

**A STUDY OF THE DIFFERENCES IN THE
PERSONALITY PROFILES OF CHRONIC
JUVENILE DELINQUENTS AND FIRST TIME JUVENILE
OFFENDERS IN CHRISTIAN COUNTY, KENTUCKY**

BY

JACKALYN A. WEATHERFORD

A STUDY OF THE DIFFERENCES IN THE PERSONALITY PROFILES
OF CHRONIC JUVENILE DELINQUENTS AND FIRST TIME
JUVENILE OFFENDERS IN CHRISTIAN COUNTY, KENTUCKY

A Research Paper
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Jackalyn A. Weatherford
December 1973

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Research Paper written by Jackalyn A. Weatherford entitled "A Study of the Differences in the Personality Profiles of Chronic Juvenile Delinquents and First Time Juvenile Offenders in Christian County, Kentucky." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Garland E. Blair

Major Professor

Accepted for the Council:

Wayne E. Stamps

Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere appreciation to
Dr. Garland Blair, Professor of Psychology, Austin Peay
State University, who suggested the instrument and who
aided and counseled her during the course of the study; to
Mr. James Johnson, Director of Juvenile Services who
volunteered the subjects used in the research and also
provided much of the social data concerning them.

Appreciation is extended to the staff social workers
at Juvenile Services who spent many hours administering
the tests to the youths in their caseloads in an effort to
make use of their established rapport for more valid
scores.

The author wishes to thank her husband, Bill, for
his patience and understanding during the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.	v
Chapter	15
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Purpose of the Study.	2
Importance of the Study	13
Limitations of the Study.	4
Definition of Terms Used.	4
Review of Literature.	5
Hypothesis.	10
II. PROCEDURE	11
The Sample.	11
Description of the Instrument	11
Administration and Scoring.	13
III. RESULTS	14
IV. DISCUSSION.	17
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	23
APPENDIX.	26

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Significance of Difference Between 20 Chronic Offenders and 20 First Offenders on the High School Personality Questionnaire . . .	15
2. Scores for Washington State, Scottish, and Christian County Delinquents Outside of the Average Range.	16
3. Profile Scores for Washington State, Scottish, and Christian County Juvenile Delinquents. . . .	18

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the first juvenile court was created in Chicago, Illinois, in 1899; judges, correction officers, social workers, and interested citizens have been concerned with the problem of recidivism in juvenile delinquents. Inspection of the docket book of the Christian County Juvenile Court implies that punitive measures are not effective as deterrents to juvenile offenders who are adjudicated for crimes in Christian County, Kentucky; thus it seems apparent that the solution to this problem must be found elsewhere. Recent legislative programs are emphasizing rehabilitation programs for youthful offenders. Professional training for all levels of correctional personnel is being stressed by responsible state and federal officials. This current trend to understand the world of the delinquent as he sees it focuses on the attitudes of the delinquent as well as his behavior. If effective measures can be applied to change self-defeating attitudes into self-respecting attitudes, changed behavior may result.

The Kentucky Crime Commission, the Kentucky Department of Child Welfare, and the Christian County Quarterly Court have recently established a pilot program based on the aforementioned theory. The program is entitled "Juvenile Services". Juvenile Services is a branch of the Department

of Child Welfare which has six full-time social workers and one supervisor assigned as staff members. When a child commits his first offense, he is assigned to a social worker in lieu of appearing before the County Judge for adjudication. The social worker works intensively with the child to prevent further offenses. If a child becomes a second time offender, he must appear before the judge to answer for that offense and is transferred to a second social worker. If the child continues to behave in a lawless manner, as a last resort he is committed to a reformatory for juvenile delinquents. When he returns to the community from the reformatory, he is assigned to a third social worker. This social worker has assigned to his caseload only those children who have returned to the community from the reformatory.

This paper attempts to determine whether the personality profile of the first offender is significantly different from the profile of the chronic offender in Christian County.

Purpose of the Study

It was the purpose of this study (1) to compare the personality profile of a representative sample of first offenders with a like sample of chronic offenders; (2) to provide the social workers in the Juvenile Services Program with data concerning attitudinal patterns of the delinquent children assigned to their respective caseloads.

Importance of the Study

The recidivist or repeater has been studied in relationship to his race, intelligence, age, type of offense, family background, personal background, and many other characteristics. Healey and Bronner (1961) in a study of 420 juvenile court cases reported that 74 percent had subsequent commitments as children and 50 percent were arrested as adults. These and other like studies indicate that a significant percentage of juvenile delinquents who reach the courts are not significantly affected by court intervention but continue to behave in an antisocial manner and cause concern to their families and the community at large.

The trend in treatment of delinquent offenders until recently in Christian County and numerous other communities has been to release the youngsters when their behavior met certain ambiguous criterion that would predict probability of success in the world. Upon their release, many of them return to the community and continue to appear in court for continued offenses. Since this method of treatment has failed so miserably, professionals working with these youths are struggling to find a better, more effective method.

More studies are needed to aid in the understanding of the delinquent's world as he sees it. Studies are also needed to give those professional individuals working with delinquents some insight into their behavior patterns. Do they change as they add offense after offense to their

records, or are their attitudes formulated when they first begin their lawless behavior? It is important that a community be aware of these and other questions if effective rehabilitation is to take place. The point of community intervention is a delicate one. Research at the local level can help to put tools in the hands of those who are working to alleviate the juvenile delinquent problem.

Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted using only delinquents who are residing in Christian County, Kentucky. It compares only those scores earned on the Junior-Senior High School Personality Questionnaire designed by Raymond Cattell. One major limitation of the study is the small number of available subjects. The test is made up of fourteen scales each containing ten items. Because each scale contains only ten items, reliability is a problem.

Definitions of Terms Used

Juvenile Delinquent. Tait and Hodge (1962) describe the term as communicating many things to many people. It may have legal, ethical, social, or other connotations. Throughout this paper the term shall be interpreted as it is interpreted by the State of Kentucky. The Kentucky Crime Commission (1969) states a delinquent is any child under the age of eighteen who:

- (a) has committed a public offense; or
- (b) does not subject himself to the reasonable control of his parents, teacher, guardian, or custodian

by reason of being wayward or habitually disobedient; or
 (c) is habitually truant from school or home.

First Offender. This term is used throughout this paper to describe a child who has been referred to the Department of Child Welfare for committing one of the aforementioned acts.

Chronic Offender. This term is used to describe a juvenile delinquent who has been adjudicated at least three times for one of the aforementioned reasons.

Recidivism. The term is used throughout the paper to describe the recurrence of lawless behavior by juvenile delinquents.

Review of Literature

Since World War II, except for a short period thereafter, there has been a steady rise in the proportion of young persons arraigned on delinquency charges. Shulman (1961) reported research findings that during the period from 1948 to 1956 the figure more than doubled with only a nineteen percent increase in the child population of juvenile court age.

Dickerson (1958) estimated that fifty thousand boys and girls in New York City are involved at any one time in various degrees of juvenile delinquency. This is about three percent of that population. In any event, the proportions are large, growing and creating a genuine major problem of social control.

Correction officers, judges, police officers, social workers, and psychologists seem to share the consensus that the problem of recidivism is an area of major concern. Sheldon and Elnora Glueck (1961) conducted a follow-up study of one thousand Boston juvenile court cases and found that eighty-eight and two-tenths percent had subsequent juvenile delinquencies. Healey and Bronner (1961) in a study of four hundred and twenty juvenile court cases reported that seventy-four percent had subsequent commitments as children and fifty percent were arrested as adults.

Bapp and Blazer (1958) conducted a study to investigate differences existing in twenty social characteristics displayed by a group of recidivist and a group of non-recidivist delinquents. Significant differences were discovered on three of fourteen characteristics. The remaining fourteen items proved to be statistically insignificant.

Pierson and Kelly (1963) compared the personality profile of a state wide population of delinquents in Washington with the reported standardization sample in the Handbook of the High School Personality Questionnaire. Significant differences were found on scales A, C, D, F, H, I, J, Q₃ and Q₄. The Washington delinquents were found to be more outgoing, adventurous, easy going, casual, and careless. This study did not concur with the long held view that delinquents are less intelligent than the norm group. Nor did they find a defective super-ego to be characteristic

of their delinquents. They also found their delinquents to be significantly lower on the tension scale, Q_4 .

John McQuaid (1963) used the HSPQ to study the personality profile of five hundred and thirty-two Scottish delinquents. Contrary to Pierson and Kelly's findings, he found Scottish delinquents to be significantly lower on factor B; intelligence, as well as low in super-ego strength when compared with two hundred and fifty non-delinquent boys of the same age group in Southwest Scotland. Less reliably, the delinquents were more withdrawn (A), lacking in resources (Q_2), and more obstructive (J). There was no evidence that they regard themselves as more aggressive (E) than normal, a finding at variance with Pierson.

Cattell (1962) presented a delinquent personality profile showing teenage delinquents to be cold and aloof (A), less intelligent (B), less dependable (G), more dominant and aggressive (E), and more obstructively individualistic (J). Factor J concurs with McQuaid's findings cited earlier. Factor E is not compatible with McQuaid's research.

McQuaid (1967) did a study of trends in answers to Cattell's HSPQ. Answers to personality questionnaires by eight groups totaling one thousand seven hundred and thirty-three subjects from South and Southwest Scotland showed marked trends towards anxiety and less definite tendency toward introversion by comparisons with American norms for the test. The result for introversion confirms that of a previous study of British subjects by Cattell and

Warburton in 1961, but the results for anxiety are idiosyncratic and require confirmation by other studies on large samples. Cattell (1957) referred to greater introversion among British subjects compared with Americans and to higher than average scores on surgency among French subjects. Cattell and Warburton (1961) again found British students to be significantly more introverted and less anxious than their American counterparts. Americans were also less radical.

Pierson and Kelly (1963) did a study investigating the relationship of anxiety, extroversion, and general idiosyncrasy of personality to delinquent behavior. The HSPQ was administered routinely to all male juveniles of age fourteen years and over received by the Washington Bureau of Juvenile Rehabilitation from the courts between April, 1961, and September, 1962. Their findings substantiated that the anxiety of the delinquent population is significantly below normal. They also found factors A and H of the HSPQ to be very significantly above average in teenage delinquents describing a frivolous, carefree, and devil-may-care extroversion. Exaggerated indifference aptly describes the syndrome of low anxiety and high extroversion.

White and Porter (1970) conducted research using sixty youthful offenders. The two instruments used were HSPQ and an adaptation of Osgood's Semantic Differential. Twelve bipolar adjectives separated by a seven point scale were selected because of their factorial representativeness and

because of their stability of measuring several kinds of concepts in prior scales. Response on all twelve scales for the twenty-one concepts were factorally analyzed by the principal component method with unities at a principal diagonal. It was expected that there would be a great deal of communality between the attitudes of the sixty delinquent boys expressed by themselves and their personalities as shown in self-report type of inventory, the HSPQ. Data did not support this expectation.

Dean Edwards (1971) in a paper written for Federal Probation quoted Dr. Arnold Richards as saying "as long as we cannot keep the recidivist locked up for his whole life, we can only fulfill our obligation to the security of society by changing behavior". All those individuals working with delinquents are continuously searching for innovative treatment methods. More research is needed to aid those individuals to understand the world of the delinquent. Further study needs to be done to identify by personality measurement the types of delinquents that clinical observation has for so long recognized. Perhaps the most useful advantage of a theory of delinquency treatment based on a factorial measurement is that while contributing a necessary portion of surplus meaning, it would also generate a wealth of testable hypotheses which is so vitally needed. Research is vitally needed to guide in social planning for preventive programs for juvenile delinquents. If research supports the hypothesis set for in this paper, preventive

programs must be geared to the pre-delinquent in early childhood to be effective.

Hypothesis

In this study, the hypothesis is stated in the null form. The hypothesis is that there is no statistically significant difference between the chronic juvenile offenders and the first time juvenile offenders on any of the fourteen aspects of personality measured by the HSPQ.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE

The Sample

The sample used in this study consisted of those male and females who have been referred to the Juvenile Court Project for delinquent behavior. Two types of juvenile offenders participated. Twenty boys and girls were youngsters who had been referred to the court for the first time, this being their one and only offense. The remaining twenty boys and girls had been referred to the court earlier and since that time have committed two additional unlawful acts and been apprehended for that behavior. The social workers assigned to the Juvenile Court Project administered the test to these children. They have an established rapport with them, and it was felt that more valid measures could be obtained through their administering the tests. The tests were administered in July and August of 1973.

Description of the Instrument

According to Hogan (1972), the HSPQ was developed to assess all of the more adequately research demonstrated dimensions of the personality in the twelve to eighteen age range. It was designed to measure twelve of the sixteen factors appearing on Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Cattell (1962) maintains that the dimensions of the HSPQ have been replicated or confirmed by other psychologists. Anastasia (1968) on the other hand remarks that despite the extensive research conducted by Cattell and

his associates over more than twenty years, the traits proposed by Cattell must be regarded as tentative. According to Jackson (1972), both Cattell and Anastasia may be overstating the case. While all fourteen dimensions have not been repeatedly confirmed, five of the HSPQ scales (E, I, A, G, C, and B--dominance, agreeableness, dependability, emotional stability, and intelligence) are certainly well accepted. Form The others perhaps less universal dimensions are: ~~w~~excitability, D; surgency, F; shyness, H; tough-mindedness, I; individualism, J; self-confidence, Q; self-sufficiency, ~~Q~~₂; self-control, ~~Q~~₃; and intenseness, ~~Q~~₄.

Hogan (1972) reports a reliability score of .63 for one form. This finding prompted Cattell to recommend use of both forms when possible. Anastasia (1968) reporting on the reliability of the HSPQ states that even when using a combination of forms A and B to lengthen the scales the reliability coefficients may fall below .80.

Jackson further states that the primary positive features of the test include Cattell's well-known support program of factor analytic work; an easy to read test booklet with clear, concise directions regarding administration; and an easy to use scoring template. Guidance counselors, teachers, principals, and social workers may find the test of particular interest because of its concise directions and easy to use scoring template.

Administration and Scoring

The instruments were given to the children in groups of three or four according to the directions in the manual. As was aforementioned, the test was administered by the two social workers who were familiar with the children to insure more valid participation. The HSPQ was scored by this researcher according to the instructions in the manual. Form (a) of the HSPQ was used in the study. Table (6) was used too, since the sample contained boys and girls between the ages of eleven and seventeen regardless of sex difference. The standard deviation is 14.4. Both Davidson County Delinquent and Non-Delinquent were the mean on scales A, E, F, and G. Both groups scored below the mean on scales B, C, I, O, and Q₁. In a measure of self-control, both groups scored lower than the standard deviation below the mean score for the non-delinquent. The highest score for the two groups was earned on scale D which is the scale that measures aggression. Both groups scored high which requires intellectual ability; however, the delinquent group scored lower on this scale. The mean and standard deviation for the two groups are presented in Table 1. The data presented in this table are summarized in Table 2.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The "t" test was employed to determine whether a significant difference existed between the scores of the two groups tested with the HSPQ. The test encompasses ten scales and each scale was scored individually. There was no significant difference between the two sample groups on scales A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, O, Q_2 , and Q_3 . There was a significant difference on scale Q_4 at the .05 level. The mean score for the norm group on the HSPQ is 5.5 and the standard deviation is 2.0. Both Christian County delinquent groups scored above the mean on scales D, E, F, and H. Both groups scored below the mean on scales B, G, I, O, and Q_4 . Q_3 is a measure of self-control. Both groups scored lower than one standard deviation below the mean score for the norm group. The highest score for the two groups was earned on scale E which is the scale that measures aggression. Scale B is the scale which measures intellectual ability; both groups scored below average on this scale.

Table 1 summarizes "t" scores for the two groups. Means and standard deviations are summarized in Table 2.

Table 1

Significance of Difference Between 20 Chronic Offenders
and 20 First Offenders on the HSPQ

Scale	"t" value
A.	.5745
B.	.2109
C.	.4691
D.	.1929
E.	.5745
F.	.6169
G.	.6168
H.	.3088
I.	.1631
J.	.1591
O.	.7324
Q ₂ .	.3024
Q ₃ .	.2089
Q ₄ .	2.191 *

*Significant at .05

Table 2
Scores for Washington State, Scottish, and Christian County Delinquents
Outside of the Average Range

	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.	F.	G.	H.	I.	J.	O.	Q ₂ .	Q ₃ .	Q ₄ .
F.O. sten	5.10	3.85	5.75	6.45	7.10	6.35	4.05	5.75	4.80	6.50	5.20	5.85	3.00	6.40
C.O. sten	5.50	3.90	5.45	6.85	6.80	6.20	4.45	5.90	3.85	5.40	4.70	5.20	2.75	5.30
F.O. SD	1.76	2.10	1.67	1.72	1.84	1.56	1.69	1.67	1.86	1.86	1.53	1.98	1.51	1.28
C.O. SD	1.72	2.14	2.42	1.46	1.50	1.60	1.66	1.30	2.99	2.35	2.04	1.50	1.44	1.76

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The review of literature cited studies done with the HSPQ involving delinquents from Scotland and the State of Washington. The Scotland delinquents were below average on Factor B and above average on no factor. Washington delinquents were above average on Factor B and below average on none. Christian County delinquents were above average on Factor E and D and below average on B, G, I, and Q₃. All other mean scores were in the average range for all three groups. According to the score sheet provided for scoring the HSPQ profile, scores between 4.5 and 6.5 are in the average range. The Standard Deviation is 2 and the mean score is 5.5. The above findings indicate that six of fourteen scores are out of this range for Christian County youths, one of fourteen for Washington youths, and one of fourteen for Scottish delinquents. Table (3) shows the scores that were out of the average range for the aforementioned groups. The shaded area encompasses the average range.

Some explanation for the large number of average mean scores for the various groups seems feasible. Miller, Radman, and Sneed (1960) offer this explanation. It has been clinically observed for some time now that there seems to be two types of delinquents. There is the belligerent, hostile boy who is openly defiant of adult authority and the frequently withdrawn schizoid boy who operates alone and

whose actions against society are acts upon things or symbols. These two types are opposites; and if equal numbers of them were averaged, their personality scores would probably combine for average scores. Individual profiles for Christian County delinquents registered one hundred and sixty-eight below. These scores concur with their explanation.

The researcher made a study of the socio-economic conditions and school achievements of the Christian County delinquents and found that between ninety and ninety-five percent of the subjects tested were in the lower socio-economic level. Seventy-five percent were having a difficult time in school. Some were dropouts, and others, under-achievers or discipline problems. Approximately seventy percent of the subjects were recipients of public welfare. These important cultural communalities may be factors to consider in the absence of significant differences between the two groups of Christian County delinquents tested for this study.

A recent article by Haney and Gold (1973) declares that detected delinquency does not reflect undetected delinquency. The majority of delinquent research is conducted with detected research. Official records are highly misleading. Middle class youth are more likely to be overlooked, or their parents can afford to buy them out of trouble, or their actions are interpreted as hijinks rather than offenses.

Haney and Gold also state that white authorities tend to be more lenient with white boys and interpret their behavior as sowing-wild-oats brand of delinquency, but they become fearful and hard-nosed with a black adolescent who coincides with their image of the delinquent. These variables are difficult to control in research with delinquents.

Christian County juvenile authorities working with the subjects used in this study stated that these youngsters started to school as second class citizens, poor, dirty, inadequately dressed, and looked down on by their middle class classmates. By the time they are eleven or twelve years old and commit their first offense, their personality profile is formulated. It would not seem strange that there is no significant difference on thirteen of the fourteen personality scales.

This study is so culturally influenced that the author believes that the influence may account for six factor scores located out of the average range. Washington and Scottish studies cited in this study report only one score each out of the average range. The small number of available subjects in Christian County may also be significant in comparing the studies.

The HSPQ profile describes the Christian County delinquent as being less intelligent, more aggressive, unrestrained, quitting, tough-minded and careless.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to compare the personality profile of a group of 20 chronic juvenile delinquents and 20 first time juvenile delinquent offenders residing in Christian County, Kentucky. The test was employed to determine if there were significant differences between the two groups from which the samples were selected. The instrument used to measure the differences was the Bobbs-Merrill Edition of the HSPQ Form A.

It was found that there were no differences between the two groups on scales A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, O, Q₂, and Q₃. There was a significant difference at the .05 level on scale Q₄. The sample groups scored above the norm group average on scales D and E and below average on scales B, G, I and Q₃.

Recommendations

The Kentucky Crime Commission (1969) did an intensive study of delinquency in the State of Kentucky. It was found that each community had its own unique patterns for delinquent behavior. Hopkins County and Henderson County are located adjacent to one another in Western Kentucky. They are similar in population, racial balance, and average wealth. Yet, a youth residing in Henderson County is three times as likely to be arrested than his peer who resides in Hopkins County.

Studies cited in the review of the literature were found to be inconsistent. The aforementioned appears to the author to signify that delinquency is a community problem and thus should be dealt with by the individual communities.

Records in Christian County indicate that poverty plagues 90 percent of the sample groups used in this study. They also were found to be in trouble in school either academically or socially. Since this study did not reveal any significant differences in 13 of the 14 aspects of the personality in the first offender and the chronic offender, it would seem much effort needs to be exerted at an earlier age. Therefore, it would appear day care centers for very young children might be a more effective way to fight the delinquent problem in Christian County. Delinquency in Christian County appears to be more of a social problem than a legal one.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anastasi, A. Psychological Testing London: Macmillian Company, 1968.
- Bapp, F. B. and Blazer, J. A. Social characteristics of recidivist and non-recidivist in male delinquents. Psychology 1958.
- Cattell, R. B., Beloff, H. and Coan, R. W. Handbook for High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality Ability Testing, 1962.
- Cattell, R. B. and Butcher J. Prediction of School Achievement. Cincinnati: Bobbs Merrill, 1963.
- Cattell, R. B. and Warburton, F. W. Cross Cultural comparisons of patterns of extraversions and anxiety. British Journal of Psychology, 1961 52 3-15.
- Delinquency In Kentucky. Kentucky Commission on Law Enforcement and Crime Prevention 1969 1-17.
- Dickerson, F. The new "beat generation" Parents 1958.
- Edwards, D. Specific objectives for institutional treatment for juveniles. Federal Probation 1971 35 26-29.
- Glueck, S. and S. Juvenile Delinquency in American Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Haney, B. and Gold, M. The juvenile delinquent nobody knows. Psychology Today 1973 48-49.
- Healey and Bronner, In Shulman, H. M. Juvenile Delinquency in American Society. New York: Harper and Row. 1961.
- Hogan, R. R. A review of the HSPQ, IPAT Edition. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook. New Jersey: Macmillian, 1972. 207.
- Jackson, D. N. A review of the HSPQ, IPAT Edition. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The Seventh Mental Measurement Yearbook. New Jersey: Macmillian, 1972. 208.
- McQuaid, J. A. A note on trends in answers to Cattell's Personality questionnaires by Scottish Subjects. British Journal of Psychology. 1967, 58 455-458.

- McQuaid, J. A. A personality profile of delinquent boys in Scottish Approved Schools. British Journal of Criminology, 1970 10 39-54.
- Pierson, G. R. and Kelly, R. F. Anxiety, Extraversion, and Personality Idiosyncrasy. Journal of Psychology 1963 56 441-445.
- Pierson, G. R. and Kelly, R. F. HSPQ norms on a statewide delinquent population. Journal of Psychology 1963 56 185-192.
- Millar, T. P. and Radman, R. J. and Sneed, D. Program development in a school for delinquent boys. Social Casework. 1960 41 472-480.
- Shulman, H. M. Juvenile Delinquency in American Society. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Supplement of Normas Manual for the Jr. Sr. High School Personality Factor Questionnaire. Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. 1960 3.
- Tait, C. D., Jr. and Hodge, E. F. Delinquents, Their Families and the Community. Springfield, Illinois: Doubleday and Co. 1962.
- White, W. F. and Porter, L. P. Multivariate analysis of attitudes personality characteristics among 60 youthful offenders. Psychological Reports 1970 26 487-491.

APPENDIX

Low Scores

High Scores

FACTOR A

Aloof

The person who scores low on Factor A tends to be aggressive, critical, obstructive, cool, hard, precise, suspicious, jealous, rigid, prone to sulk, cry and resist adult direction.

Sociable

The person who scores high on Factor A tends to be good natured, easy-going, ready to cooperate, attentive to other people, soft-hearted, casual, trustful, adaptable, careless, warm-hearted, and prone to laugh readily.

FACTOR B

Dull (low mental ability)

The person who scores low on Factor B tends to be of lower morale, to quit easily, to be uninterested in intellectual matters.

Bright (intelligent)

The person who scores high on Factor B tends to be conscientious, persevering, intellectual and cultured.

FACTOR C

Emotionally Unstable

The person who scores low on Factor C tends to be emotional when frustrated, to change his mind easily, to be excitable, overactive, evasive, and prone to worry, to quit easily, to get into fights and accidents.

Mature, Calm

The person who scores high on Factor C tends to be emotionally mature, stable, phlegmatic, realistic, placid, and prone to adjust to facts and stay out of difficulty.

FACTOR D

Phlegmatic

The person who scores low on Factor D tends to be placid, self-sufficient, deliberate, not easily jealous, self-effacing, constant, not restless.

Unrestrained

The person who scores high on Factor D tends to be demanding, impatient, self-assertive, egotistical, distractible, undependable, and prone to seek attention, to be nervous.

Low Scores

High Scores

FACTOR E

Submissive

The person who scores low on Factor E tends to be dependent, kindly, soft-hearted, expressive, conventional, conforming, easily upset, self-sufficient.

Aggressive

The person who scores high on Factor E tends to be assertive, self-assured, independent, hard, stern, solemn, unconventional, rebellious, tough, attention-getting.

FACTOR F

Glum

The person who scores low on Factor F tends to be silent, introspective, depressed, concerned, brooding, incommunicative, languid and prone to stick to inner values.

Enthusiastic

The person who scores high on Factor F tends to be talkative, cheerful, serene, happy-go-lucky, frank, expressive, quick and alert.

FACTOR G

Casual, Undependable

The person who scores low on Factor G tends to be frivolous, demanding, impatient, relaxed, indolent, delinquent, and prone to disregard obligations to other people.

Conscientious

The person who scores high on Factor G tends to be persevering, determined, responsible, emotionally mature, contently ordered and attentive to other people and to rules.

FACTOR H

Shy

The person who scores low on Factor H tends to be withdrawn from the opposite sex, aloof, self-contained, restrained, conscientious, careful, considerate, quick to see danger.

Adventurous

The person who scores high on Factor H tends to be adventurous, active, responsive, genial, impulsive, frivolous, emotional, carefree and prone not to see danger signals.

Low Scores

High Scores

FACTOR I

Tough

The person who scores low on Factor I tends to be realistic, self-reliant, cynical, unartistic, unaffected, prone to act on practical logical evidence and be unaware of physical disabilities.

Sensitive

The person who scores high on Factor I tends to be demanding, impatient, subjective, dependent, kindly, artistic, imaginative, hypochondriacal, anxious, prone to act on sensitive intuition.

FACTOR J

Gregarious

The person who scores low on Factor J tends to like to follow the group, to sink his personality into the group, to be vigorous, to accept common standards.

Passively Individualistic

The person who scores high on Factor J tends to act individualistically, to be self-sufficient, fastidiously obstructive, neurasthenically fatigued, and to evaluate intellectually.

FACTOR O

Confident

The person who scores low on Factor O tends to be self-confident, cheerful, resilient, tough, placid, expedient, rudely vigorous, fearless.

Timid

The person who scores high on Factor O tends to worry, to be depressed, to cry easily, to be sensitive, exacting, fussy, hypochondriacal, moody, lonely, brooding.

FACTOR Q₂

Sociably Group Dependent

The person who scores low on Factor Q₂ tends to value social approval, to be conventional and fashionable.

Self-Sufficient

The person who scores high on Factor Q₂ tends to be resolute and accustomed to making his own decisions.

Low Scores

High Scores

FACTOR Q_3

Uncontrolled

The person who scores low on Factor Q_3 tends to be uncontrolled, excitable, emotional, and to reject cultural demands.

Controlled

The person who scores high on Factor Q_3 tends to show will power, to accept approved ethical standards, to be ambitious, considerate, farsighted.

FACTOR Q_4

Relaxed

The person who scores low on Factor Q_4 tends to be composed.

Tense

The person who scores high on Factor Q_4 tends to be irrationally worried, too irritable, and in turmoil.