample of high school male student and a sample of male prisoners range from .65, over a one year period, for the former group to .80, over 21 days between testing, for the latter sample (Gough 1969, p. 19).

Measures of Inner-containment: Four scales were selected from Gough's (1969) CPI to measure the degree of four elements of inner-containment. The scales used are the Self-acceptance (Sa), the Self-control (Sc), the Tolerance (To), and the Responsibility (Re). Each one of the above variables is encompassed by norm-containment theory as elements of inner-containment; this proposed relationship is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Relationship Between the CPI Scales and the Elements of Inner-containment

CPI SCALES	PURPOSE OF SCALES*	INNER-CONTAINMENT**
Self-acceptance (Sa)	To asses factors such as personal worth, self-acceptance...	Good self-concept, ego strength...
Self-control (Sc)	To assess the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control...	Self-control
Tolerance (To)	To identify persons with permissive, accepting, and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitudes.	High frustration tolerance.
Responsibility (Re)	To identify persons of conscientious, responsible and dependable disposition and temperament.	Well-developed super-ego, high sense of responsibility

*Gough, 1969, p. 10

**Reckless, 1961a, pp. 44-45.

There are 34 items in the Sa scale, 50 items in the Sc scale, 32 items in the To scale, and 42 items in the Re scale. Each scale is of a true-false paper-and-pencil format and the S is asked whether he agrees (T) or disagrees(F) with the content of each item. The questionnaire form in which the scales were administered is presented in Appendix E and the corresponding numbers for the items representing each separate scale are presented in Appendix H.

The norms for different samples and the information on the validity of each scale are presented in the CPI manual (Gough, 1969).

Test-retest correlations for a sample of high school male students and a sample of male prisoners, over a one year period and 21 days interval between testing for each respective sample, range from .67 to .71 in the Sa scale, .75 to .86 in the Sc scale, .71 to .87 in the To scale, and from .65 to .85 in the Re scale (Gough, 1969, p. 19).

Directionality of Control: The Internal-External (I-E) locus of Control Scale (Rotter, 1966) developed from Social Learning Theory (Rotter, 1954) was used to measure the S's locus of control. The I-E scale is a 29-item forced-choice paper-and-pencil test, including 6 buffer items, presented to the S as a Personal Reaction Inventory (Appendix F). The I-E scale measures the degree to which the individual believes that reinforcements of his behavior are contingent on his own attributes. The person who perceives certain events which he regards as reinforcers (i.e., love and status) as the consequence of his own actions is considered as possessing an internal locus of control; whereas the person who feels that reinforcements for his behavior are the result of chance, fate, or powerful others is considered as possessing an external locus of control (Rotter, 1966). According to Rotter's (1954) Social Learning Theory these beliefs, or feelings, can generalize across a variety of situations during the individual's life. A high score on the I-E scale indicates externality and a low score indicates internality.

The reliability measures reported for the I-E scale have been consistent. Rotter (1966) has reported that test-retest correlations

for different samples ranged from .49 to .83 over a one to two month interval. Other study has also reported coefficients ranging from .48 to .84 for a two month interval between test-retest (Hersch and Scheibe, 1967). Rotter (1966) has reported that the correlations of internal consistency estimates have ranged from .65 to .79, with almost all the coefficients in the range of the .70s.

Measures of Outer-containment: A modified version of the Role Behaviour Test (RBT) (Foa, 1966) was used to measure the S's perceptions of his family relationships (See Appendix G). The RBT records eight types of interpersonal behavior in a given role pair as perceived by the person occupying one of the two roles. In the present study the parent-son roles were used and the observer was always the son.

Each type of interpersonal behavior represents the combination of three dichotomous elements or conceptual dimensions. The first dimension is the mode of the behavior--giving or taking--, the second dimension represents the object of the behavior--self or other--and the third dimension represents the resource of the behavior--love or status--(Foa, 1974; Foa and Foa, 1972, 1974).

Table 2 presents the eight types of interpersonal behavior that result from all the possible combinations of the facet elements when one element is taken at a time from each facet (Donnenwerth *et al.*, 1973).

TABLE 2

Facet Design of the Variables of
Interpersonal Behaviors and Meaning of their Items*

Variables (Behaviors)	Facet Design			Meaning of Items
	Mode	Object	Resources	
GSO	Giving	Other	Status	Displays respect for parent
GLO	Giving	Other	Love	Loves parent
GSS	Giving	Self	Status	Relies on himself
GLS	Giving	Self	Love	Feels happy with himself
TSO	Taking	Other	Status	Disrespects parent
TLO	Taking	Other	Love	Dislikes parent
TSS	Taking	Self	Status	Disrespects himself
TLS	Taking	Self	Love	Rejects and blames himself

*After Donnenwerth *et al.*, (1973, p. 146)

Each type of behavior, or each variable, is represented in the test by three statements having similar meaning but expressed in different forms (Foa, 1974). In the present study the test covered the eight types of interpersonal behavior with regard to the S's perceptions of his behavior toward himself and toward his parents. In this instance each statement was followed by the question: "Do you act this way when you are with your father (or mother)? (Donnenwerth *et al.*, 1973, p. 146)". Appendix I presents the numbers of the statements that represented each variable for measuring the S's

perception of his behavior.

Table 3 presents the facet design for the four types of interpersonal behavior that were used to measure the S's perceptions of his parents' behaviors towards him. In this instance each statement was followed by the question: "Does your father (or mother) act this way when he (she) is with you?" (Donnenwerth *et al.*, 1973, p. 146). The numbers of the items that represented the S's perceptions of his parents' behaviors towards him are presented in Appendix J.

TABLE 3

Facet Design of the Variables Representing the S's Perceptions of His Parents' Behaviors towards Him and their Corresponding Meaning*

Variables	Facet Design			Meaning of Items
	Mode	Object	Resource	
GSO	Giving	Other	Status	Parent displays respect for son
GLO	Giving	Other	Love	Parent loves son
TSO	Taking	Other	Status	Parent disrespects son
TLO	Taking	Other	Love	Parent dislikes son

*After Donnenwerth *et al.*, (1973, p. 146).

In each of the above cases the items representing one type of behavior are scattered randomly to minimize sequential effects. The items are semi-projective and the S is not asked if he, or the parent,

behaves, or ever behaved, in a given way but how often his behavior, or his parent's behavior, is, or was, similar to the behavior described by the item (Donnenwerth *et al.*, 1973; Foa, 1966). Each item is answered on a five-point scale (4 to 0) and the score for each type of behavior is the total sum of the weights on the answers chosen by the S on the three items of the corresponding variable (Foa, 1966; 1974).

Although no information has been reported about the validity and reliability of the test, Foa and Foa (1974) have presented the findings provided by numerous studies in which all the reported correlations show the same pattern.

Procedure

The items from the So scale were reproduced in the same sequential order in which they are presented in the CPI (Gough, 1969) and numbered from one to fifty-four. The fifty-four items were then randomly distributed and presented to the Ss as "The Way I Feel" questionnaire with the instructions shown in Appendix C. Added to the instructions of the questionnaire a brief introduction was presented (See Appendix B) and the directions shown in Appendix K were read during each testing session before the Ss started to answer the questionnaire.

"The Way I Feel" questionnaire (So scale) was administered to seventy-two male university students. Three testing sessions were held in order to allow the students to participate in the study without missing any lectures. Twenty-four students were tested in each

session; average testing time was 15 minutes. Those Ss scoring in the upper and in the lower quartile were selected for the remaining part of the research. Thus, there were 18 Ss in the upper quartile and 18 Ss in the lower quartile; the former Ss formed the group of non-delinquent prones and the latter Ss formed the group of delinquent prones

The items from the Sa, Sc, To and Re scales were reproduced separately in the same sequential order in which they are presented in the CPI (Gough, 1969). Following a random distribution of the four scales the items in each scale were sequentially numbered. The corresponding numbers for the items comprising each scale were: To scale items from 1 to 32, items in the Sc scale from 33 to 82, Sa items from 83 to 116, and Re items from 117 to 158. These 158 items corresponding to the four separated scales were randomly distributed and presented to the Ss as a "More About Me" questionnaire with the instructions shown in Appendix E.

Added to the "More About Me" questionnaire, the Social Reaction Inventory (Appendix F) and the Role Behaviour Test (Appendix G), with their respective instructions, were presented to the Ss as one set of questionnaires. This set of questionnaire was accompanied by a brief introduction (See Appendix D).

The non-delinquent prones and the delinquent prones were administered the set of questionnaire described above during three testing sessions. The directions presented in Appendix K were read during each session before the Ss started to answer the questionnaires; average testing time was one hour and thirty minutes per session.

The eighteen ex-convicts forming the group of 'true' delinquents were tested individually as they reported to the John Howard Society for their monthly assessments. Each one of these Ss was administered all the questionnaires described above during one testing session. The directions presented in Appendix K were read to each S by the caseworker before they answered the questionnaires. Average testing time was two hours and forty-five minutes.

RESULTS

Delinquency Proneness

The mean scores on the delinquency proneness scale (So) are presented in Table 4. Analysis of variance (Appendix L) indicated that the three means were significantly different (F = 128.21, df = 2/51, p <.001).

TABLE 4

Mean Scores on the Delinquency Proneness (So) CPI Scale

Group	Non-delinquent Prones (N = 18)	Delinquent Prones (N = 18)	'True' Delinquents (N = 18)	
$\bar{X}$	40.50	25.33	19.11	F = 128.21

Newman-Keuls comparisons (Appendix M) revealed that the mean score for the non-delinquent prones was significantly different than the delinquent prones' mean score (p <.01), and the 'true' delinquents' mean score (p <.01). The mean scores of the delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents were also significantly different from each other (p <.01).

The mean of the non-delinquent prones is consistent with the mean ($\bar{X}$= 36.8) from a sample of 1133 male college students reported by Gough (1969, p.34). The mean of the 'true' delinquents is smaller than the mean ($\bar{X}$= 29.0) presented by Gough for a group of 142 male delinquents.

These results seem to suggest that the scores on the So scale indicated different degrees of delinquency proneness among the three groups.

Measures of Inner-containment

Table 5 presents the mean scores on the CPI scales that were used as measures of inner-containment.

TABLE 5

Mean Scores on Measures of Inner-containment: Self-acceptance (Sa), Self-control (Sc), Tolerance (To), and Responsibility (Re) Scales of the CPI

Group	Non-delinquent Prones (N = 18)	Delinquent Prones (N = 18)	'True' Delinquents (N = 18)	
Scale	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$	F
Sa	19.88	19.33	18.11	.09
Sc	27.11	19.33	17.66	9.81
To	19.05	17.00	14.44	3.25
Re	28.88	27.77	16.38	33.23

Analysis of variance performed on each independent measure revealed that while the groups' mean scores on the Sa scale did not differ significantly (F = .09, df = 2/51, p >.05; Appendix N), the groups' mean scores on the Sc scale (F = 9.81, df - 2/51, p <.001; Appendix O), on the To scale (F = 3.25, df - 2/51, p <.05; Appendix P), and on the Re scale (F = 33.23, df = 2/51, p <.001; Appendix Q) were significantly different.

Newman-Keuls comparisons (Appendix R) revealed that on the Sc scale the mean score of the non-delinquent prones differed significantly from the mean scores of the delinquent prones ($p < .01$) and the 'true' delinquents ($p < .01$). The mean scores of the delinquent prones and the 'true' delinquents were not significantly different.

Newman-Keuls comparisons (Appendix S) revealed also that on the To scale the non-delinquent prones' mean score was significantly different from that of the 'true' delinquent ($p < .05$). However, the mean scores of the non-delinquent prones and of the delinquent prones did not differ significantly. Nor was there a significant difference between the mean scores of the delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents.

Newman-Keuls comparisons were also computed for the mean scores on the Re scale (Appendix T). The non-delinquent prones' mean score was significantly different from that of the delinquent prones ($p < .01$) and also from that of the 'true' delinquents ($p < .01$). The mean scores of the delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents were also significantly different ($p < .01$).

The mean scores presented in Table 5 are consistent with those reported by Gough (1969) in the CPI manual. While the Sc, To, and Re mean scores for the non-delinquent prones are very similar to those that Gough (1969, p. 34) presents for a sample

of 1133 male college students (Sc, $\bar{X}$= 27.6; To, $\bar{X}$= 23.3; Re, $\bar{X}$= 30.8), the Sa mean score for the non-delinquent prones is significantly smaller than the mean score ($\bar{X}$= 37.3) reported by Gough for the male college students.

A similar trend to that outlined above appears in comparing the Sa, Sc, To, and Re mean scores for the delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents with those provided by Gough (1969) for a sample of 142 male young delinquents. In fact, the mean scores for the 'true' delinquents are smaller than those (Sa, $\bar{X}$= 18.4; Sc, $\bar{X}$= 26.2; To, $\bar{X}$= 16.3; Re, $\bar{X}$= 23.9) presented by Gough (1969, p. 34) for the sample mentioned above.

The above results suggest that the measures of self-control, tolerance, and responsibility were better discriminators between the non-delinquent prones' and the delinquent prones' elements of inner-containment than the self-concept variable.

Directionality of Control

The groups' mean scores on the I-E locus of control scale are

presented in Table 6. Analysis of variance (Appendix U) revealed that the groups' mean scores were significantly different (F = 1707, df = 2/51, p <.001).

TABLE 6

Mean Scores on the I-E Locus of Control Scale

Group	Non-delinquent Prones (N = 18)	Delinquent Prones (N = 18)	'True' Delinquents (N = 18)	
$\bar{X}$	10.38	11.05	14.72	F = 17.07

Newman-Keuls comparisons (Appendix V) indicated that the mean score for the group of non-delinquent prones did not differ significantly from the delinquent prones' mean score. The 'true'delinquents' mean score was significantly different from that of the non-delinquent prones (p <.01) and also from the delinquent prones' mean score (p <.01).

The results on the I-E locus of control scale suggest that the 'true' delinquent is more externally controlled than his non-delinquent prone and delinquent prone counterparts.

Correlations

The Pearson product-moment coefficients (Ferguson, 1971) correlating the measures that containment theorists proposed as elements of

inner-containment with the degree of delinquency proneness are presented in Table 7

TABLE 7

Correlates of Inner-containment
(Self-acceptance, Self-control, tolerance, and Responsibility)
with the Degree of Delinquency Proneness (Socialization)[a]

Scale		Sa	Sc	To	Re
	Group				
So	Non-delinquent Prones	.45	.87*	.85*	.87*
	Delinquent Prones	-.43	.17	.02	-.06
	'True Delinquents	-.19	-.21	-.17	-.25

[a]N = 18 Ss per group.

*$p < .001$

Although none of the correlations between self-concept (Sa) and delinquency proneness (So) were significant, the coefficients are in the direction that might be predicted by containment theorists: positive for the non-delinquent prones and negative for the 'true' delinquent. The correlations between the remaining elements of inner-containment (Sc, To, and Re) and delinquency proneness show the same trend; however, significant coefficients are found among the non-delinquent prones only.

Table 8 presents the Pearson correlations of inner-containment with self-concept and directionality of control.

TABLE 8

Correlates of Inner-Containment
(Self-control, Tolerance, and Responsibility)
With Self-acceptance and Directionality of Control[a]

Scale	Group	Sa	I-E
Sc	Non-delinquent Prones	.52*	-.71***
	Delinquent Prones	.20	-.40
	'True' Delinquents	-.12	-.23
To	Non-delinquent Prones	.43	-.62**
	Delinquent Prones	.05	-.04
	'True' Delinquents	.04	-.87***
Re	Non-delinquent Prones	.52*	-.79***
	Delinquent Prones	.45	-.45
	'True' Delinquents	-.37	-.79***

[a]N = 18 Ss per group.

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

***$p < .001$

The correlations presented in Table 8 are of a theoretically consistent direction. However, while most of the coefficients for both non-delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents are statistically significant in the case of inner-containment and the I-E locus of control relationships, the opposite is found in the correlations between inner-containment and the self-concept measure.

It should be noted that the correlations presented above are consistent with those reported in a previous study (Hersch and Scheibe, 1967). Hersch and Scheibe (1967) found a significant negative relationship between I-E scores and scores on the Sc, To, and Re scales ($r = -.20$, $p < .01$, $N = 446$; $r = -.31$, $p < .01$, $N = 446$; and $r = -.28$, $p < .01$, $N = 446$) when college volunteers working on mental institutions were tested.

Although the direction of the above results suggest that delinquency proneness seems to be related to the self-concept, it should be noted that this relationship is not reliable enough to draw the causal implications proposed by containment theorists. The present findings indicate also, as predicted, that inner-containment is more related to locus of control than to the self-concept. Thus, the present study indicates that the self-concept hypothesis held by containment theorists may be an extreme position.

Discussion

The results of the present investigation indicate that self-control, tolerance, and responsibility are some of the 'self-factors' which contribute to the strength of the non-delinquent's inner-containment. Conversely, these self-factors do not seem to be important in the inner-containment of delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents.

The present finding that non-delinquent prones, delinquent prones, and 'true' delinquents have an equal sense of personal

worth (self-concept) is inconsistent with the notion (Dinitz et al., 1962; Reckless, 1962; Reckless et al., 1956, 1957) that criminal behavior is the result of a 'poor' self-concept. These findings are also inconsistent with the hypothesized relationship (Dinitz et al., 1962; Reckless, 1962, 1967) between inner-containment and the self-concept. The findings presented here indicate that the relationship between inner-containment and locus of control is stronger than the association between inner-containment and the self-concept. Nevertheless, the notions that containment theorists hold about the non-delinquent's inner-direction of control seems to be valid according to the perspective outlined above.

Consistent with the line of reasoning advanced by containment theorists the present study indicates that the non-delinquent's and the delinquent's inner-containment is negatively related to their locus (directionality) of control.

It may be concluded that the present results support the inner-containment hypotheses advanced by containment theorists.

Measures of Outer-containment

The results of the Role Behaviour Test were analyzed using a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Ferguson, 1971) between the variables examined. Foa (1968) and Foa and Foa (1974) have stated that the analysis of the interrelationships among variables related to cognitive structure (e.g., Role Behaviour Test variables) provides more information about perceptual differences than a means comparison because "cognition indicates the relationship between ... how one event is 'caused' by another" (Foa and Foa, 1974, p.5).

Accordingly, lower differentiation in perceptions is reflected by high correlations. This rationale is supported by empirical evidence presented in Foa (1966) and Foa and Foa (1974).

Table 9 presents the correlations between the S's perception of his behavior towards his parents (giving to and taking away love and status from each parent) and his perception of the corresponding parental behaviors toward him. As can be seen, most of the correlations for the three groups were significant at the .05 level or better. It can also be seen in Table 9 that most of the correlations were lower for the non-delinquent prones than for the delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents. Testing the significance of each correlation pair separately (Appendix W) showed that on those combinations involving the father, the coefficients for the non-delinquent prones on the GLO (Z = -2.19, df = 16, p <.05) and on the TLO (Z = -2.81, df = 16, p <.01) variables were significantly different from those of the 'true' delinquents. The remaining correlation pairs involving the father did not differ significantly None of the correlation pairs involving the mother were statistically different.

The correlations between the S's perception of his behavior towards himself with his perception of each parent's behavior towards him presented in Table 10 show a similar trend. In this analysis, too, most of the correlations for the three groups were statistically significant at the .05 level or better and also lower for the non-delinquent prones. The significance of each correlation pair tested

TABLE 9

Correlations Between Perceived S's Behaviors Towards Parents and the Corresponding Parental Behaviors Towards Him

Correlated Variables (Behaviors)	GROUP		
	Non-delinquent Prones (N = 18)	Delinquent Prones (N = 18)	'True' Delinquents (N = 18)
GSO: Son gives status to father and father gives status to son	.39	.66**	.79***
GLO: Son gives love to father and father gives love to son	.58**	.69**	.89**
TSO: Son takes status from father and father takes status from son	.65**	.82***	.86***
TLO: Son takes love from father and father takes love from son	.46	.73***	.90***
GSO: Son gives status to mother and mother gives status to son	.43	.57*	.74***
GLO: Son gives love to mother and mother gives love to son	.61**	.55*	.66**
TSO: Son takes status from mother and mother takes status from son	.69**	.82***	.84***
TLO: Son takes love from mother and mother takes love from son	.42	.68**	.75***

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

***$p < .001$

TABLE 10

Correlations Between Perceived S's Behaviors Towards Self and the Corresponding Parental Behaviors Towards Him

Correlated Variables (Behaviors)	GROUP		
	Non-delinquent Prones (N = 18)	Delinquent Prones (N = 18)	'True' Delinquents (N = 18)
GSS & GSO: Son gives status to self and father gives status to son	.57*	.66**	.79***
GLS & GLO: Son gives love to self and father gives love to son	.58**	.56*	.89***
TSS & TSO: Son takes status from self and father takes status from son	.65**	.82***	.86***
TLS & TLO: Son takes love from self and father takes love from son	.59**	.48*	.90***
GSS & GSO: Son gives status to self and mother gives status to son	.43	.57*	.74***
GLS & GLO: Son gives love to self and mother gives love to son	.25	.58**	.66**
TSS & TSO: Son takes status from self and mother takes status from son	.09	.22	.38
TLS & TLO: Son takes love from self and mother takes love from son	.27	.31	.19

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

***$p < .001$

separately (Appendix X) showed that on those combinations involving the father the non-delinquents' coefficients on the GLS (Z = -2.19, df = 16, p <.05) and on the TLS (Z = -2.29, df = 16, p <.05) variables were significantly different from those of the 'true' delinquents. The differences between the delinquent prones' and the 'true' delinquents' correlations on the GLS (Z = -2.27, df = 16, p <.05) and on the TLS (Z = -2.73, df = 16, p <.01) combinations were statistically significant also. The remaining correlation differences involving the father did not reach statistical significance. Again, none of the correlation pairs involving the mother differed significantly.

The above results indicate that the non-delinquent prone perceives more differentiation between the behaviors of self towards the parents and the corresponding parental behaviors toward the self, as compared to the delinquent prone and the 'true' delinquent. These results indicate also that the perceptions between the individual's behaviors toward the self and the corresponding behaviors of the parents towards him are more differentiated by the non-delinquent prone than by the delinquent prone and the 'true' delinquent. These differential discriminations of perceived behaviors seem to be less pronounced when the parent concerned is the mother. The data which follow point in the same direction

Table 11 presents the correlations between the S's perceptions of the behavior of father and the behavior of mother towards him.

TABLE 11

Correlates of S's Perceptions of Father's and Mother's Behaviors Towards Him[a]

Variable (Behavior)	GROUP		
	Non-delinquent Prones	Delinquent Prones	'True' Delinquent
GSO	.36	.36	.33
GLO	.49*	.03	.47*
TLO	.18	.42	.41
TSO	.56*	.03	.02

[a]N = 18 Ss per group

*$p < .05$

It can be seen in Table 11 that most of the correlations did not reach significance but that they were higher for the non-delinquent prones. Testing each correlation pair separately (Appendix Y) showed that none of the differences were statistically significant. Nevertheless, the above correlations suggest that the non-delinquent prone perceives less differentiation between the behavior of father and the behavior of mother towards him than the delinquent prone and 'true' delinquent. These results may be a reflection of the effects that early conditions of family interaction have in shaping the cognition of the individual.

Discussion

The finding that delinquents perceive their relationship with their parents more negatively than non-delinquents is consistent with other studies (Deitz, 1969; Donnenwerth et al., 1973; Teichman, 1971) in which the association between delinquency and perceptions of early conditions of family interaction was examined. Thus, the present research supports the notion (Dinitz et al., 1958; Reckless and Shoham, 1963; Reckless et al., 1956, 1957) that discrimination between the behaviors of father and mother towards the self seems to be associated with effective outer-containment.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to test the validity of the hypotheses stated by norm-containment theory (Reckless, 1961a, 1962, 1967; Reckless and Shoham, 1963) in the explanation of criminal behavior. Evidence has been presented supporting most of the theory's propositions about the circumstances under which some sociopsychological elements may facilitate or inhibit involvement in criminal activities.

The relevance that norm-containment theory has for the explanation of criminal conduct will be discussed from two points of view. Norm-containment theory may be useful in explaining the conditions of some of the internal controls (inner-containment) exercised by the individual over himself and how the development of these controls may be related to certain environmental circumstances (outer-containment) to which the person is exposed. The interplay between inner-outer-containments may prevent, or facilitate, deviations from social and legal norms.

Inner-containment may be viewed as the relationship between a conglomeration of elements operating in the person's psychological repertoire. Criminal behavior may be related to one or more of the following psychological elements: (a) sense of personal worth or self-concept, (b) degree of self-regulation or self-control, (c) tolerance of particular experiences that the person encounters in life, (d) the sense of responsibility that the individual feels over the consequences of his actions, or (e) a combination of the three latter elements (locus of control).

Since norm-containment theory holds that inner-containment prevents deviation from the social and legal norms (Reckless, 1962), the degree of inner-containment would be expected to vary between non-delinquent prones, delinquent prones, and 'true' delinquents.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to test the validity of the hypotheses stated by norm-containment theory (Reckless, 1961a, 1962, 1967; Reckless and Shoham, 1963) in the explanation of criminal behavior. Evidence has been presented supporting most of the theory's propositions about the circumstances under which some sociopsychological elements may facilitate or inhibit involvement in criminal activities.

The relevance that norm-containment theory has for the explanation of criminal conduct will be discussed from two points of view. Norm-containment theory may be useful in explaining the conditions of some of the internal controls (inner-containment) exercised by the individual over himself and how the development of these controls may be related to certain environmental circumstances (outer-containment) to which the person is exposed. The interplay between inner-outer-containments may prevent, or facilitate, deviations from social and legal norms.

Inner-containment may be viewed as the relationship between a conglomeration of elements operating in the person's psychological repertoire. Criminal behavior may be related to one or more of the following psychological elements: (a) sense of personal worth or self-concept, (b) degree of self-regulation or self-control, (c) tolerance of particular experiences that the person encounters in life, (d) the sense of responsibility that the individual feels over the consequences of his actions, or (e) a combination of the three latter elements (locus of control).

Since norm-containment theory holds that inner-containment prevents deviation from the social and legal norms (Reckless, 1962), the degree of inner-containment would be expected to vary between non-delinquent prones, delinquent prones, and 'true' delinquents.

Previous studies have indicated that when measured with the Semantic Differential Test (Deitz, 1969) or the Bills Index of Adjustment and Values (Teichman, 1971) the delinquent's self-concept does not differ from the self-concept of the non-delinquent. The very fact that in the present study the self-concept of the 'true'delinquent and the delinquent prone did not differ from that of the non-delinquent prone indicates that the notion that a 'poor' self-concept provides the individual with a motive force to indulge in criminal behavior (Dinitz et al., 1962; Reckless, 1961a, 1961b, 1962, 1967; Reckless and Dinitz, 1967; Reckless and Shoham, 1963; Scarpetti et al., 1960) lacks support in the existing literature. Thus, to argue that future criminality can be determined on the basis of the individual's responses to measures of self-concept seems to be irrelevant and, perhaps, detrimental for the development of adequate programs of prevention against crime.

Although the hypothesis that norm-containment theorists (Reckless, 1961a, 1962, 1967; Reckless and Shoham, 1963) propose about the delinquent's lack of self-control is not a novel proposition in the study of criminal behavior, the present investigation supports the notion that delinquents possess less sense of self-control than non-delinquents. The finding of the present research is consistent with previous studies indicating that delinquents show less self-control, or are more impulsive, than non-delinquents (Miller, 1969; Nye, 1958; Peterson et al., 1959; Reiss, 1951; Tiffany et al., 1961). Thus,the present study suggests that a measure of self-control may be a useful criterion for predicting the way in which an individual would react to certain social situations or to some illegal temptations.

Further support for the inner-containment hypotheses is provided by the present finding indicating that non-delinquent prones are more tolerant than 'true' delinquents. The present evidence is consistent with other investigations (Berkowitz, 1962; Peterson et al., 1959; Wirt and Briggs, 1959), denoting that because of his low tolerance or non-accepting social attitude the delinquent

behaves in a socially unacceptable and aggressive manner. The present study indicates, however, that tolerance, at least in terms of the measure used here, is not a differentiating element of inner-containment when comparing non-delinquent prones with delinquent prones or the latter group with 'true' delinquents. Thus, the relevance that tolerance may have for the explanation of criminal behavior seems unclear at this point. However, in the discussion to follow it is assumed that the individual's tolerance is relevant for the explanation of criminal behavior when its relationship with other element of inner-containment (e.g., locus of control) is taken into consideration.

Additional support for the inner-containment hypotheses has been provided by the finding of the present study indicating that delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents have less sense of responsibility than their non-delinquent prone counterparts. The present indication that the behavior of the non-delinquent seems to be characterized by a high sense of responsibility is consistent with other studies (Dinitz et al., 1958, 1962; Jensen, 1973; Peterson et al., 1959; Reckless et al., 1957; Simpson et al., 1960) suggesting that the non-delinquent feels responsible for the consequences of his behavior.

Thus, the present study indicates that with the exception of the self-concept hypothesis, the remaining inner-containment propositions that Reckless' theory (Reckless, 1961a, 1961b, 1962, 1967) advances in its explanation of criminal behavior are valid assumptions. Specifically, the findings reported here indicate that non-delinquents differ more from delinquents on the measures of self-control, tolerance, and responsibility than on the self-concept variable.

The above indication does not imply that the present study has provided evidence indicating that it could be safely predicted that the individual who lacks self-control, tolerance, or responsibility would become a criminal. However, as it will be noted in the remaining part of this paper, the findings of the present research indicate that these elements of inner-containment might

vary together among delinquents and non-delinquents.

The very fact that in the present research the non-delinquent prone differed significantly from the delinquent prone and 'true' delinquent not only on the measures of self-control, tolerance, and responsibility but also in the directionality of locus of control is indicative of the variation that may be expected between the elements of inner-containment. The present finding indicating that the elements of inner-containment are significantly related to the non-delinquent prone's and the'true' delinquent's locus of control in the direction predicted is consistent with a growing number of investigations, notably Hersch and Scheibe's (1976) study reporting a significant negative correlation between the Sc, To, and Re CPI scales and the I-E scale, Williams and Vantress' (1969) research indicating a positive correlation between locus of control and the self-control scale from The Buss-Surkee Hostility Inventory, and other evidence (James, Woodruff, and Werner, 1965; Miller, 1969; Straits and Sechrest, 1963) suggesting that internals possess more control of their impulses.

The evidence presented here indicates that delinquents have expectancies of external control. Because a substantial relationship has been found to exist between I-E locus of control and the independent measures of self-control, responsibility, and tolerance, a 'locus of control hypothesis' seems to be an adequate proposition for investigating the inner-containment of delinquent and non-delinquent prones. In other words, to concentrate our attention on the delinquent's locus of control rather than on his degree of self-control, responsibility, and tolerance may prove to be a more useful approach for the understanding of delinquency.

Theoretically speaking it could be argued that the reciprocity discussed above may be due to the possibility that the development of self-control, tolerance, responsibility, and locus of control is partly related to early conditions

of outer-containment (cf. Miller, 1969; Rotter, 1954). Thus, outer-containment may be viewed as the dynamics of family relationships that may directly, or indirectly, influence the development of the person's internal controls.

Evidence has been presented to show that the quality of family interaction from the individual's own viewpoint and from his perceived parental viewpoints is described more negatively by delinquent prones and 'true' delinquents than by non-delinquent prones. These findings are consistent with other studies (Deitz, 1969; Donnenwerth et al., 1973) indicating that the delinquent differentiates less between his own behavior and the corresponding parental behavior, and more between the behavior of father and mother than the non-delinquent. On the other hand, those studies (Lazowick, 1955; Sopchak, 1952) suggesting that for the male the father rather than the mother is the main reinforcing agent of internal controls have been supported by the present research. A previous study (Donnenwerth et al., 1973) in which the Role Behavior Test was used to measure the perception of family relationships among delinquent and non-delinquent girls has reported similar findings to those presented here. Thus, the present research indicates that the Role Behavior Test may also be used as an indicator of the quality of relationships that characterizes the family of the delinquent and of the non-delinquent male.

The present investigation supports the propositions stated by norm-containment theory (Reckless, 1961a, 1961b, 1962, 1967; Reckless and Shohams, 1963) in reference to the influence that outer-containment (family relationships) has in the development of inner-containment (internal controls). Interestingly enough, the present results suggesting an association between the individual's inner-containment and his perception of the relationship between him and his parents are consistent with other investigations (Bandura and Walters, 1959; Bennett, 1960; McCord et al., 1959; Peterson and Becker, 1965) indicating that the conditions of family interaction are crucial in shaping the behavior

and cognition of the delinquent individual. The reciprocity between inner-outer containment emphasized in the preceding discussion has been summarized in Gibbens and Ahrenfeldt's (1966) observation that

> Erratic or inconsistent behavior by parents is one of the causes of extremely patchy internalization of controls. Anxiety about the varied consequences of behavior, or fear that things may go wrong for no detectable reason,...may give rise to the impulsiveness and inability to postpone the immediate satisfaction of desires that are so characteristic of the delinquent. Life has taught him that if a chance of present satisfaction is postponed, it may not recur; promises of rewards in the future are not fulfilled. Delinquents have also been taught to show...an inadequate understanding of the future consequences of behavior...Great insecurity, and an inability to feel safe in the present, may restrict the delinquent's attention to a constant watchfulness on the present. In order to relieve anxiety, he commonly takes refuge in...a philosophy that everything is a matter of good luck or bad luck, that there are no regularities or reliable expectations. (pp. 76-77).*

Thus, another interesting indication derived from the present investigation is that treatment by parents, as reported by non-delinquents and delinquents, seems to be related to the development of the attitudes of internal-external locus of control. The above indication supports Rotter's (1966) suggestion that unpredictable parents would encourage the development of an external locus of control. This suggestion is also consistent with the notion (Rotter, 1954) that love, status, and dependence are some of the psychological goals that determine the importance of family relationships as reinforcing agents of desirable behaviors.

On the basis of the suggestions outlined above, Reckless et al.'s (1962) assertion that the importance of inner-direction lies in the fact that it allows the person to reach middle class values must be rejected because it denies the fact that the delinquent does have values of his own. Although the delinquent's values may be different from those held by his middle class counterpart, they are, nevertheless, the values which he has acquired through his process of socialization (cf. Rotter, 1954).

---

*Emphasis added.

In summary, the present research indicates that in the study of crime, behavior should be considered as a construct that represents the way in which a "unified, complexly organized person" (Rotter, 1954; p. 82) reacts to his environment according to his past experiences. Although most of the results presented here are great enough to reach statistical significance and allow one to make differentiations about the degree of inner-outer containment among non-delinquent prones, delinquent prones, and 'true' delinquents, it should be stressed that such differences are a matter of degree rather than specific characteristics of the delinquent individual. However, the practical implications of the present findings in reference to the hypotheses held by norm-containment theory can only be determined by future research.

Some Suggestions for Future Research

Because the above investigation has suggested a 'locus of control' hypothesis of inner-containment, future research in the relationship between the I-E locus of control scale and a variety of independent measures of self-control, tolerance, and responsibility might be useful in determining whether the I-E scale alone is a valid indicator of the non-delinquent's and of the delinquent's degree of inner-containment.

Since the above study has indicated that the development of inner-containment is influenced by the quality of family relationships, investigations focusing on the association between the directionality of control of parents and that of their non-delinquent and delinquent offsprings might be useful for clarifying the dynamics behind the development of locus of control. It would be expected that internally-controlled parents would foster the development of internal-control among their children; conversely, externally-controlled parents would foster the development of children with attitudes of external control.

Another possibility for future research would be to develop programs of crime prevention based on the modification of locus of control. A behavior modification, or behavioral counselling, program geared towards modifying the locus of control could be developed for a group of externally-controlled youngsters. A comparison rate of future delinquency and changes in the locus of control could be used as an index of the effectiveness of the program.

Further possibility for future research is found in the development of programs of rehabilitation geared towards modifying the delinquent's attitude of external locus of control. Specifically, incarcerated individual's could receive counselling to encourage the development of internal locus of control. Upon release from prison a follow-up could be conducted and a comparison rate of recidivism and changes in locus of control could be used as an indicator of the usefulness of the program.

REFERENCES

Adler, A. What Life Should Mean to You. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1931.

Ainsworth, M. The effects of maternal deprivation: A review of findings and controversy in the context of research strategy. World Health Organization, Public Health Papers, 1962, No. 14.

Alexander, F. and Shapiro, L. Neuroses, behavior disorders, and perversions. In F. Alexander and H. Ross (Eds.), Dynamic Psychiatry. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1952.

Anderson, R. Where's dad? Paternal deprivation and delinquency. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1968, 18, pp. 641-649.

Andry, R. Delinquency and Parental Pathology: A Study in Forensic and Clinical Psychology. London: Melturen, 1960.

Argyle, M. A new approach to the classification of delinquents with implications for treatment. California Board of Corrections, 1961, Monograph No. 2, pp. 15-26

Ball, J. Delinquent and non-delinquent attitudes toward the prevalence of stealing. The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1957, 48, pp. 259-274

Bandura, A., and Walters, R. Dependency conflicts in aggressive delinquents. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14, pp. 52-65.

Adolescent Aggression. New York: Ronald, 1959.

Barnes, H., and Teeters, N. New Horizons in Criminology. (Revised Edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959.

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

Bennett, I. Delinquent and Neurotic Children. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Berkowitz, L. Aggression: A Social Psychological Analysis. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.

Bordua, D. Juvenile delinquency and 'anomie an attempt at replication. Social Problems, 1959, 6, pp. 230-238.

Borgestroem, C. Eine serie von kriminellen zwillingen. Archiv von Rassenbiologie, 1939. In J. Cortes and F. Gatti. Delinquency and Crime. A Biopsycho-social Approach. New York: Seminar Press, 1972.

Bowlby, J. Forty-Four Juvenile Thieves: Their Character and Home Life. London: Bailliere, Trindall and Cox, 1947.

Bowlby, J. Research into the origins of delinquent behavior. British Medical Journal, 1950, 1, pp. 570-573.

Bowlby, J. Maternal care and mental health. Bulletin World Health Organization, 1951, 3, pp. 355-534.

Burgess, R., and Akers, R. A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior. Social Problems, 1966, 14, pp. 128-147.

Casey, M., Segall, L., Street, D., and Blank, C. Sex Chromosome abnormailites in two state hospitals for patients requiring special security. Nature, 1966, 209, pp. 641-642.

Chilton, R. Continuity in delinquency area research: a comparison of studies for Baltimore, Detroit, and Indiannapolis. American Sociological Review, 1964, 29, pp. 71-83.

Chilton, R., and Markle, G. Family disruption, delinquent conduct and the effect of subclassification. American Sociological Review, 1972, 37, pp. 93-99.

Christiansen, K. Cited by N. Walker, Crime and Punishment in Britain. (Rev. ed.). Edinburgh: University Press, 1968.

Cloward, R., and Ohlin, L. Delinquency and Opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. Glencoe: Free Press, 1960.

Cohen, A. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gangs. New York Free Press, 1956.

Cole, L., and Hall, I. Psychology of Adolescence. (6th Ed.) New York: Holt, 1966.

Conger, J., Miller, W., and Walsmith, C. Antecedents of delinquency: Personality, social class, and intelligence. In P. Mussen, J. Conger, and J. Kagan (Ed.), Readings in Child Development and Personality. (2nd, Ed.). New York: Harper, 1970, pp. 565-588.

Court Brown, W., Price, W., and Jacobs, P. The XYY male. British Medical Journal, 1968, 4, p. 513.

Cortes, J., and Gatti, F. Delinquency and Crime. A Biopsychosocial Approach. New York: Seminar Press, 1972.

Daly, R. Neurological abnormalities in XYY males. Nature, 1969, 221 p. 472.

Davis, F. Law as a type of social control. In F. Davis, H. Foster, C. Jefferey, and E. Davis. (Ed.), Society and the Law. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Deitz, G. A comparison of delinquents and non-delinquents on self-concept, self-acceptance, and parental identification. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1969, 115, pp. 285-295.

DeFleur, M., Quinney, R. A reformulation of Sutherland's differential association theory and strategy for empirical verification. The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1966, 3(1), pp. 1-22.

Dinitz, S., Reckless, W., and Kay, B. A self gradient among potential delinquents. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1958, 49, pp. 230-233.

Dinitz, S., Scarpitti, F., and Reckless, W. Delinquency vulnerability: A cross group and longitudinal analysis. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, pp. 315-317.

Donald, E., and Dinitz, S. Self-concept and delinquency proneness. Interdisciplinary Problems in Criminology: Papers of the American Society of Criminology, 1964.

Donnenwerth, G., Teichman, M., and Foa, V. Cognitive differentiation of self and parents in delinquent and non-delinquent girls. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 12, pp. 144-152.

Durkheim, E. The Rules of Sociological Method. G. Catlin (Ed.) Chicago: Uniersity of Chicago Press, 1938.

Eissler, K. (Ed.) Searchlights on Delinquency. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1949.

Erickson, M, and LaMar, E. Class position, peers, and delinquency. Sociology and Social Research, 1965, 49, pp. 268-282.

Eron, L. Relationship of TV viewing habits and aggressive behavior in children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, pp. 193-196.

Estabrook, A. The Jukes in 1915. Washington: Carnagie Institute, 1916.

Estabrook, A., and Davenport, C. The Nam Family. Lancaster, Pa.: New Era Publishing Co., 1912.

Eysenck, H. Crime and Personality. Boston: Houghton, 1964.

Eysenck, S., and Eysenck, H. Crime and personality: an empirical study of the three-factor theory. British Journal of Criminology, 1970, 10, pp. 225-239.

Eysenck, S., and Eysenck, H. Crime and personality: item analysis of questionnaire responses. British Journal of Criminology, 11, 1971a, pp. 49-62.

Eysenck, S., and Eysenck, H. A comparative study of criminals and matched controls on three dimensions of personality. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1971b, 10, pp. 362-366.

Ferentz, E. Mental deficiency and crime. Journal of Criminal Law, 1954, 45(3), pp. 299-307.

Ferguson, G. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Ferris, E. Criminal Sociology. (English Ed., Abridged) New York: Appleton, 1896.

Ferri, E. Criminal Sociology (Fourth Ed.). Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1917.

Foa, V. Perception of behavior in reciprocal roles: the ringex model. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 1966, 80(5), pp. 1-21.

Foa, V. Three kinds of behavioral changes. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, pp. 460-473.

Foa, V. Personal communication, 1974.

Foa, V., and Foa, E. Resource exchange toward a structural theory of interpersonal communication. In A. Goldstein and L. Krasner (Ed.), Studies in Dyadic Communication. New York: Pergamon Press, 1972.

Foa, V., and Foa, E. Societal Structures of the Mind. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publishing, 1974.

Foster, J., Dinitz, S., and Reckless, W. Perceptions of stigma following public intervention for delinquent behavior. Social Problems, 1972, 21(3), pp. 202-209.

Frease, D. Delinquency, social class, and the schools. Sociology and Social Research, 1973, 57(4), pp. 443-419.

Friedlander, K. The Psycho-Analytic Approach to Juvenile Delinquency. New York: International Universities Press, 1947.

Freud, S. Some character-types met in psycho-analytical work. In Collected Papers. New York and London: International Psycho-analytic Press, Vol. IV, 1925.

Garofalo, R. Criminology. (American Ed.). Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1914.

Gibbens, T., and Ahrenfeldt, R. Cultural Factors in Delinquency. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1966.

Gibbens, D. Society, Crime, and Criminal Careers. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1968 and 1970.

Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. Physique and Delinquency. New York: Harper, 1950.

Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. Delinquents in the Making: Paths to Prevention. New York: Harper and Row Co., 1952.

Goddard, H. The Kallikah Family. New York: the Macmillan Co., 1912.

Goddard, H. Feeblemindedness: Its Causes and Consequences. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914.

Goodman, R., Smith, W., and Migeon, C. Sex Chromosome abnormalities. Nature, 1967, 216, pp. 942-943.

Gold, M. Undetected delinquent behavior. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1966, 3, pp. 27-46.

Gordon, R. Issues in the ecological study of delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, pp. 927-944.

Goring, C. The English Convict: A Statistical Study. London: H.M.S.O., 1913.

Gough, H. California Psychological Inventory. (CPI; Manual). Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1969.

Gregory, I. Anterospective data following childhood loss of parent. Digest Neurological Psychiatry, 1965, p. 400.

Griffiths, A., and Zaremba, J. Crime and sex chromosome anomalies. British Medical Journal, 1967, 4, p. 622.

Grygier, T., Chesley, J., and Tuters, E. Parental deprivation: a study of delinquent children. The British Journal of Criminology, 1969, 9(3), pp. 209-253.

Hartung, F. Methodological assumption in a social-psychological theory of criminality. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1955, 45, pp. 652-661.

Haskell, M., and Yablonski, L. Crime and Delinquency. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1971.

Hathaway, S., and Monachesi, E. The M.M.P.I. in the study of juvenile delinquents. In A. Rose (Ed.). Mental Health and Mental Disorder. London: Routledge ane Kegom Paul, 1956.

Hersch, P., and Scheibe, K. Reliability and validity of internal-external control as a personality dimension. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31(6), pp. 609-613.

Hoghughi, M., and Forrest, A. Eysenck's theory of criminality. British Journal of Criminology, 1970, 10(3), pp. 240-254.

Hook, E. Behavioral implications of the human XYY genotype. Science, 1973, 179, pp. 139-150.

Jacobs, P., Brunton, M., Melville, M., Brittain, R., and McClemont, W. Aggressive behavior, mental subnormality, and the XYY male. Nature, 1965, 208, pp. 1351-1352.

James, W., Woodruff, A., and Werner, W. Effect of internal and external control upon changes in smoking behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, pp. 169-175.

Jeffery, C. The structure of American criminological thinking. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1956, 42, pp. 658-672.

Jensen, G. Inner-containment and delinquency. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1973, 64(4), pp. 464-470.

Jensen, G. Delinquency and adolescent self-conceptions: A study of the personal relevance of infraction. Social Problems, 1972, 21(1), pp. 84-102.

Johnson, E. Crime, Correction, and Society. (Revised Edition). Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1968.

Kranz, H. Lelienschicksale Kriminneller Zwillinge. Berlin: Springer, 1936. Cited by Cortés and Gatti, 1972.

Lander, B. Toward an Understanding of Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1954.

Lange, J. Verbrechen als Shicksal: Studien an Kriminellen Zwillingen, Georg Thieme: Leipzig, 1929. English translation by Charlotte Haldane, as Crime and Destiny, New York: Charles Boni, 1930.

Lambert, L. Personal Communication, 1974.

Lazowick, L. On the nature of identification. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, pp. 175-183.

Legras, A. Psychose und Kriminalität bei Zwillingen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Utrecht, 1932. Cited by Cortés and Gatti, 1972.

La Mar, T. E., and Erickson, M. Hidden delinquency and social status. Social Forces, 1966, 44, pp. 546-554.

Lemert, E. Social Pathology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951.

Lemert, E. An isolation and closure theory of naive check forgery. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1953, 47, pp. 294-310.

Lewis, H. Deprived Children. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.

Lindesmith, A., and Dunham, H. Some principles of criminal typology. Social Forces, 1941, 19, pp. 301-315.

Little, A. Professor Eysenck's theory of crime: an empirical test on adolescent offenders. British Journal of Criminology, 1963, 4, pp. 152-163.

Lively, A. A study of teen-age socialization and delinquency insulation by grade levels. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Ohio State Univ., 1959.

Lively, A., Dinitz, S., and Reckless, W. Self-concept as a predictor of juvenile delinquency. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1962, pp. 159-168.

Loban, W. A study of social sensitivity among adolescents. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1953, 44, pp. 102-112.

Lombroso, C. Crime: Its Causes and Remedies. translated by H. P. Horton. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1911.

MacDonald, C. Personal Communication, 1973.

Mannheim, H. Comparative Criminology. Boston: Hougton Mifflin Co., 1965.

Marshall, C. The Black Market. New York: Rinehart Co., 1952, pp. 285-329.

Marshall, T. An investigation of the delinquency self-concept theory of Reckless and Dinitz. British Journal of Criminology, 1973, 13(3), pp. 227-236.

Matthews, V. Differential identification: An empirical note. Social Problems, 1968, 15, pp. 376-383.

McCord, W. and McCord, J. Origins of Crime. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

McWhirter, K. Ethnic variations in incidence of the XYY anomaly. Journal of Heredity, 1970, 61(5), 1970.

Merton, R. 1938. Social structure and anomie. Reprinted in Social Theory and Social Structure. (Rev. Ed.) New York: Free Press, 1957, pp. 131-160.

Miller, W. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. The Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14, pp. 5-19.

Miller, W. The impact of a total-community delinquency control project. Social Problems, 1962, 10, pp. 168-191.

Miller, R. Impulsivity and locus of control among juvenile delinquents. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh), Ann Arbor, Michigan: Univ. Microfilms, 1969, No. 69-21, 038.

Naar, R. A note on the intelligence of delinquents in Richmond, Virginia. British Journal of Criminology, 1965, 5, pp. 82-85.

Nye, I. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Owen, D. The 47 XYY male: a review. Psychological Bulletin, 1972, 78(3), pp. 209-233.

Palmore, E., and Hammond, P. Interacting factors in juvenile delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1964, 29, pp. 848-854.

Parnell, R. Behavior and Physique: An Introduction to Practical and Applied Somatometry. London: Arnold, 1958.

Peterson, D., and Becker, W. Family interaction and delinquency. In H.C. Quay (Ed.). Juvenile Delinquency: Theory and Research. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1965.

Peterson, D., Quay, H., and Tiffany, T. Personality factors related to juvenile delinquency. Child Development, 1961, 32, pp. 355-372.

Poorkaj, H., and Bockelman, C. The impact of community volunteers on delinquency prevention. Sociology and Social Research, 1973, 57(3), pp. 335-341.

Prentice, N., and Kelly, F. Intelligence and delinquency: a reconsideration. Journal of Social Psychology, 1963, 60, pp. 327-337.

Quay, H. Personality dimensions in delinquent males as inferred from the factor analysis of behaviour ratings. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1964, 1, pp. 33-37.

Quinney, R. Is criminal behaviour deviant behaviour? British Journal of Criminology, 1965, 5, pp. 132-142.

Reckless, W. Criminal Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1940.

Reckless, W. The Crime Problem. (First Edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950.

Reckless, W. A new theory of delinquency and crime. Federal Probation, 1961a, 25(4), pp. 42-46.

Reckless, W. The Crime Problem. (Third Edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961b.

Reckless, W. A non-causal explanation: Containment theory. Excerpta Criminologica, 1962, 2(2), pp. 131-134.

Reckless, W. The Crime Problem. (Fourth Edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Reckless, W., and Dinitz, S. Pioneering with self-concept as a vulnerability factor in delinquency. The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1967, 58(4), pp. 515-523.

Reckless, W., and Shoham, S. Norm-containment theory as applied to delinquency and crime. Excerpta Criminilogica, 1963, 3, pp. 637-645.

Reckless, W., Dinitz, S., and Kay, B. The self component in potential delinquency and potential non-delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, pp. 566-570.

Reckless, W., Dinitz, S., and Murray, E. Self-concept as an insulator against delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1956, 21, pp. 744-746.

Reckless, W., Dinitz, S., and Murray, E. The 'good' boy in a high delinquency area. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1957, 48, pp. 18-25.

Reiss, A. Delinquency as a failure of personal and social controls. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, pp. 196-207.

Reiss, A., and Rhodes, L. The distribution of juvenile delinquency in the social class structure. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, pp. 720-732.

Reiss, A., and Rhodes, L. An empirical test of differential association theory, Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1964, 1, pp. 5-18.

Richardson, H., and Surko, E. WISC scores and status in reading and arithmetic of delinquent children. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1956, 89, pp. 251-262.

Robin, G. Gang member delinquency: Its extent, sequence, and typology. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1964, 55, pp. 59-59.

Robins, L. Deviant Children Grown Up: A Sociological and Psychiatric Study of Sociopathic Personality. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1966.

Rosanoff, A., Handy, L., and Plesset, I. Criminaltiy and delinquency in twins. Journal of Criminology and Criminal Law, 1934, 24, pp. 923-934.

Rosen, L., and Turner, S. An evaluation of the Lander approach to ecology and delinquency. Social Problems, 1967, 15, pp. 189-200.

Rotter, J. Social Learning and Clinical Psychology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1954.

Rotter, J. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychol. Monographs: General and Applied, 1966, 80, (Whole No. 2), pp. 1-27.

Rotter, J., Seeman, M., and Liverant, S. Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A major variable in behaviour therapy. In N. F. Washburne, (Ed.), Decisions, Values and Groups, Vol. 2, London: Pergamon Press, 1962.

Sanocki, W. The use of Eysenck's inventory for testing young prisoners. Przeglad Penitencjarny, 1969, 7, pp. 53-68.

Scarpitti, F., Murrary, E., Dinitz, S., and Reckless, W. The "good" boy in a high delinquency area: Four years later. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, pp. 555-558.

Schafer, S. Theories in Criminology. New York: Random House, 1969.

Schrag, C. Crime and Justice: American Style. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1971.

Schur, E. Our Criminal Society: The Social and Legal Sources of Crime in America. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1969.

Sears, R., MacCoby, E., and Levin, H. Patterns of Child Rearing. New York: Row, Peterson and Co., 1957.

Seashore, C. Family dynamics in relation to conscience and deviant behaviour among adolescent boys. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1961.

Sellin, T. Crime. In E. Schigman (Ed.). Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (Vol. IV). New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937, pp. 563-569.

Shaw, C. The Jack-Roller: A Delinquent Boy's Own Story. (New Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966. (Originally published in 1930).

Shaw, C. and McKay, H. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Sheldon, W. (with the collaboration of S.S. Stevens and W.B. Tucker). The Varieties of Human Physique. New York: Harper, 1940.

Sheldon, W. The Varieties of Temperament. New York: Harper, 1942.

Sheldon, W. Varieties of Delinquent Youth. New York: Harper, 1949.

Short J. Gang delinquency and anomie. In M. Clinard (Ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1964.

Short, J. (Ed.). Gang Delinquency and Delinquent Subcultures. New York: Harper, 1968.

Silver, A. TAT and M.M.P.I. psychopath deviant scale differences between delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, pp. 370-384.

Simpson, J., Dinitz, S., Kay, B., and Reckless, W. Delinquency potential of pre-adolescents in high delinquency areas. British Journal of Delinquency, 1960, 10, pp. 211-215.

Sopehak, A. Parental identification and tendency toward disorders as measured by the M.M.P.I. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, pp. 159-165.

Spergel, I. An exploratory research in delinquent subcultures. Social Service Review, 1961, 35, pp. 33-47.

Spergel, I. Male young adult criminality, deviant values, and differential opportunities in two lower class Negro neighborhoods. Social Problems, 1963, 10, pp. 237-250.

Spergel, I. Racketville, Slumtown, Haulburg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Stephenson, S. Myths about juvenile delinquency. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1973, 15, pp. 83-92.

Straits, B., and Sechrest, L. Further support of some findings about characteristics of smokers and non-smokers. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, p. 282.

Sutherland, E. Principles of Criminology. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1934.

Sutherland, E. White Collar Crime. New York: Dryden Press, 1949.

Sutherland, E. Mental deficiency and crime. In K. Young (Ed.). Social Attitudes. New York: Henry Holt, 1931, Chapter 15.

Sutherland, E., and Cressey, D. Principles of Criminology. (7th Edition). Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1967.

Taft, D., and England, R. Criminology (Fourth Edition) New York: Macmillan Co., 1964

Tangri, S., and Schwartz, M. A note on self-concept as an insulator against delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, pp. 922-926.

Tangri, S., and Schwartz, M. Delinquency research and the self-concept variable. The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1967, 58(2), pp. 182-190.

Tappan, P. Crime, Justice and Correction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

Teichman, M. Ego defense, self-concept and image of self ascribed to parents by delinquent boys. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1971, 32, pp. 819-823.

Telfer, M., Baker, D., Clark, G., and Richardson, C. Incidence of gross chromosomal errors among tall criminal American males. Science, 1968, 159, pp. 1249-1250.

Thrasher, F. The Gang. (Abridged Ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Toby, J. The differential impact of family disorganization. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, pp. 505-512.

Trasler, G. The Explanation of Criminality. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.

Vold, G. Theoretical Criminology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1918.

Voss, H. Differential association and reported delinquent behavior: a replication. Social Problems, 1964, 12, pp. 78-85.

Voss, H. Socioeconomic status and reported delinquent behavior. Social Problems, 1966, 13, pp. 314-324.

Wardle, C. Two generations of broken homes in the genesis of conduct and behaviour disorders in children. British Medical Journal, 1961, p. 349.

West, D. The Young Offender. Middlesex, England: Penquins Books Ltd., 1967.

Williams, C., and Vantress, F. Relation between internal-external control and aggression. Journal of Psychology, 1969, 71, pp. 59-61.

Wirt, R., and Briggs, P. Personality and developmental factors in the development of delinquency. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 1959, 73, pp. 1-24.

Woodward, M. Low Intelligence and Crime. London: I.S.T.D., 1955.

Yablonsky, L. The Violent Gang. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX PAGE

APPENDIX A

Reckless' and Dinitz's Self-concept Items*

(1) Will you probably be taken to juvenile court sometime?

(2) Will you probably go to jail sometime?

(3) If you found that a friend was leading you into trouble, would you continue to run around with him or her?

(4) Do you plan to finish high school?

(5) Do you think you'll stay out of trouble in the future?

(6) Are grown-ups usually against you?

(7) If you could get permission to work at 14 would you quit school?

(8) Are you a big shot with your pals?

(9) Do you think your teacher thinks you will ever get into trouble with the law?

(10) Do you think your mother thinks you will ever get into trouble with the law?

(11) Do you think if you were to get into trouble with the law, it would be bad for you in the future?

(12) Have you ever been told that you were headed for trouble with the law?

(13) Have most of your friends been in trouble with the law?

(14) Do you confide in your father?

(15) Do your parents punish you?

(16) Do you think you are quiet _____average _____active_____?

---

*Reckless and Dinitz (1967), p. 519.

APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTION I

This research is being conducted at Lakehead University as part of my M.A. thesis. I would like to thank you very much for participating in this project, and at the same time remind you that your cooperation is completely voluntary. However, the more students that consent to take part, the more accurate and meaningful my results will be. For this reason I hope that you will kindly answer the attached questionnaires. All information will be kept STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL and your name will not be used or referred to in any of the findings. Thank you again for your cooperation.

APPENDIX C

SOCIALIZATION SCALE*

The Way I Feel

This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. This questionnaire contains a series of statements. Read each one decide how you feel about it, and then circle the "letter" that applies to the way you feel. If you AGREE with a statement, or feel that it is true about you, Circle "T" for TRUE at the right margin of the page. If you DISAGREE with a statement, or feel that it is NOT TRUE about you, circle "F" for FALSE at the right margin of the page. If you find a few questions which you cannot or prefer not to answer, they may be omitted.

Name _____

Age _____

---

*Reproduced by special permission from California Psychological Inventory, by Harrison G. Gough, Ph.D., Copyright date 1956, Published by Consulting Psychologists Press Inc.

1.	My home as a child was less peaceful and quiet than those of most people.	T	F
2.	I would rather go without something than ask for a favour.	T	F
3.	I never worry about my looks.	T	F
4.	I often think about how I look and what impression I am making upon others.	T	F
5.	It is very important to me to have enough friends and social life.	T	F
6.	A person is better off if he doesn't trust any one.	T	F
7.	Before I do something I try to consider how may friends will react to it.	T	F
8.	Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid.	T	F
9.	I would do almost anything on a dare.	T	F
10.	Sometimes I used to feel that I would like to leave home.	T	F
11.	It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people.	T	F
12.	I hardly ever get excited or thrilled.	T	F
13.	I sometimes wanted to run away from home.	T	F
14.	Even when I have gotten into trouble I was usually trying to do the right thing.	T	F
15.	I keep out of trouble at all costs.	T	F
16.	My parents never really understood me.	T	F
17.	I have used alcohol excessively.	T	F
18.	I have often gone against my parents' wishes	T	F
19.	My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.	T	F
20.	I often feel as though I have done something wrong or wicked.	T	F

21. I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think. T F

22. I have had more than my share of things to worry about. T F

23. I think Lincoln was greater than Washington. T F

24. With things going as they are, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something. T F

25. When I meet a stranger I often think that he is better than I am. T F

26. I get nervous when I have to ask someone for a job. T F

27. My home life was always happy. T F

28. As a youngster in school I used to give the teachers a lot of trouble. T F

29. People often talk about me behind my back. T F

30. My home life was always very pleasant. T F

31. I think I am stricter about right and wrong than most people. T F

32. I have never been in trouble with the law. T F

33. It is pretty easy for people to win arguments with me. T F

34. I never cared much for school. T F

35. I seem to do things that I regret more often than other people do. T F

36. I am somewhat afraid of the dark. T F

37. I go out of my way to meet trouble rather than try to escape it. T F

38. I often feel that I made the wrong choice in my occupation. T F

39. I know who is responsible for most of my troubles. T F

40. My parents have generally let me make my own decisions. T F

41. I get pretty discouraged with the law when a smart lawyer gets a criminal free. T F

42.	I used to steal sometimes when I was a youngster.	T	F
43.	I have never done any heavy drinking.	T	F
44.	Life usually hands me a pretty raw deal.	T	F
45.	I don't think I'm quite as happy as others seem to be.	T	F
46.	The members of my family were always very close to each other.	T	F
47.	Most of the time I feel happy.	T	F
48.	I would never play cards (poker) with a stranger.	T	F
49.	My parents often disapproved of my friends.	T	F
50.	When I was going to school I played hooky quite often.	T	F
51.	I have been in trouble one or more times because of my sex behaviour.	T	F
52.	If the pay was right I would like to travel with a circus. or carnival.	T	F
53.	In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up.	T	F
54.	I find it easy to "drop" or "break with" a friend.	T	F

APPENDIX D

INTRODUCTION II

I would like to thank you for participating in the first part of this project. Today you will be completing the final part of this project. I would like to remind you that your cooperation is completely voluntary and that all information will be kept STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL. Remember, your name will not be used or referred to in any of the findings. Thank you again for your cooperation.

APPENDIX E

MEASURES OF INNER-CONTAINMENT*

More About Me

This is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. This questionnaire contains a series of statements. Read each one, decide how you feel about it, and then circle the "letter" that applies to the way you feel. If you AGREE with a statement, or feel that it is true about you, circle "T" for TRUE at the right margin of the page. If you DISAGREE with a statement, or feel that it is NOT TRUE about you circle "F" for FALSE at the right margin of the page. If you find a few questions which you cannot or prefer not to answer, they may be omitted.

Name _____

Age _____

---

*The Self-Control, Tolerance, Self-Acceptance, and Responsibility Scales are reproduced by special persmission from the California Psychological Inventory, by Harrison G. Gough, Ph.D., Copyright date 1956, Published by Consulting Psychologists Press Inc.

1.	When someone does me a wrong I feel I should pay him back if I can, just for the principle of the thing.	T	F
2.	I can honestly say that I do not really mind paying my taxes because I feel that's one of the things I can do for what I get from the community.	T	F
3.	I do not always tell the truth.	T	F
4.	Sometimes I have the same dream over and over.	T	F
5.	It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of thing.	T	F
6.	I set a high standard for myself and I feel others should do the same.	T	F
7.	Sometimes I rather enjoy going against the rules and doing things I'm not suppose to	T	F
8.	When a man is with a woman he is usually thinking about things related to her sex.	T	F
9.	I very much like hunting.	T	F
10.	I would be ashamed not use my privilege of voting.	T	F
11.	I must admit that I have a bad temper, once I get angry.	T	F
12.	At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.	T	F
13.	I feel that I have often been punished without cause.	T	F
14.	I would disapprove of anyone's drinking to the point of intoxication at a party.	T	F
15.	I think I would like to drive a racing car.	T	F
16.	When in a group of people I usually do what others want rather than make suggestions.	T	F
17.	Sometimes I think of things too bad to talk about.	T	F
18.	My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.	T	F

19.	I like poetry.	T	F
20.	Most people are honest chiefly through fear of being caught.	T	F
21.	I have frequently found myself, when alone, pondering such abstract problems as freewill, evil, etc.	T	F
22.	Every family owes it to the city to keep their sidewalks cleared in the winter and their lawn mowed in the summer.	T	F
23.	I would like to see a bullfight in Spain.	T	F
24.	I would like to be an actor on the stage or in the movies.	T	F
25.	I have sometimes stayed away from another person because I feared doing or saying something that I might regret afterwards.	T	F
26.	Most people make friends because friends are likely to be useful to them.	T	F
27.	I feel sure that there is only one true religion.		
28.	I seldom or never have dizzy spells.	T	F
29.	Police cars should be especially marked so that you can always see them coming.	T	F
30.	I am often said to be hotheaded.	T	F
31.	I doubt whether I would make a good leader.	T	F
32.	I like to be the center of attention.	T	F
33.	I refuse to play some games because I am not good at them.	T	F
34.	I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.	T	F
35.	I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first.	T	F
36.	It's no use worrying my head about public affairs, I can't do anything about them anyhow.	T	F
37.	It makes me feel like a failure when I hear of the success of someone I know well.	T	F

38. I used to like it very much when one of my papers was read to the class in school. T F

39. I like science. T F

40. Sometimes I feel like swearing. T F

41. The future is too uncertain for a person to make serious plans. T F

42. I must admit I often try to get my own way regardless of what others want. T F

43. Most people will use somewhat unfair means to gain profit or an advantage rather than to lose it. T F

44. I enjoy a race or a game better when I bet on it. T F

45. I like to go to parties and other affairs where there is lots of loud fun. T F

46. I often feel as though I have done something wrong or wicked. T F

47. I never make judgements about people until I am sure of the facts. T F

48. My daily life is full of things that keep me interested. T F

49. At times I have a strong urge to do something harmful or shocking. T F

50. People have a real duty to take care of their aged parents, even if it means making some pretty big sacrificies. T F

51. Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principles. T F

52. I have strange and peculiar thoughts. T F

53. I like to read about science. T F

54. When I work on a committee I like to take charge of things. T F

55. I would like to wear expensive clothes. T F

56. Before I do something I try to consider how my friends will react to it. T F

57. As a youngster I was suspended from school one or more times for cutting up. T F

58. It makes me angry when I hear of someone who has been wrongly prevented from voting. T F

59. I am often bothered by useless thoughts which keep running through my mind. T F

60. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it. T F

61. I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it. T F

62. I am a better talker than a listener. T F

63. I sometimes pretend to know more than I really do. T F

64. I have often met people who are supposed to be experts who were not better than I. T F

65. I was a slow learner in school. T F

66. Maybe some minority groups do get rough treatment, but it's no business of mine. T F

67. I do not always tell the truth. T F

68. Every citizen should take the time to find out about national affairs even if it means giving up some personal pleasures. T F

69. With things going as they are, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something. T F

70. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences. T F

71. I seldom or never have dizzy spells. T F

72. I feel that I have often been punished without cause. T F

73. Police cars should be especially marked so that you can always see them coming. T F

74. I have often found people jealous of my good ideas, just because they had not thought of them first. T F

75. I have had more than my share of things to worry about. T F

76.	I have strange and peculiar thoughts.	T	F
77.	I am fascinated by fire.	T	F
78.	A person who doesn't vote is not a good citizen.	T	F
79.	The man who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it.	T	F
80.	I have frequently found myself, when alone, pondering such abstract problems as freewill, evil, etc.	T	F
81.	I think most people would lie to get ahead.	T	F
82.	There's no use in doing things for people; you only find that you get it in the neck in the long run.	T	F
83.	I do not dread seeing a doctor about sickness or injury.	T	F
84.	Several times a week I feel as if something dreadful is about to happen.	T	F
85.	I don't blame anyone for trying to grab all he can get in this world.	T	F
86.	My home life was always happy.	T	F
87.	I am inclined to take things hard.	T	F
88.	I would like to see a bullfight in Spain.	T	F
89.	When I get bored I like to stir up some excitement.	T	F
90.	I like large, noisy parties.	T	F
91.	As long as a person votes every four years, he has done his duty as a citizen.	T	F
92.	I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or a job.	T	F
93.	I am apt to show off in some way if I get the chance.	T	F
94.	When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.	T	F
95.	Most people would tell a lie if they could gain by it.	T	F

96. When a person "pads" his income tax report so as to get out of some of his taxes, it is just as bad as stealing money from the government. T F

97. A person needs to "show off" a little now and then. T F

98. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class. T F

99. We ought to worry about our own country and let the rest of the world take care of itself. T F

100. Most people are secretly pleased when someone else gets in trouble. T F

101. I often get feelings like crawling, burning, tingling, or "going to sleep" in different parts of my body. T F

102. I was a slow learner in school. T F

103. At times I have worn myself out by undertaking too much. T F

104. When prices are high you can't blame a person for getting all he can while the getting is good. T F

105. I commonly wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing something nice for me. T F

106. When I was going to school I played hooky quite often. T F

107. Police cars should be especially marked so that you can always see them coming. T F

108. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people. T F

109. It is hard for me to start a conversation with strangers. T F

110. Sometimes I feel as if I must injure either myself or someone else. T F

111. I have never been in trouble with the law. T F

112. I keep out of trouble at all costs. T F

113. Sometimes I feel like smashing things. T F

114. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it. T F

115. I think I would enjoy having authority over other people. T F

116. I feel that I have often been punished without cause. T F

117. I like school. T F

118. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences. T F

119. When a man is with a woman he is usually thinking about things related to her sex. T F

120. I think I would like to fight in a boxing match sometime. T F

121. I must admit that I often do as little work as I can get by with. T F

122. I would like to wear expensive clothes. T F

123. I consider a matter from every standpoint before I make a decision. T F

124. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence. T F

125. I like to boast about my achievement every now and then. T F

126. Usually I would prefer to work with women. T F

127. Sometimes I feel as if I must injure either myself or someone else. T F

128. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people T F

129. I often do whatever makes me feel cheerful here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal. T F

130. In school I found it very hard to talk before the class. T F

131. A person does not need to worry about other people if only he looks after himself. T F

132. I fall in an out of love rather easily. T F

133. I would rather go without something than ask for a favour. T F

134. It is hard for me to find anything to talk about when I meet a new person T F

135. I do not have a great fear of snakes. T F

136. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. T F

137. I have very few quarrels with members of my family. T F

138. I often feel as though I have done something wrong or wicked. T F

139. I sometimes pretend to know more than I really do. T F

140. My parents have often disapproved of my friends. T F

141. In school my marks in deportment were quite regularly bad. T F

142. I looked up to my father as an ideal man. T F

143. Once a week or oftener I feel suddenly hot all over, without apparent cause. T F

144. School teachers complain a lot about their pay, but it seems to me that they get as much as they deserve. T F

145. I think I would like to belong to a motorcycle club. T F

146. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something. T F

147. When I work on a committee I like to take charge of things. T F

148. I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it. T F

149. We ought to pay our elected officials better than we do. T F

150. We ought to let Europe get out of its own mess; it made its bed, let it lie in it. T F

151. I would do almost anything on a dare. T F

152. I would like to be an actor on the stage or in the movies. T F

153. Women should not be allowed to drink in cocktail bars. T F

154. I never make judgments about people until I am sure of the facts. T F

155. I often do whatever makes me feel cheerful here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal. T F

156. Sometimes I rather enjoy going against the rules and doing things I'm not supposed to. T F

157. If I get too much change in a store, I always give it back. T F

158. It's a good thing to know people in the right places so you can get traffic tags, and such things, taken care of. T F

APPENDIX F

MEASURE OF DIRECTIONALITY OF CONTROL

Social Reaction Inventory

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief. Obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. Circle the letter which corresponds to the statement you choose as most true.

In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you're concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

REMEMBER

Select that alternative which you personally believe to be more true.

I more strongly believe that:

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people's lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People's misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual's worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don't realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don't like you.
   b. People who can't get others to like them, don't understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays the major role in determining one's personality.
   b. It is one's experiences in life which determine what they're like.

I more strongly believe that:

9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
   b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well-prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work, that studying is really useless.

11. a. Becoming a sucess is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
    b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
    b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
    b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
    b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
    b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
    b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
    b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

I more strongly believe that:

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
    b. There really is no such thing as "luck".

19. a. One should always be willing to admit his mistakes.
    b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.

20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
    b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
    b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
    b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can't understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
    b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
    b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
    b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.
    b. There's not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
    b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
    b. Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction, my life is taking.

I more strongly believe that:

29. a. Most of the time I can't understand why politicians behave the way they do.

b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as on a local level.

APPENDIX G

THE ROLE BEHAVIOUR TEST

Son-Father Relationship

The purpose of this questionnaire is to help you to form as faithful and sharp a picture as possible of the relationship between you and your father.

This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Just answer the way you feel. This questionnaire will be kept in STRICT CONFIDENCE.

On the following pages you will find a number of brief statements describing behavior between son and father. Each statement is followed by some questions. For each question quickly choose the answer which best reflects your situation and check a mark (X) on the line in front of the answer you have chosen. Please answer each question, but give only one answer to each question, then go on immediately to the next statement.

EXAMPLE:

John spends most weekends out in the yard taking care of the garden. Do you act this way?

__X__ almost never

_____ seldom

_____ sometimes

_____ often

_____ almost always

If you almost never act this way, you would place an (X) next to that answer.

(1) Pete shows his father he loves him and cares for him; he tries to please him and do the things he likes.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Jones shows his son he loves him and cares for him; he tries to please him and do the things he likes.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(2) Sam gives respect to his father; he shows him he admires whatever he does.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Smith gives respect to his son; he shows him he admires whatever he does.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(3) When he is with his father, Jerry treats himself with dignity; he shows he respects himself by the way he talks and acts.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(4) When he is with his father, John is a gloomy person who acts unhappy with himself.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(5) Dave does not give love to his father; he ignores his feelings and shows him he does not like him.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Adams does not give love to his son; he ignores his feelings and shows him he does not like him.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(6) Bob treats his father with disrespect; he does not look up to him, and he downgrades whatever he does.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Adams treats his son with disrespect; he does not look up to him, and he downgrades whatever he does.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(7) When he is with his father, Keith shows disrespect for himself and acts as if he thinks he's useless.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(8) Jim proves his love for his father by helping him and sharing things with him.

Do yuu act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Bach proves his love for his son by helping him and sharing things with him.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(9) Al shows he is proud of what his father can do; he tells him he is worth a lot and that he can do things very well.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Bold shows he is proud of what his son can do; he tells him he is worth a lot and that he can do things very well.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(10) When he is with his father, Don shows a lot of respect toward himself; he makes known his self-respect by what he says and does.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(11) Joe acts spitefully toward himself in front of his father and does not try to please himself.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(12) Rob downgrades himself when he is with his father; he doesn't show respect for himself and acts as if he can't do anything right.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____ seldom
2 _____ sometimes
3 _____ often
4 _____ almost always

(13) Ray doesn't have pride in himself; he belittles himself in front of his father and criticizes his abilities.

Doe you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(14) Ron does not show respect for his father; he criticizes him and tells him his is useless.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Cook does not show respect for his son; he criticizes him and tells him he is useless.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(15) Ken shows his father he doesn't like him; he does things he dislikes, and he will not try to please him.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Cooper shows his son he doesn't like him; he does things he dislikes and he will not try to please him.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(16) When he is with his father, Mac is a cheerful son who acts pleased with himself.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(17) Ted belittles his father when he talks to him; he looks down on his abilities and tells him he doesn't do things right.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Daniels belittles his son when he talks to him; he looks down on his abilities and tells him he doesn't do things right.

Does your father act this way when he is with your?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(18) Carl acts as if everything his father does is very important; he praises whatever he does.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Brown acts as if everything his son does is very important; he praises whatever he does.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(19) Fred is a happy person when he is with his father; he acts like a son who knows he is a nice, likable person.

Doe you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(20) Steve gives his father a lot of love; he shows trust in him and is very affectionate with him.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr Brown gives his son a lot of love; he shows trust in him and is very affectionate with him.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(21) Rick acts spiteful toward his father; he lets him know he dislikes him and can't stand him.

Doe you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mr. Jones acts spiteful towards his son; he lets him know he dislikes him and can't stand him.

Does your father act this way when he is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(22) When he is with his father, Tom acts displeased with himself and does not seem happy with himself.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(23) When he is with his father, Brian praises himself for his ability; he acts like a son who does things very well.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(24) When he is with his father, Bill acts content with himself and seems to be satisfied with himself.

Do you act this way when you are with your father?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Son-Mother Relationship

Now we turn to some statements about the behavior of a son when he is with his mother.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to help you to form as faithful and sharp a picture as possible of the relationship between you and your mother.

Please answer the following statements exactly in the same manner as you answered those in the first part of the set.

(25) Dick shows his mother he loves her and cares for her; he tries to please her and do the things she likes.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4._____almost always

Mrs. Jones shows her son she loves him and cares for him; she tries to please him and do the things he likes.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(26) When he is with his mother, Bob shows disrespect for himself and acts like he thinks he's useless.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(27) James treats his mother with disrespect; he does not look up to her, and he downgrades whatever she does.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Brown treats her son with disrespect; she does not look up to him, and she downgrades whatever he does.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____ almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(28) Al proves his love for his mother by sharing things with her and helping her.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Foster proves her love for her son by sharing things with him and helping him.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(29) When he is with his mother, Jack is a gloomy son who acts unhappy with himself.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(30) William downgrades himself when he is with his mother; he doesn't show respect for himself and acts like he can't do anything right.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(31) Mike acts spitefully toward himself in front of his mother, and does not try to please himself.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(32) Ed doesn't have pride in himself; he belittles himself in front of his motehr and criticizes his abilities.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(33) Larry shows his mother he doesn't like her; he does things she dislikes, and he will not try to please her.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Green shows her son she doesn't like him; she does things he dislikes, and she will not try to please him.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(34) Dave gives his mother a lot of love; he shows trust in her and is very affectionate with her.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Laing gives her son a lot of love; she shows trust in him and she is very affectionate with him.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(35) When he is with his mother, Peter acts displeased with himself and does not seem happy with himself

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(36) Gary does not show respect for his mother; he criticizes her and tells her she is useless.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Park does not show respect for her son; she criticizes him and tells him he is useless.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(37) Robert acts as if everything his mother does is very important; he praises whatever she does.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Olson acts as if everything her son does is very important she praises whatever he does.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(38) Richard belittles his mother when he talks to her; he looks down on her abilities and tells her she doesn't do things right.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Reid belittles her son when she talks to him; she looks down on his abilities and tells him he doesn't do things right.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(39) Joe is a happy son when he is with his mother; he acts like a son who knows he is a nice, likable person.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(40) Dan acts spiteful toward his mother; he lets her know he dislikes her and can't stand her.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Adams acts spiteful toward her son; she lets him know she dislikes him and can't stand him.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(41) Chuck shows he is proud of what his mother can do; he tells her she is worth a lot and that she can do things very well.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Black shows she is proud of what her son can do; she tells him he is worth a lot and that he can do things very well.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(42) John gives respect to his mother; he shows he admires whatever she does.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Lander gives respect to her son; she shows she admires whatever he does.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(43) Fred does not give love to his mother; he ignores her feelings and shows her he does not like her.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

Mrs. Bloom does not give love to her son; she ignores his feelings and shows him she does not like him.

Does your mother act this way when she is with you?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(44) When he is with his mother, Bill acts contented with himself and seems to be satisfied with himself.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(45) When he is with his mother, Paul praises himself for his abilities; he acts like a son who thinks he does things very well.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(46) When he is with his mother, Tom is a cheerful son who acts pleased with himself.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(47) When he is with his mother, Harry shows a lot of respect toward himself; he makes known his self-respect by what he says and does.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

(48) When he is with his mother, Jim treats himself with dignity; he shows he respects himself by the way he talks and acts.

Do you act this way when you are with your mother?

0 _____almost never
1 _____seldom
2 _____sometimes
3 _____often
4 _____almost always

APPENDIX H

Numbers of the Items Representing Each Scale of Gough's CPI as Measures of Inner-Containment (See APPENDIX E)

	CPI SCALE			
	Self-acceptance (Sa)	Self-control (Sc)	Tolerance (To)	Responsibility (Re)
Item #	6	3	5	1
	14	4	8	2
	16	7	19	9
	28	11	20	10
	31	12	26	13
	48	17	27	15
	51	18	33	22
	55	21	34	29
	56	23	37	35
	63	24	39	36
	65	25	41	44
	80	30	43	50
	87	32	46	53
	88	38	64	54
	94	40	69	57
	98	42	72	58
	103	45	74	60
	107	47	75	61
	109	49	76	66
	119	52	79	68
	121	59	81	70
	124	62	84	71
	128	67	85	77

	Self-acceptance (Sa)	Self-control (Sc)	Tolerance (To)	Responsibility (Re)
Item #	129	73	105	78
	131	86	108	82
	133	90	110	83
	134	92	114	89
	142	93	126	91
	145	95	130	96
	147	97	135	99
	152	100	143	102
	153	101	146	104
	154	112		106
	156	113		111
		115		117
		116		140
		118		141
		120		144
		122		149
		123		150
		125		157
		127		158
		132		
		136		
		137		
		138		
		139		
		148		
		151		
		155		
Total Items in each scale	34	50	32	42

APPENDIX I

Statements of The Role Behaviour Test According to the Variables Representing the S's Perceptions of His Behavior Towards Himself and Towards His Parents*

Variable	Statement Number	
	Father-Son Role	Mother-Son Role
Giving Status to Other,	2, 9, 18	37, 41, 42
Giving Love to Other,	1, 8, 20	25, 28, 34
Giving Love to Self,	16, 19, 24	39, 44, 46
Giving Status to Self,	3, 10, 23	45, 47, 48
Taking Status From Self,	7, 12, 13	26, 30, 32
Taking Love From Self,	4, 11, 22	29, 31, 35
Taking Love From Other,	5, 15, 21	33, 40, 43
Taking Status From Other,	6, 14, 17	27, 36, 38

*After Foa (1974), and Foa and Foa (1974) pp. 392-395.

APPENDIX J

Statements of The Role Behaviour Test According to the Variables Representing the S's Perceived Behaviors of His Parents Towards Him*

Variable	Statement Number	
	Perceived Behavior of Father	Perceived Behavior of Mother
Giving Status to Other,	2, 9, 18	37, 41, 42
Giving Love to Other,	1, 8, 20	25, 28, 34
Taking Love From Other,	5, 15, 21	33, 40, 43
Taking Status From Other,	6, 14, 17	27, 36, 38

*After Foa (1974), and Foa and Foa (1974) pp. 392-395.

APPENDIX K

Instructions Read to the Ss Before Each Testing Session

I would like to thank you for participating in this research. The questionnaires that you have in front of you do not have RIGHT or WRONG, answers. Each statement represents the way you feel about certain events in life or the way you behave in some situations. Please read each statement carefully and do not think for too long about the answer that you should choose. Mark down the first choice that comes to your mind. If the events described by some of the statements do not apply to you at the present time, try to remember how would you have felt about them in the past and mark the answer that you think represents the way you would have felt at that time. Thank you again for your participation and remember that there are no RIGHT or WRONG answers.

APPENDIX L

Analysis of Variance on Socialization Scale

Source	df	MS	F
Between groups	2	1320.66	128.21*
Within groups	51	10.30	

*p < .001

APPENDIX M

Newman-Keuls Comparison on Socialization Scale Means

Means	c	b	a
-c = 19.11 ('True' Delinquents)		8.22*	28.27*
-b = 25.33 (Delinquent Prones)			20.05*
-a = 40.50 (Non-delinquent Prones)			

*p < .01

APPENDIX N

Analysis of Variance on Self-acceptance Scale

Source	df	MS	F
Between groups	2	14.89	1.18*
Within groups	51	12.54	

*Non-significant

APPENDIX O

Analysis of Variance on Self-control Scale

Source	df	MS	F
Between groups	2	457.41	9.81*
Within groups	51	46.58	

*$p < .001$

APPENDIX P

Analysis of Variance on Tolerance Scale

Source	df	MS	F
Between groups	2	96.02	3.25*
Within groups	51	29.51	

*p < .05

APPENDIX Q

Analysis of Variance on Responsibility Scale

Source	df	MS	F
Between groups	2	710.91	33.23*
Within groups	51	21.39	

*p < .001

APPENDIX R

Newman-Keuls Comparisons on Self-control Scale Means

Means	c	b	a
-c = 17.66 ('True' Delinquents)		1.03	5.87*
-b = 19.33 (Delinquent Prones)			4.83*
-a = 27.11 (Non-delinquent Prones)			

*P < .01

APPENDIX S

Newman-Keuls Comparison on Tolerance Scale Means

Means	c	b	a
-c = 14.44 ('True' Delinquents)		1.99	3.60*
-b = 17.00 (Delinquent Prones)			1.60
-a = 19.05 (Non-delinquent Prones)			

*p < .05

APPENDIX T

Newman-Keuls Comparisons on Responsibility Scale Means

Means	c	b	a
-c = 16.38 ('True' Delinquents)		6.77*	11.46*
-b = 23.77 (Delinquent Prones)			4.68*
-a = 28.88 (Non-delinquent Prones)			

*p < .01

APPENDIX U

A.
Analysis of Variance on the I-E Locus of Control Scale

Source	df	MS	F
Between groups	2	97.99	17.07*
Within groups	51	5.74	

*p < .001

APPENDIX V

Newman-Keuls Comparisons on I-E Locus of Control Scale Means

Means	a	b	c
-a = 10.38 (Non-delinquent Prones)		1.18	7.68*
-b = 11.05 (Delinquent Prones)			6.50*
-c = 14.72 ('True' Delinquents)			

*p < .01

APPENDIX W

Z Scores for the Comparisons Between the Correlations of the Ss' Perceptions of Their Behaviors Towards Their Parents With Their Perceptions of the Corresponding Parental Behaviors Towards Them

VARIABLES	GROUPS	SON-FATHER CORRELATIONS		
		a (Non-deliqneunt Prones)	b (Delinquent Prones)	c ('True' Delinquents)
GSO	a		-1.099	-1.902
	b			-0.802
	c			
GLO	a		-0.536	-2.193*
	b			-1.657
	c			
TSO	a		-1.102	-1.495
	b			-0.392
	c			
TLO	a		-1.247	-2.814**
	b			-1.567
	c			
		SON-MOTHER CORRELATIONS		
GSO	a		-0.542	-1.414
	b			-0.871
	c			
GLO	a		0.262	-0.242
	b			-0.505
	c			
TSO	a		-0.892	-1.076
	b			0.184
	c			
TLO	a		-1.099	-1.515
	b			-0.415
	c			

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

APPENDIX X

Z Scores for the Comparisons Between the Correlations of the Ss' Perceptions of Their Behaviors Towards the Self With Their Perceptions of Each Parent's Behavior Towards Them

VARIABLES	GROUPS	SON-FATHER CORRELATIONS a (Non-delinquent Prones)	b (Delinquent Prones)	c ('True' Delinquents)
GSS & GSO	a		-0.041	-0.657
	b			-0.802
	c			
GLS & GLO	a		0.083	-2.193*
	b			-2.277*
	c			
TSS & TSO	a		-1.102	-1.495
	b			-0.392
	c			
TLS & TLO	a		0.447	-2.292
	b			-2.379
	c			
		SON-MOTHER CORRELATIONS		
GSS & GSO	a		-0.542	-1.414
	b			-0.871
	c			
GLS & GLO	a		-1.174	-1.553
	b			-0.378
	c			
TSS & TSO	a		-0.617	-1.125
	b			-0.508
	c			
TLS & TLO	a		-0.127	0.245
	b			0.372
	c			

*p <.05
**p <.01

APPENDIX Y

Z Scores for the Comparisons Between the Correlations of the Ss' Perceptions of the Behaviors of Father and Mother Towards Them

VARIABLES	GROUPS	a (Non-delinquent Prones)	b (Delinquent Prones)	c ('True' Delinquents)
GSO	a		0.000	0.981
	b			0.981
	c			
GLO	a		1.532	0.075
	b			-1.457
	c			
TLO	a		-0.767	-0.733
	b			-0.034
	c			
TSO	a		1.899	1.899
	b			1.899
	c			