

**A COMPARISON OF SELF-ACCEPTANCE, LOCUS
OF CONTROL AND ANXIETY IN DEVELOPMENT
AND NON-DELINQUENT JUVENILE FEMALES**

EDWARD DAVIS

A COMPARISON OF SELF-ACCEPTANCE, LOCUS
OF CONTROL AND ANXIETY IN DEVELOPMENT
AND NON-DELINQUENT JUVENILE FEMALES

An Abstract
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University

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

by
Edward Davis

August, 1984

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted to compare a group of delinquent females with a non-delinquent female population on the variables of anxiety, self-acceptance and locus of control. The results of the t-test for independent groups indicate that there are significant differences between the two groups on all variables examined. The delinquent females were, in fact, more anxious, less self-accepting, and exhibited more externality. The Pearson product-moment correlations revealed that the constructs measured did contain certain commonalities with the exception of the measure of self-acceptance and locus of control within the delinquent female population.

A COMPARISON OF SELF-ACCEPTANCE, LOCUS
OF CONTROL AND ANXIETY IN DELINQUENT
AND NON-DELINQUENT JUVENILE FEMALES

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
Austin Peay State University

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

by
Edward Davis

August, 1984

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a Thesis written by Edward Davis entitled "A Comparison of Self-Acceptance, Locus of Control and Anxiety in Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Juvenile Females." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Psychology.

Lynde B. Russell
Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Dean G. Lewis
Second Committee Member

Garland E. Blair
Third Committee Member

Accepted for the
Graduate Council:

William H. Ellis
Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express a most sincere appreciation to Dr. Linda Rudolph, Professor of Psychology, for her time, guidance, patience, and concern throughout this entire study.

Appreciation is also extended to the following persons:

Mrs. Gail Cobb, Teacher, Mrs. Patti Hancock, Guidance Counselor, Mrs. Sheila Faust, Guidance Counselor, Clarksville High School; and Mrs. Barbara Hall, Tennessee State Department of Corrections.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	vii
<u>CHAPTER</u>	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Review of the Literature	1
Purpose of Study	19
2. METHOD	21
Subjects	21
Instrumentation	21
Administration	23
3. RESULTS	24
4. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	26
REFERENCES	28
APPENDIX	40

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Comparison of Experimental and Control Group in Terms of Anxiety, Self- Acceptance and Locus of Control	37
2. Intercorrelation Among Locus of Control, Anxiety and Self-Acceptance for the Experimental Group	38
3. Intercorrelation Among Locus of Control, Anxiety and Self-Acceptance for the Control Group	39

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Review of the Literature

Theories of delinquency are not autonomous bodies of thought. There are numerous theoretical approaches to the explanation of delinquency causation and within these are many philosophical counterproductive dichotomies. Following are some of the more common definitions of delinquency used in the current literature.

Delinquency is behavior by nonadults which violates specific legal norms or the norms of a particular societal institution with sufficient frequency and/or seriousness so as to provide a firm basis for legal action against the behaving individual or group according to Kvaraceus and Miller (1959).

For Hirschi (1969) the delinquent is the faulty or unfinished product of socialization--the delinquent is an incomplete social being. The social process of making the adolescent moral has been interrupted by uncaring parents, poor school performance, visions of occupational failure, delinquent associates, and a questionably legitimate legal system (cited in Weiss, 1977).

Glueck and Glueck (1950) view delinquency as being repeated acts of a kind which, when committed by persons

beyond the statutory juvenile court age of sixteen, are punishable as crimes (either felonies or misdemeanors), except for a few instances of persistent stubbornness, truancy, running away, associating with immoral persons, and similar behaviors.

Williams and Gold (1972) distinguish between delinquent behavior and official delinquency. They identify delinquent behavior to be "norm violating behavior of a juvenile which, if detected by an appropriate authority, would expose the actor to legally prescribed sanctions" (p. 210). Official delinquency is defined as "the identification and response to delinquent behavior by the police and the courts" (p. 210). The writers make this distinction in an effort to eliminate confusion and to direct appropriate treatment and social practices to various unique adolescent populations.

Neumeyer (1955) reports that juvenile delinquency includes offenses committed by juveniles (whose ages conform to the age group specified by law as juvenile) that are in violation of federal, state, and local laws. Such breaches of the law by adults would be punishable by fines or imprisonment. His definition of delinquency also includes certain forms of behavior peculiar to youth such as habitually running away from home, incorrigibility, other forms of deviant behavior, and being in places or living in surroundings that are regarded as harmful to youth and that lawfully may be interpreted as requiring official sanction.

According to Tennessee Code Annotated 37-1-102, a delinquent child means a child who has committed a delinquent act and is in need of rehabilitation. A "delinquent act" is defined as an act designated a crime under the law, including local ordinances of this state, or of another state if the act occurred in that state, or under federal law, and the crime does not fall under subdivision (21) (C), and the crime is not a traffic offense as defined in the traffic code of the state other than failing to stop when involved in an accident pursuant to 55-10-101, driving under the influence of an intoxicant or drug, or vehicular homicide. Subdivision (21) (C) describes a category of offenses in juvenile law referred to as unruly offenses with which only a child could be charged.

Researchers suggest that delinquent behavior is a method by which adolescents can ignore or reject the social order that has excluded them from normality. Cohen (1955) says that juvenile delinquency "devalues the devaluations and the devaluators." McCorkle and Korn (1954) call it "a rejection of the rejectors," and Sykes (1978) refers to it as "a condemnation of the condemners." Some psychoanalysts feel that juvenile delinquency is an unconscious desire for punishment.

There are three theoretical approaches to the analysis of delinquency causation. They are social structural disorganization, cultural disorganization and control theories. According to Cernkovich and Denisoff (1978), structural

theories stress the importance of social class position and access to legitimate opportunities in the causal processes which lead to delinquency. Social structural disorganization states that it is the frustration from a desire or intent to conform to a conventional or majority order that cannot be actualized that causes nonconformist behavior. These theories of delinquency have been characterized as the result of "good answers to bad questions" by Hirschi (1969). He suggests that the child's motivation is a causal factor in that the child wants to satisfy the requirements of conformity but cannot, and is thus forced into noncompliant behavior.

Merton (1937), borrowing from Durkheim, purposes that anomie and crime result from a disjunction between cultural goals (ends) and socially structured approved means to their attainment (cited in Weiss, 1977). It is his contention that when society emphasizes and almost demands a recognition of success and when attainment of certain aspirations is inaccessible, a person may seek whatever means, including illegal ones, to achieve them. Further, to lose out in the competitive struggle carries a double sting. The unsuccessful person not only fails to obtain success and value, but is also held accountable for his/her failure. The corollary of the concept of the "self-made man" is the "self unmade man." Merton (1937) argues that American society teaches its members that those who fail have only themselves to blame.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) identify these unsuccessful people as a third subculture comprised of the "double failures," who because of failure in legitimate and illegitimate attempts, turn to escapist activity (cited in Phillipson, 1974).

Cohen (1955) similarly emphasizes aspiration in his "status deprivation theory." He identifies the goal for minors as "status" and proposes that lower class males have an unequal opportunity because they are governed by middle class rules in their dominate environment, which is school. They adjust to their lack of status in the environment by participation in delinquent gang subcultures.

Cloward and Ohlin (1960) refined the general social structural disorganization model and attempted to integrate it with cultural disorganization theory. They propose a "differential opportunity structure" theory of juvenile delinquency. Their theory purports that young people who are denied "equal opportunity" to participate, compete, and achieve are prime candidates for juvenile delinquency. They argue that Merton only talked about the availability of legitimate means for achieving material success and ignored the illegitimate means (Phillipson, 1974).

Middle class delinquency is seen as essentially a different phenomenon from the delinquent adjustments arising from participation in "criminal," "conflict" or "retreatist" subcultures. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) tend to use personality

explanations for most middle class delinquency, with a downgrading of the subcultural aspect, although they admit that middle class delinquent subcultures do exist. They see middle class subcultures as more responsive to control and change, and being organized principally for petty delinquencies such as alcohol, sex, cars, and marijuana (cited in Miller, 1970).

Cultural disorganization theory posits that conformity to cultural standards that are in conflict with those of the conventional order causes juvenile delinquency (Shaw & McKay, 1942; Sutherland & Cressey, 1970; Miller, 1957). According to these theorists, the juvenile delinquent is merely "marching to a different drummer" (cited in Weiss, 1977).

The theory of differential association proposes that deviant or criminal behavior is learned in interaction with others (Sutherland & Cressey, 1970). Sutherland et al. hypothesized that persons become criminal or delinquent when they experience an excess of definitions encouraging law violation over definitions encouraging law abiding behavior. These definitions are conveyed to the individual largely within intimate groups such as the peer group or the family (Phillipson, 1974).

Criminal behavior, in short, is not based on idiosyncratic motives or blind passions. Instead, crime is part of a cultural tradition that is transmitted through social interaction

and in which crime is normatively approved and admired; that is, the person has internalized what he/she recognizes as values of their immediate social group (Sykes, 1978).

In a more sophisticated approach to differential association and differential opportunity as applied to the middle class delinquent, Daniel Glaser (1960) (cited in Miller, 1970) formulated a theory of "differential anticipation." This theory suggests that a child may feel a camaraderie or an acceptance to a nonreference group as a result of a self-concept that the child perceives (i.e., being a delinquent). Miller (1957) theorizes that delinquent behavior is not seen as hostile or rebellious behavior directed at middle class values, but as a reflection of enculturation to a deviant value system. These feelings of camaraderie or acceptance of a nonreference group appear to contribute to another social phenomenon, a subculture.

The concept of subculture is an attempt to deal analytically with the apparent fact that a range of small "societies" characterized by some values that seemingly conflict with or differ from those of conventional society are contained within the political unit of the total society (Phillipson, 1974).

Cohen (1955) postulates that the prolonged dependency and postponement of gratification needed in becoming "adult" in the middle class leads boys with similar problems into joining together into middle subcultures.

In reference to middle class delinquent subcultures or gangs, Bloch and Neiderhoffer (1958) view the problem as being "barriers" to adult status which adolescents universally experience (cited in Miller, 1970).

Hruska (1978) suggests that there exists an "obsolescence of adolescence." That is, with the evolution of the modern family, career, and community, the role of adolescent has dwindled into ambiguity. As a result, adolescents may feel a loss of identity or that they are not needed. Cernkovich (1978) contends that adolescents should be afforded a "stake in conformity" which would serve to inhibit or expostulate delinquent behavior.

Matza (1964) explains that subcultural delinquents are anxious and exhibit a mood of fatalism because they feel that they have no control over their environment; therefore, to restore their mastery, they engage in deviant behavior. There are less risks in further fatality because success or failure in such deviance still asserts mastery where conventional conformity only reinforces the perception of no control.

Control theory asserts that delinquent behavior occurs when an individual's moral bonds to conventional order are weak, broken, or absent (Reiss, 1951; Nye, 1958; Reckless, 1956, 1961; Matza, 1964; Hirschi, 1969). Control theory suggests that many adolescents are insulated from involvement in delinquent activities by conventional value commitments (Cernkovich, 1978).

In social structural and cultural disorganization theories, humans are thought to be moral by nature and nonconformity is a fall from grace. In control theory, nonconformity signifies that individuals have not yet become moral. They have not learned what they ought, and especially, ought not to do: "If we grow up naturally without cultivation, like weeds, we grow up like weeds--rank" (Nettler, 1974, p. 246).

Durkheim philosophized "We are moral beings to the extent that we are social beings." Further, Durkheim wrote that "control theorists sometimes suggest that attainment to any object outside one's self, whether it be the home town, the starry heavens, or the family dog, promotes moral behavior" (Durkheim, 1961, p. 83). He says that a society is regulated by the amount of social control placed on an individual by traditions, laws, or other social constraints.

Nye (1958) contends that juvenile delinquency occurs simply because it is not prevented. While Weiss (1977) views delinquency as a failure of personal and social controls, Nye goes further by defining the basic distinctions of personal and social controls contributing to delinquent behavior. They are: direct control, internalized control, indirect control, and finally, alternative means to goals.

Reckless (1956), too, attempts to distinguish between personal control and social controls. He proposes that persons are controlled through outer or inner containment. Outer containments are social constraints to conform to the normative

group value. Inner containment consists of "self-control" mechanisms which have been developed through socialization. A high degree of self-control is indicated by (1) a good self-concept, (2) goal directedness, (3) realistic aspiration, (4) frustration tolerance, and (5) identification with lawfulness (cited in Nettler, 1974).

David Matza (1964) sees the delinquent as being committed to neither delinquent nor conventional enterprise. He sees them in a state of drift which he describes as follows:

Drift stands midway between freedom and control. Its basis is an area of the social structure in which control has been loosened, coupled with the abortiveness of adolescent endeavor to organize an autonomous subculture, and thus an independent source of control around illegal action. The delinquent transiently exists in a limbo between convention and crime, responding in turn to the demands of each, flirting now with one, now with the other but postponing commitment, evading decision. Thus, he drifts between criminal and conventional action. (p. 28)

The drift is a motion that is gradual by underlying movements. The first stage may be accidental or unpredictable.

Psychological theories focus on processes which occur within an individual, and delinquent behavior is seen as one manifestation of those processes. The common focus in all psychological theory of delinquency is on the individual's mental processes and the resultant behavior which is manifested (Waugh & Dunbar, 1977).

In the psychoanalytic tradition, Freudian theory suggested that the manner in which innate drives were dealt with by an individual could be categorized as "normal," "neurotic," and "criminal." Freud distinguished innate drives as the sexual and the aggressive. These drives produce tension and the unconscious processes which are required to seek reality and gratification develop the construct of the id, ego, and superego. Many psychoanalysts feel that delinquency is unconscious desire for punishment. Gold (1978) identifies delinquent behavior as an ego defense which also provides self-enhancing experiences. Many of the psychoanalysts have taken cultural and social factors into their theoretical considerations.

For Erikson (1963) delinquent behavior results from inadequate development of a sense of identity. Adolescents, facing rapidly changing physiology and "tangible tasks ahead of time, are concerned primarily with what they appear to be in the eyes of others as compared with what they feel that they are, and with the question of how to connect the roles and skills cultivated earlier with the occupational prototypes of the day" (p. 261). Erikson cautions that for the adolescent leaving childhood and facing adult issues there is a danger point, and that the danger is role confusion. He says that where adolescents have not yet established a solid sexual and ethnic identity, they can demonstrate episodes of delinquent or even psychotic behavior. Other issues which must be dealt with after this identity crises are: "intimacy vs. isolation"

as a young adult, "generativity vs. stagnation" in maturity, and "ego vs. despair" in the older years.

Learning theory suggests that delinquency occurs as a result of specific training. Learning theorists postulate that children are trained by parents and educators, and that they are subjected to behavior modification, whether it is known or not by the particular trainer. Bandura (1969) suspects that "most persistent antisocial behavior is maintained through substantial intermittent positive reinforcement which outweighs the inhibitory effects of punishment, except insofar as the latter leads to changes in the form of antisocial acts designed to maximize the offender's chances of securing further reinforcement" (p. 213).

George Herbert Mead's "symbolic interactionist" approach asserts that the self is a process involving the "I" and the "Me." Where Mead's perspective focuses on one's self-concept and behavior being controlled by normative response, labeling theorists have applied it to deviant behavior. Some labeling theorists are concerned only with external factors of the labeling phenomenon; specifically, how an initial negative stigma awarded to an individual acts as an impetus to further negative consequence. Reactions to delinquent behavior are crucial because, as well as being an effect of the behavior, they may also be a further causation or reinforcement.

Labels may exaggerate or underestimate actual behavior. General or global labels may misdirect or reveal little about

specific types of deviant behaviors. Further, there are multivariate features to the labeling process; namely, the labelee(s), the labeler(s), and their respective situational or social context(s) and the reciprocal interactions among all of the foregoing (Feldman, 1978).

Many variables are related to the concept of locus of control, which more than implies that the orientation of control is of paramount importance as an aspect of social interaction and personality development. Rotter (1966) defines locus of control as:

An event regarded by some persons as a reward or reinforcement may be differently perceived and reacted to by others. One of the determinants of this reaction is the degree to which the individual perceives that the reward follows from, or is contingent upon, his own behavior or attributes versus the degree to which he feels the reward is controlled by forces outside of himself and may occur independently of his own actions. . . . a perception of causal relationship need not be all or none but can vary in degree. When a reinforcement is perceived by the subject as following some action of his own but not being entirely contingent upon his action, then, in our culture, it is typically perceived as the result of luck, chance, fate, as under the control of powerful others, or an unpredictable because of the great complexity of the forces surrounding him. When

the event is interpreted in this way by an individual, we have labeled this a belief in external control.

If the person perceives that the event is contingent upon his own behavior or his relatively permanent characteristics, we have termed this a belief in internal control. (p. 227)

Rotter (1966) predicted a low linear relationship between perceived locus of control and personal adjustment in a normal population. Externality has evidenced a relationship to depression, neuroticism, self-pity and debilitating anxiety, death anxiety and sensitization to suicide and accident proneness and to intropunitive responses to frustration. Higher externality has been found in pathological groups more than in normal groups (Toler & Reznikoff, 1967; Williams & Nickles, 1969; Butterfield, 1964; Harrow & Ferrante, 1969). Internality is associated also with such favorable attributes as social insight, independence and self-confidence. It has been associated with aspirations to improve one's life circumstances. It has also been related to greater need achievement, greater social influence, higher socioeconomic status, less need for social approval, but more accepting and openminded approaches toward others (Lefcourt, 1966; Rotter, 1966; Gold, 1968; Phares, 1965; Powell & Vega, 1972; Franklin, 1963; Graves, 1961).

Studying the personality characteristics of conformers,

Odell (1959) found more externally controlled subjects possessing greater tendencies to conform. Phares (1972) also suggests that criminal acts arise out of conformity to social norms. Cone (1971) thinks that internals, feeling that they have control or influence with those around them, may try to behave in a more socially desirable way, while externals, who feel the victim of fate anyway, have no such desire.

Internal control has been associated with reports of nurturing and acceptance by parents, while externals have been associated with parents who demonstrate lax and inconsistent discipline (Davis & Phares, 1969; MacDonald, 1971).

In a study examining the differences in feeling of control, parental locus of control and parental child rearing attitudes of probated juvenile delinquent and adolescents with no official record of delinquency, it was found that the probated adolescents demonstrated attitudes similar to their parents' expressed attitudes. Powell and Pearson suggest that control through guilt is an important variable in the adolescent's feeling of personal control (Powell & Pearson, 1974).

Studies by Kaplan and Kipper (cited in Powell & Pearson, 1974) support previous theories of delinquents being rebellious to achieve feelings of greater control and power. They discovered more externality in adolescents who had committed

larcenies and burglaries than in a nondelinquent control population.

Liverant and Scodel (1960) studied subjects possessing high and low levels of externality in chance-determined circumstances. Their findings suggest that low externals reveal a greater tendency toward self-regulation in risk-taking situations than do subjects high in externality.

Keefe (1976) compared a delinquent female population to a control nondelinquent female population. She examined the personality variables of powerlessness, sex role self-concept, and sex role attitudes and their relation to delinquency and the choice of type of delinquent behavior. She proposed that female delinquents could be classified into two categories: those who committed offenses which were sexually acting out, and those who committed offenses of aggressive acts against society. The results of her study indicate that the delinquents do perceive themselves as relatively more powerless and masculine than do the non-delinquent controls. The more aggressive females tested more masculine. These results suggest that sex role attitudes are more predictive of the type of delinquent behavior an adolescent female commits. Additionally, those females feeling relatively more powerless and masculine are more likely to appear in a delinquent group than are those exhibiting less powerlessness and more femininity.

According to Williams and Vantress (1969), external persons become frustrated over their helplessness and feelings of being incapable to direct their destiny. They feel that they have no control over their existence or future. If this

feeling endures for an extended period of time, the individual will remain in an interminable state of anxiety and pain (cited in Patton & Freigtag, 1977).

Siegel and Mayfield (1973) researched self-reported anxiety after failure or success on an experimental task by a population of internal and externals. They found that the failing externals exhibited less anxiety than did the externals who had succeeded or the internals that had passed or failed. They explain that the externals failing immediately devalue the experience. The internals exhibit more anxiety as they cannot devalue the failure, but in fact attribute it to themselves.

Houston (1972) suggests that internals may become more physiologically stimulated than externals in stress as they feel that they are less a victim of fate than do the externals (cited in Mayfield, 1973). In a study of locus of control, self-reported and unobtrusive measures of anxiety, it was found that the results obtained by the Taylor Manifest Activity Scale (MAS) appear congruent with previous research indicating that externals are more anxious; however, the results of the Activity Preference Questionnaire (APQ) brought forth questions regarding the validity and led the researchers to believe that the MAS would be more appropriately interpreted in terms of perceived self-esteem than anxiety (Oleary, Donovan & Hague, 1974). A self-esteem is the feeling about one's self that an individual possesses at a given time. During adolescence, acceptance by

others, as well as acceptance by one's self, is an intricate part of the maturation process. Kizziar (1979) identifies the adolescent as remarkably vulnerable to the judgments of those in their immediate environment as they are in a period of self-concept construction. They need acceptance from those that they consider significant others in order to accept themselves. James R. Scroggs (1978) says that "to accept means to appropriate, to take right into the very center of one's being" (p. 48). Carl Rogers (1961) says that "the more fully an individual is understood and accepted, the more he tends to drop the false fronts with which he has been meeting life, the more he tends to move in a direction which is forward."

Bledsoe and Garrison (1962) refer to the self-concept as "one of the most vital areas of human growth." They continue, ". . . an individual's perception of himself may well be the central factor influencing his behavior . . . the self is involved in social reactions; it operates in the service of need satisfaction, particularly in the enhancement of the self or in relation to self esteem; it is a vital force in effective adjustment" (p. 1).

Lipsitt (1958) found a relationship between children's self-concepts and the degree of anxiety that they were prepared to admit. He found that the self-concepts had a significant correlation with anxiety; disparaging children were more anxious. He suggests that the self-disparagement seems to be an antecedent for generalized anxiety.

Baruch (1973) maintains that the individual's self-evaluation as being competent is of absolute importance to feminine self-esteem. Similarly, Kovar (1968) describes an "autonomous process" as a temporary psychological withdrawal that a girl must go through. She asserts that the adolescent girl is not yet autonomous. If the girl's process of autonomy is not complemented with positive relations, etc., but is instead abandoned or ignored by family, she is forced into attention-getting behavior which is presumably labeled "bad."

Rosenberg (1979) describes a period of "self-concept disturbance" during the early adolescent years. It is a period when a self-consciousness, defined as an uncomfortable awareness of the opinions and reactions of others to the self, reaches its most concentrated awareness. During early adolescence, unreflective self-acceptance vanishes and global self-esteem declines. In later adolescence, global improves, but the general self-concept disturbances prevail.

According to Hruska (1978), adolescents demonstrate seemingly incongruous behavior in an effort to find clarity and meaning during a period in their life where they don't know "who they are" or "who they are becoming."

Purpose of Study

Theories of delinquency suggest various plausible causations. Research of current literature is replete with examinations of delinquency and academic achievement; however, studies examining the relationship of delinquency with other casual or related variables are few.

There is some research which indicates that externality is related to debilitating anxiety and depression. Further, it is suggested that often delinquent children exhibit rebellious behavior in an effort to achieve personal feelings of power and/or control. Correlations have been found between children's self-concepts and the degree of anxiety they are prepared to admit.

During adolescence, the individual is confronted by constantly changing role expectations as well as physiological change. Some individuals make the necessary adjustments and proceed through the maturation process with no involvements in delinquent behavior, while others do not.

Theoretically, there is a dearth of explanations. The present study was undertaken to examine the relationship of delinquency and the following variables: (1) anxiety, (2) self-acceptance, and (3) locus of control.

The hypotheses are:

(1) There will be a significant difference between the delinquent group and the non-delinquent group tested, with the delinquent females exhibiting greater anxiety;

(2) There will be a significant difference between the delinquent and non-delinquent measurements of self-acceptance, with the delinquent population being less self-accepting; and

(3) There will be a significant difference between the delinquent and non-delinquent locus of control measures, with those of the delinquent group revealing greater externality.

Chapter 2

METHOD

Subjects

This research compared two groups of adolescent subjects. The experimental sample consisted of 25 juvenile female subjects who had been adjudicated delinquent and subsequently institutionalized with the Tennessee Department of Corrections. The mean age for this group was 15.72 and the group consisted of 19 Caucasians, 5 blacks, and 1 Indian.

The control group consisted of 25 juvenile females selected from the general student population in a public high school. The females in this control population indicated neither previous problems with juvenile authorities nor any prior court participation. The mean age for this group was 16.04 and the group consisted of 19 Caucasians, 3 Blacks, 1 Indian, and 2 Hispanic.

Instrumentation

The Rotter Internal-External Locus of Control Scale is designed to measure a person's perception of the contingency between his or her actions and the subsequent events that follow. It consists of 23 pairs of questions with 6 filler items and employs a forced choice format.

Rotter (1966) reports an internal consistency Kuder Richardson coefficient of .70 for a sample of 400 college

students. A number of studies seeking to establish the validity of the Rotter Scale have indicated that it is sensitive to existing individual differences in perceptions of personal control of destiny.

The Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale was constructed to detect a predisposition to emotional discontent during stress. It consists of 50 items covering feelings or behaviors ranging from overt signs of anxiety to somatic complaints. Items are programmed in a manner which makes higher scores indicative of greater anxiety. Taylor (1953) reports test-retest reliability coefficients of .89, .82, and .81 over periods of three weeks, 5 months and 7 to 19 months, respectively, using a sample of college students. She contends that the items of the scale may be regarded as an operational definition of manifest anxiety.

The Phillips Self-Acceptance Scale is arranged to measure one's acceptance of self. The Phillips Scale consists of 25 items. Each negative answer indicates higher self-acceptance.

Onwake (1954) found that the Berger Expressed Acceptance of Self Scale and Phillips Self-Acceptance Scale correlated .75. She also obtained correlations of .49 and .55 with the Bills Self-Acceptance Scale for the Berger and Phillips Scales, respectively. For the Phillips Scale a five-day test-retest correlation of .84 was obtained with a sample of 45 subjects. Research suggests that the Phillips Scale probably would benefit from item analysis (Phillips, 1951).

Administration

To obtain permission for testing the sample population, a proposal (see Appendix) was sent to the Tennessee Department of Corrections Research Advisory Committee. When approval was obtained from the State Department, Tennessee Department of Corrections Standard Consent Forms were sent to the Director of the Juvenile Corrections School. The Director was responsible for collecting the signatures of the parents for each subject. Participants in the experimental population were randomly selected by the Director according to class schedule cards located in her office.

The subjects in the control group were randomly selected by a guidance counselor from schedule cards located in the office at Clarksville High School. The same standard consent forms were delivered to the guidance counselor and the parents' consent was obtained for each participant.

A date for testing each group was appointed and the administration of these instruments were conducted in a standardized manner for each. The test administrator read with the subjects the purpose of the study and the method of instruction for each measure. Anonymity was explained and subsequently no participants identified themselves by name on any measure. Each subject, however, was assigned a number which he or she wrote in the top right corner of each measure to keep all measurements together for each subject. At the conclusion of the testing period, all subjects were thanked for their participation and then dismissed.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

Data were analyzed using the t-test for independent samples. The results of this analysis appear to support the hypotheses and the results found by other researchers.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there would be a significant difference between the delinquent and non-delinquent girls tested with the delinquent females exhibiting greater anxiety. A t value of 4.35 was obtained between the two groups on the anxiety measurement (p < .005). The mean for the experimental group was 25.72; the mean anxiety score for the control group was 16.60.

Hypothesis 2 proposed that there would be a significant difference between the two groups on self-acceptance, with the delinquent group being less self-accepting. The mean score for the experimental group was 77.48, whereas the mean score for the control group was 64.12. The t-test analysis produced a t of 3.31 (p < .005). Thus, there was a significant difference between the two groups, with the delinquent girls exhibiting less self-accepting scores.

Finally, Hypothesis 3 predicted a significant difference between the delinquent and non-delinquent groups, with the delinquent girls possessing greater externality. A mean score of 11.36 was reported on the Rotters Scale for the

delinquent group, compared to a mean score of 7.52 on the same measurement for the control population. T-test analysis rendered a t of 4.55 ($p < .005$). Again, there was a significant difference between the two groups, with the delinquent population exhibiting greater externality.

There is a likelihood that these variables which were measured possess commonalities in their individual constructs; therefore, the parametric technique of the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was used to determine the nature and degree of relationship between the three measures. The r values obtained for all intercorrelations were significant with the exception of the intercorrelation of self-acceptance and locus of control for the delinquent (see Table 2 and Table 3).

Chapter 4

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the present study appear to be congruent with those reviewed in the current literature. The delinquent sample obtained scores are indicative of greater anxiety and intropunitive responses to frustration as predicted by Rotter (1966).

Although speculative, the nonsignificance of the inter-correlation of self-acceptance and the locus of control for the delinquent group may suggest that individuals who possess greater externality have a different evaluation construct for self-acceptance than do internals who hold themselves responsible for, perhaps, even their ability to be satisfied with or to accept themselves. This would lend support to Cone's (1971) contention that internals may behave in more socially desirable ways since they feel that they have control where externals, feeling victimized, do not. The research of Kaplan and Kipper (1974) supports other studies indicating that delinquents behave rebelliously in order to feel personal control. Perhaps, this is the basis for the difference in construct evaluation between those internally or externally oriented.

These results clearly corroborate significant differences between the two groups tested which implies a different

treatment approach for children demonstrating delinquent behavior. Findings suggest that further research should be undertaken with regard to these variables and delinquent behavior.

Related research would be of value in attempts to understand the adolescent. A closer examination of parental influence may offer evidence to support theories that suggest that children emulate the behaviors demonstrated in their home environment and express attitudes similar to those of their parents. Additionally, an investigation of the methods and consistency of discipline administered by the parents of delinquent children compared to the methods employed by parents of a non-delinquent group may show results that would benefit planning an effective parenting skills training program for the prevention of delinquent behavior.

Further research should be conducted to explore contributors to inadequate self-esteem and its relationship to delinquency as this study supports research indicating that non-delinquents demonstrate a greater willingness to accept themselves than do the delinquents. This may be relevant particularly since the literature reviewed distinguishes self-acceptance as a very important factor in determining whether a person is more likely to conform to peer group dictates or to live by their own convictions.

REFERENCES

- Bandura, Albert & Walters, Richard H. (1969). Social Learning and Personality Development, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Toronto, London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Baruch, Grace K. (1973). Feminine Self-esteem, Self Ratings of Competence, and Maternal Career Commitment. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, p. 487-448.
- Bledsoe, J. C. & Garrison, K. C. (1962). The Self Concepts of Elementary School Children in Relation to Their Academic Achievement, Intelligence, Interests, and Manifest Anxiety. Athens: University of Georgia, College of Education, p. 1-2.
- Bloch, H. & Niederhoffer, A. (1958). The Gang. New York: Philosophical Press.
- Butterfield, E. C. (1964). Locus of Control, Test Anxiety, Reactions to Frustration and Achievement Attitudes. Journal of Personality, 32, 298-311.
- Cernkovich, Stephen A. & Denisoff, R. (1978). Value Orientations and Delinquency: A Theoretical Synthesis, School Crime and Disruption, Responsible Action.
- Cloward, R. & Ohlin, L. (1960). Delinquency and Opportunity. Chicago: Free Press.
- Cohen, Albert (1955). Delinquent Boys. Glencoe, Ill.: New York Free Press.

- Cone, John D. (1971). Locus of Control and Social Desirability. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36, No. 3, p. 449.
- Davis, W. L. & Phares, E. J. (1969). Parental Antecedants of Internal-External Control of Reinforcement, Psychological Reports, 24, 427-436.
- Durkheim, Emile (1961). Moral Education. New York: The Free Press.
- Erikson, Erik (1963). Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton, Inc., p. 246.
- Feldman, Ronald A. (1978). Delinquent Behavior in the Public Schools: Toward More Accurate Labeling and Effective Intervention. School Crime and Disruption, Responsible Action, Davis, California.
- Franklin, R. D. (1963). Youth's Expectancies about Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcements Related to N Variables. Dissertation Abstracts, 23, 3437.
- Glaser, Daniel (1960). Differential Association and Criminal Prediction. Journal of Social Problems, VIII, I, 7-14.
- Glueck, Sheldon & Glueck, Eleanor (1950). Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York: The Commonwealth Fund.
- Gold, D. (1968). Some Correlation Coefficients: Relationships Among I-E Scores and Other Personality Variables. Psychological Reports, 22, 983-984.
- Gold, Martin (1978). Scholastic Experiences, Self Esteem and Delinquent Behavior: A Theory for Alternative Schools. School Crime and Disruption, Responsible Action.

- Graves, T. D. (1961). Time Perspective and the Deferred Gratification Pattern in a Tri-Ethnic Community. Boulder: University of Colorado, Tri-Ethnic Research Project, Institute of Behavioral Sciences.
- Harrow, M. & Ferrante, A. (1969). Locus of Control, Psychiatric Patients. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 582-589.
- Hirschi, Travis (1969). Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Houston, B. K. (1972). Control Over Stress, Locus of Control and Response to Stress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 21, 249-255.
- Hruska, Jack (1978). The Obsolescence of Adolescence. School Crime and Disruption, Responsible Action.
- Kaplan, M. & Kipper, D. A. (1974). Externalization Style Among Solitary and Social Delinquents. Journal of Community Psychology, 2, 88-90.
- Keefe, Janet Butera (1976). The Relationship of Locus of Control, Sex Role Self Concept and Sex Role Attitudes to Female Delinquent Behavior. New York University.
- Kizziar, Janet & Hagedorn, Judy (1979). Search for Acceptance: The Adolescents and Self Esteem. Nelson Hall, Chicago.
- Kovar, Lillian Cohen (1968). Faces of the Adolescent Girl. Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey.
- Kvaraceus, William C. & Miller, Walter B. (1959). Delinquent Behavior: Culture and the Individual. Washington: National Education Association, p. 54.

- Lefcourt, Herbert M. (1966). Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement. Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 65, No. 4, p. 206-220.
- Lipsitt, L. P. (1958). A Self Concept Scale for Children and its Relationship to the Childrens Form of Manifest Anxiety Scale. Child Development, 29, 463-472.
- Liverant, S. & Scodel, A. (1960). Internal and External Control as Determinants of Decision Making Under Conditions of Risk. Psychological Reports, 7, p. 59-67.
- MacDonald, A. P., Jr. (1971). Internal-External Locus of Control: Parental Antecedants. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 37, 141-147.
- Matza, David (1964). Delinquency and Drift. University of California, Berkeley. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Mayfield, Roxie (1973). Psychological Reports, 32, p. 1189-1190.
- McCorkle, Lloyd & Korn, Richard (1954, May). Resocialization Within Walls. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 293.
- Merton, Robert K. (1937). Social Structure and Anomie. American Sociological Review, E, October, p. 672-682.
- Miller, Jerome G. (1970). Research and Theory in Middle Class Delinquency. The British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 10, No. 1, 33-51.
- Miller, Walter B. (1957). Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency. Journal of Social Issues, 14(3), p. 5019.

- Nettler, Gwynn (1974). Explaining Crime. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Neumeyer, Martin H. (1955). Juvenile Delinquency in Modern Society. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc.
- Nye, F. Ivan (1958). Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Odell, M. (1959). Personality Correlates of Independence and Conformity. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Ohio State University.
- O'Leary, Michael; Donovan, Dennis & Hague, William (1974). Relationship Between Locus of Control Self Report and Unobtrusive Measures of Anxiety. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 30. Jun.-Oct., p. 372-373.
- Onwake, Katharine (1954). The Relationship Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18, 443-446.
- Patton, John F. & Frietag, Carl B. (1977). Correlational Study of Death Anxiety, General Anxiety and Locus of Control. Psychological Reports, 40, p. 51-54.
- Phares, E. J. (1965). Internal-External Control as a Determinant of the Amount of Social Influence Exerted. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 642-647.
- Phares, E. J. (1972). A Social Learning Theory Approach to Psychopathology. In J. B. Rotter, J. Chance and E. J. Phares (Eds.), Applications of a Social Learning Theory

- of Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, p. 436-469.
- Phillips, E. (1951). Attitudes Toward Self and Others: A Brief Questionnaire Report. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 15, 79-81.
- Phillipson, Michael (1974). Understanding Crime and Delinquency: A Sociological Introduction. Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago.
- Powell, A. & Vega, M. (1972). Correlates of Adult Locus of Control. Psychological Reports, 30, 445-460.
- Powell, Arnold & Pearson, Carol A. (1974). Feelings of Personal Control and Parental Child Rearing Attitudes Among Delinquent Adolescents. Paper presented at the Southeastern Psychological Association, Hollywood, Florida.
- Reckless, Walter C.; Divitz, Simon; & Murray, Ellen (1956). Self Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency. American Sociological Review, 21, 744-746.
- Reckless, Walter (1961). The Crime Problem. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Reiss, Albert J. (1951). Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls. American Sociological Review, 16, 196-207.
- Rogers, C. R. (1961). On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rosenberg, Morris (1979). Conceiving the Self. Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, New York, p. 254-255.

- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized Expectancies for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80, (1 Whole No. 609).
- Scroggs, James R. (1978). Letting Love In. Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey, p. 48.
- Shaw, Clifford & McKay, Henry D. (1942). Juvenile Delinquency in Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Siegel, Jerome M. & Mayfield, Roxie (1973). Internal-External Control and Anxiety Following Success and Failure. Psychological Reports, 32, 1189-1190.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. & Cressey, Donald R. (1970). Principles of Criminology. New York: J. B. Lippincott.
- Sykes, Gresham M. (1978). Criminology. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Taylor, Janet A. (1953). A Personality Scale of Manifest Anxiety. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, p. 253-290.
- Tennessee Code Annotated (1984). Volume 6A, Tennessee Code Commission, The Mico Company, p. 409.
- Tolor, A. & Reznikoff, M. (1967). Relation Between Insight, Repression, Sensitization, Internal-External Control and Death Anxiety. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 72, p. 426-430.
- Waugh, Isami & Dunbar, Robert (1977). Comparative Analysis of Psychological Theories of Delinquency. Preventing Delinquency, Vol. 1 of LX, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, US Dept. of Justice.

Weiss, Joseph (1977). Social Control, Comparative Analysis of Social Control Theories of Delinquency--The Breakdown of Adequate Social Controls. Preventing Delinquency, Vol. I of IX, National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, US Dept. of Justice.

Williams, C. B. & Nickles, J. B. (1969). Internal-External Control Dimension as Related to Accident and Suicide Proneness. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 485-494.

Williams, C. B. & Vantress, F. E. (1969). Relation Between I-E Control and Aggression. Journal of Psychology, 71, 69-61.

Williams, Jay R. & Gold, Martin (1972). From Delinquent Behavior to Official Delinquency. Social Problems, Fall, Vol. 20, No. 2.

TABLES

Table 1

Comparison of Experimental and Control Group in Terms
of Anxiety, Self Acceptance and Locus of Control

Variable	Experimental		Control		<u>t</u>
	N = 25		N = 25		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Anxiety	25.72	7.99	16.60	6.78	4.35*
Self Acceptance	77.48	13.45	64.12	15.05	3.31*
Locus of Control	11.36	2.82	7.52	3.12	4.55*

*p < .005

Table 2

Intercorrelation Among Locus of Control, Anxiety, and
Self Acceptance for the Experimental Group

Variable	Anxiety	Self Acceptance	Locus of Control
Locus of Control	.49*		
Anxiety		.48*	
Self Acceptance			.083

*p < .02

Table 3

Intercorrelation Among Locus of Control, Anxiety, and
Self Acceptance for the Control Group

Variable	Anxiety	Self Acceptance	Locus of Control
Locus of Control	.54*		
Anxiety		.53*	
Self Acceptance			.49**

* $p < .01$

** $p < .02$

APPENDIX



STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION
4TH FLOOR STATE OFFICE BUILDING
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37219

The Tennessee Department of Correction encourages research which shows promise of improving the efficiency, economy and/or effectiveness of the Tennessee state corrections systems and its subsystems. Employees of and offenders committed to the State Department of Correction are encouraged to participate in research efforts and submit ideas for research that their particular knowledge and experiences suggest might be of value.

For the purpose of this department, research is defined as:

Any project activity which involves the collection of data from the files or records maintained by a facility or program or the testing, interviewing, or manipulation of behavior of a resident or staff for the purpose of testing hypothesis.

The department has a formal review and approval process over research activities within the department.

Permission to conduct research projects may be granted provided the potential benefits outweigh both the cost to the state tax payer and disruptive effects on operation, the methodology of the research is clear and sound, research is carefully planned and conducted in a manner consistent with human dignity, and that research involving the use of human subjects and/or data collection from human subjects is strictly voluntary, sufficiently addresses the protection of rights to privacy, the need of informed consent, protection of the confidentiality of data and protection against physical, psychological, social, and legal risks.

Research projects requiring approval of the department's Research Advisory Committee include:

1. Research conducted by employees of the department other than that research which is considered a function of their position.
2. Research conducted jointly by outside agencies and departmental employees.
3. Outside agency research conducted within the Department of Correction.
4. Research involving inmate or staff educational, psychological, medical, or attitudinal status.
5. Student research projects other than observations, surveys of a demographic nature, simple book reports and papers, student teaching experiences, and internships.

Research projects requiring departmental approval will be submitted on a standard proposal form (see attachment) to the Research Advisory Committee. The forms herewith attached have been developed to help the researcher supply the kind of information required by the Research Advisory Committee to make a proper and valid evaluation. An original and six copies of the proposal form must be submitted to the committee through the Assistant Commissioner of Organizational Development or his/her designee. The Assistant Commissioner of Organizational Development or his/her designee or the committee may return the proposal to its originator for further information, modification, or clarification. The committee may recommend approval, approval with qualifications, or disapproval. All proposals approved by the committee will be submitted to the Commissioner of Correction for approval or disapproval.

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION
RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE
GENERAL PROPOSAL FORM

Dissertation Research: _____ Grant Proposal: _____
Masters Thesis Research: x Faculty Research: _____
Demonstration Project/
Pilot Study: _____ Other: _____

IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION: (Complete all items. Use "N/A" if necessary.)

1. Title of Proposal: A study of Comparison of Locus of Control,
Self Acceptance, and Anxiety of Juvenile Delinquent Females VS Non-Delinquent
Females
2. Date: August 18, 1980
3. Principal Researcher: Edward Davis
4. Address: 102 Allenwood Drive Clarksville, Tenn. 37040
5. Phone Number: 615-552-1710
6. Other Researchers: none
7. Faculty Advisor: Linda Rudolph PhD
8. College or University: Austin Peay State University
9. Advisor's Campus Box Number: n/a Phone Number: 615-648-7233
10. Former Title of Proposal (if applicable): n/a
11. Identify any other previous committee reviews, dates, and
results: none
12. This proposal is:
x New An Amendment An Addendum

If this proposal has been approved by this committee previously and is being resubmitted with any modifications, describe the modifications. (Include former title and review date in identification information on first page of form.)

N/A

Item #1. Summary of the Project's Overall Goal:

to research the locus of control of delinquent females as opposed to those motivations of a control group. In addition, self acceptance and anxiety will be surveyed to see any possible causations or correlations.

My hypothesis, simply stated, is that the delinquent children will test more external in their locus of control, less self-accepting, and they will exhibit more anxiety as a result.

A lot of research is being done with Locus of Control, but I feel that more research does need to be done in order for us to better equip ourselves with programs, treatments, etc., that specifically meet the needs of our incarcerated youth.

Item #2. Research Plan:

A. Scientific basis of the study: As previously stated, my hypothesis is that delinquent youth will test largely external, less self accepting and exhibit more anxiety than the control group. Measurements to be used will be Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale and the Phillips Self Acceptance Scale and an Anxiety Scale (not yet chosen, as I'm still researching validity data).

B. Specific objectives: To test hypothesis on this delinquent and control population, and to perform different statistical analysis to see if results confirm or conflict with hypothesis. It is hoped that research in this area could result in program innovation, designed to specifically meet the needs of delinquent youth.

Item #3. Identify All Procedures That Will Be Carried Out With Each Type of Subject: (Attach copies of tests or instruments to be used.)

The only procedures to be carried out will be to collectively administer 3 questionnaires to measure locus of control, self acceptance, and anxiety. Confidence of findings would be explained prior to filling out forms, and then forms and scales would be read in a standardized manner. None of the questions, etc. would be anxiety evoking. Two of the tests used will be the Rotters Internal-External Locus of Control and Phillips Self Acceptance Scale.

The third measure for anxiety has not been selected yet, as I am still researching validity data; however, it will be similar in nature to the other two measures short and easily read. I estimate the total testing time not to exceed 1½ hours.

Item #4. Describe Criteria For Selection/Inclusion of Subjects:

Selection of participants will be left up to the Director at Highland Rim; the only requirement being delinquent females, ages 13-16. Volitional participation, of course.

The control population will be selected randomly of the same age group of volunteer students. Both populations will need to include 30 students.

Item #5. Describe Types, Numbers, Ages, and Sources of Subjects To Be Studied: (From where will the subjects be recruited? How will subjects be recruited?)

Delinquent population entirely from Highland Rim School. Control population of same ages (see above) from local community.

Highland Rim students should number 30, of ages 13-16, naturally all female.

Control, the same as above.

Item #6. Describe Anticipated Risks or Inconveniences That Might Be Associated With the Procedures:

I anticipate no risks or any type of negative consequence as a result of participation in this activity.

Item #7. What Precautions Will Be Taken In Those Procedures Where Potential Risk May Be Involved:

n/a, other than all precautions taken to insure total confidentiality.

Item #8. What Steps Will Be Taken To Insure the Subjects' Rights, Privacy, and Well Being:

Explanation of purpose of study for my thesis; no names to be taken, only survey information, ages, sex, and perhaps race; and the administration of attached consent form.

Item #9. Indicate Plans For Confidentiality of Documents and Data, and Access To Such:

All results, etc. will be kept by myself until completion of research. Final paper will be furnished in copies to Corrections; Graduate Office. Paper will include collective findings only as they confirm or conflict with hypothesis.

Item #10. Is Any Element of Deception of the Subjects Necessary For This Research?

 Yes

 x No

If answer is "Yes," describe the nature of the deception and the procedure to counteract (undo) the deception:

N/A

Item #11. Procedure For Obtaining the Participants' Informed Consent:

A) Standard consent form will be used x

B) An oral presentation will be made

C) Other _____

Regardless of the method chosen, the researcher must attach to this proposal the completed standard consent form or a description of the alternate procedure. If no consent is considered necessary, please explain:

- Item #12. The researcher agrees to seek prior approval from the committee for any changes in title, experimental procedures, informed consent procedures or wording of informed consent letter, or other aspects of this proposal. The researcher further agrees to notify the committee immediately of any adverse effects experienced by subjects participating in this study.
- Item #13. The researcher agrees to provide to the Department of Correction a copy of the study and its conclusions upon completion.

SIGNATURE:

Principal Researcher

I would like to test at a date convenient for Highland Rim, sometime in September. I have discussed my plans with their Director and she could foresee no problems with making the necessary arrangements with her facility. The deadline for my paper is December 11th, 1980, however, I anticipate completion much earlier than that date, as I have already done much of the research. I will be most happy to furnish you with a copy of the finished paper. Additionally, if I can answer any questions or provide more information along the way, I would be most happy to do so. Thank you for your consideration of my research.

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION
RESEARCH REVIEW COMMITTEE

STANDARD CONSENT FORM

Principal Researcher: Edward Davis

Title of Proposal: A study of comparison of Locus of Control, Self

Acceptance, and Anxiety

1. Indicated below are the (a) purpose of this study, (b) procedures to be followed, and (c) approximate duration of this study:

Purpose of Study: To locate the Locus of Control for a delinquent student population as opposed to the Locus of Control of a random public school population of non-adjudicated female students of the same age group. Also, to examine self acceptance and anxiety.

Procedure: Three pencil and paper scales, which will be read aloud in a standardized manner in one setting with one comfort break.

Time: Total time should approximate 1½ hours.

2. Discomforts, inconveniences and/or risks that can be reasonably expected are:

There will be no discomforts, there will be a break before the administration of the last questionnaire.

3. The participant's rights, welfare, and privacy will be protected in the following manner:
- a. In signing this consent form, you have not waived any of your legal rights, nor have you released this institution/agency from liability for negligence.
 - b. All data obtained from you during the course of this study will be accessible only to the principal researcher(s) and Graduate Advisor, Austin Peay State University.
 - c. Should the results of this project be published, you will be referred to only by number.

NOTE: YOU ARE FREE TO WITHDRAW THIS CONSENT AND TO DISCONTINUE PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY OR ACTIVITY AT ANY TIME.

4. This consent information was presented in (a) written X,
(b) oral _____ form.

I understand the procedures to be used in this study and the possible risks involved. All my questions have been answered. I also understand that my rights and privacy will be maintained, and I freely and voluntarily choose to participate. I understand that I may withdraw at any time.

Date

Signature of Volunteer

Date

Signature of Parent or Guardian
(when applicable)