

1974

# Predicting Delinquent Sub-Types with the Social History Questionnaire

Charles S. Sulcer

*Eastern Illinois University*

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Psychology](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

---

## Recommended Citation

Sulcer, Charles S., "Predicting Delinquent Sub-Types with the Social History Questionnaire" (1974). *Masters Theses*. 3677.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/3677>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

PAPER CERTIFICATE #2

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

2-5-74  
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

pdm

PREDICTING DELINQUENT SUB-TYPES

WITH THE SOCIAL HISTORY QUESTIONNAIRE  
(TITLE)

BY

CHARLES S. SULCER

**THESIS**

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS IN PSYCHOLOGY

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1974  
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

August 6, 1974  
DATE

August 6, 1974  
DATE

PREDICTING DELINQUENT SUB-TYPES WITH THE SOCIAL HISTORY QUESTIONNAIRE

BY

Charles S. Sulcer

B. S. in Psychology, Eastern Illinois University, 1971

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology at the Graduate School  
of Eastern Illinois University

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1974

**314325**

### Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. William McGown and Dr. Henry Stackhouse for their tremendous help and support as members of my thesis committee. I extend special gratitude to Dr. Randall H. Best for his counsel and patience in serving as committee chairman, to make possible this endeavor. A word of thanks must go to Mr. Robert Askew, Probation Officer for Mount Vernon, Illinois City Police District, in making available the young offenders used in this research. Acknowledgement is also in order for my wife, Cyndi, whose loving support helped make possible the completion of this thesis.

### Abstract

A major problem encountered in the juvenile courts concerns the large number of young offenders placed on probation, as well as the seriousness of their violations. Representative studies by Jenkins and Glickman (1947), Hathaway and Monachesi (1953), and Shinohara and Jenkins (1967) have pointed out the complexities of delinquent behavior by indicating that most legal authorities are often unable to determine who will repeat illegal acts.

This problem necessitates some objective approach toward identifying potential repeaters and non-repeaters. Such a technique would be useful in studying the early stages of delinquent behavior and provide a means of studying the growing crime rate of adult criminals.

Delinquents have been found to fall within certain personality classifications, as implied in the Hewitt and Jenkins (1946), and Shinohara and Jenkins (1967) research. Various delinquent behavior patterns have been incorporated in the contents of the Social History Questionnaire (SHQ), a paper and pencil intake inventory developed by Best and Erikson (1973). This actuarial technique is devised to measure such personality traits as behavioral disturbances, parent-child relations, and psychosomatic disorders.

The present study was designed to construct a Recidivist-Non-recidivist scale, using those items of the SHQ that best differentiated the recidivists and non-recidivists.

Ss were 40 probation youths who had completed the SHQ. Ss were divided into two groups, Recidivists and Non-recidivists, according to number of offenses indicated by their court record. The two groups were then compared in terms of their responses to the SHQ. A  $X^2$  item analysis

was used. Of 393 SHQ items, 18 were found to differentiate between the two groups ( $p < .05$ ). One item was significant at the .01 level. These 18 items were then combined into a subscale, and norms for the entire sample were established. Various limitations, as well as implications for future research were discussed.

## Contents

Abstract .....	1
INTRODUCTION .....	3
METHODOLOGY .....	28
Subjects .....	28
Apparatus .....	28
Table 1 .....	29
Method .....	30
RESULTS .....	31
Item Analysis .....	31
Norms for the Subscale .....	31
Table 2 .....	32
Table 3 .....	34
Table 4 .....	35
DISCUSSION .....	36
Limitations .....	38
Suggestions for Future Research .....	38
REFERENCES .....	39
APPENDIX 1 .....	45
APPENDIX 2 .....	64



An existing problem in the juvenile courts concerns the number of young offenders placed on probation. This is complicated by seriousness of the offense, length of probation, and probability of committing another violation of the law.

Aside from this, the problem of definition and incidence of delinquency has received a great deal of attention in recent years. There are several ways of defining delinquency and its relation to anti-social acts. One is the ethical, or moral point of view in which perhaps all behavior in violation of values could be considered delinquent. Such a view is not applicable to empirical study. Another way of defining delinquency was brought out by Wirt and Briggs (1959): "an act which violates any law (p. 12)". This view is generally proposed by those who emphasize severity as important in a definition of "real" delinquency. The petty violations, so common as to be considered part of normal behavior, should not count in this perspective.

It should be pointed out that the legal, psychological, and sociological definitions of delinquency usually do not coincide with each other. The legal definition, as described by Vedder (1954), views the delinquent as a youth who has been apprehended for an anti-social act, brought to court, and found guilty. This definition implies that the young offender's behavior be judged through a legal system, the courts.

Vedder (1954) presents an adequate psychological definition, which considers delinquency as "acquired through the learning process, and is a form of social behavior that is often a reflection of adult surroundings (p. 3)". A major implication of this is that delinquency may be the product of disorganized personal and social interactions.

From a sociological viewpoint, the delinquent child is described by Kvaraceus (1966) as expressing himself by aggressive and overt action which does not comply with the demands and expectations of society. To those who observe him, the delinquent's behavior is considered socially troublesome to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the tolerance level of the community.

From the above, there seems to exist an overlap among the three definitions. This is brought out by the need to view delinquency from a legal, psychological, and sociological standpoint. It further points out that the courts, mental health specialists, social workers, counselors, and the schools should work together in assessing the problem of delinquency.

It can be seen that the psychologist is primarily concerned with whether there is "delinquent behavior", "psychopathic behavior", or "criminal behavior"; as well as the relationship between these various concepts. The incidence of delinquency is often considered a meaningless question, since the incidence will depend to such a large degree on the legal interpretation of what constitutes a "delinquent act", and this will differ markedly from one culture to another.

The McNaughten Rule---interpretation of insanity as the inability of the defendant to distinguish right from wrong (Wirt & Briggs, 1959)---limits the interpretation of delinquency. More recently, the defense of "irresistible impulse" has developed. The current wave of liberal court rulings have allowed for broader psychiatric emphasis on "mental disturbance" as a causative factor in crime, thus making the individual less responsible for his actions. From this position the definition of delinquency

would be restricted to include only those individuals who, in full cognition of the law, their own situations, and the possible consequences, choose to commit an illegal act. The objective criterion for study of "delinquency" would seem to be the inclusion of those adolescents possessing a known police or court record.

The problem of assessing delinquency was first studied by Hewitt and Jenkins (1946). These investigators rated 500 delinquent children referred to a child guidance clinic, and classified the ratings by means of a cluster analysis. The analysis identified three behavioral types of delinquents: (1) "unsocialized-aggressive", (2) "socialized delinquent", and (3) "overinhibited delinquent".

A study by Jenkins and Glickman (1947) conducted a further investigation of the three behavioral traits listed in the above research. They used a factor analysis to study environmental factors in each of the three types. Examination of background factors indicated that by comparison to the "socialized delinquent" group, the "unsocialized-aggressive" child had more frequently experienced parental rejection. The "socialized delinquent" came from a larger family and was more accepted in the home. It was also found that the "overinhibited delinquent" gave indication of having experienced more parental rejection than the "unsocialized delinquent".

Jenkins (1955) searched for a more refined classification of delinquent types. After researching various delinquent records, he concluded that delinquency could be classified into adaptive and maladaptive forms. The former was considered goal-oriented, and involved adaptation and learning by experience. The latter was considered a product of frustra-

tion and involved stereotyped behavior. This adaptation to the delinquent way of behaving was found to be typically increased by punishment.

Thus, it would seem from the studies mentioned thus far that delinquency consists of several sub-classes. It is also apparent that the various delinquent sub-types tend to overlap with each other.

There are several implications derived from the above points. First of all, the study of delinquency should involve correlated techniques. This allows for a more adequate comparison of criteria being investigated, as well as to determine the degree of similarities and differences among subjects used in the various studies. Secondly, the study of delinquent sub-types should concern itself with the manipulation of social variables (social class, intelligence, race, etc.). An approach such as this would provide a clearer picture of how the delinquent functions in his culture. Finally, the above studies would serve to provide guidelines for probation officers and attorneys in judging the future destiny of the young offender. In particular, the suggestions mentioned in these studies would influence the decision of whether punishment or rehabilitation should be rendered.

Many attempts have been made to provide sociological explanations for delinquent behavior. One of the more **comprehensive studies** involves the "subcultural" theory of Cohen (1956). Cohen viewed delinquency as a learned behavior, influenced chiefly by cultural elements. His main contention was that "delinquent subcultures" "...are acquired only by interaction with those who already share and embody, in their belief and action, the culture pattern (p. 13)". Cohen further described a total rejection of middle-class standards and an alternative life-style

containing legitimized acts.

Cohen's theory has been both refuted and upheld. Such authorities as Sykes and Matza (1957) have criticized Cohen's "subcultural" theory for its view of delinquents as totally rejecting dominant social demands. They have asserted that the delinquent subculture tends to accord admiration and respect for the law-abiding citizens.

In another study, Haney and Gold (1973) challenged Cohen's theory on the basis of their research findings. They evaluated autobiographical information of 125 delinquents and found that even the "most delinquent" teen-agers characterized their own friends as being "less delinquent" than teen-agers in general. That is, various "gangs" within the "delinquent subculture" showed a tendency to distrust each other.

On the other hand, Cloward and Ohlin (1960) supported Cohen's view by designating various "patterns" within the subculture itself. These were: (1) the criminal pattern---which integrates youthful delinquency with adult criminals; (2) the conflict pattern---acquiring a reputation for toughness and destructive violence, and (3) the retreatist pattern---which encompasses a variety of expressive, sensual, or consumating dependencies.

It can be seen that the "subcultural" theory goes hand-in-hand with various behavioral formulations. Yates (1970) has stated that the extent of delinquent socialization is basically a function of the amount and severity of social training. He further elaborated that socialization involves "...essentially the development of mediating fear responses which inhibit the tendency to perform anti-social acts (p. 210)".

In summary the role of the social environment has much impact on shaping delinquent behavior, as pointed out by Cohen (1956). It should be mentioned that an adequate understanding of the offender's background should be met before proceeding to diagnosis and psychological evaluations.

A look at how delinquency can be evaluated through other variables follows. It would be impossible to study the delinquent personality without employing the use of court records or some other objective technique of measurement. The use of court records and psychological tests has served to provide adequate guidelines for assessing the degree of delinquent behavior. This gives the clinician provisions for making important decisions concerning the type of rehabilitative counseling measures to be taken.

#### Court Records and Related Information

Much of the material related to delinquency is kept by juvenile courts and probation offices. Here, one finds information dealing with family background, education, and social interactions. Legal matters are handled through evaluation of all the above, as well as the adolescent's behavior assessment when on probation. It would seem logical that psychological information could be gathered from this.

An attempt at using court records was made by Wattenberg (1954). In this study, the police records of 334 11-year-old boys were examined. An attempt was undertaken to ascertain whether or not there was any distinctive group factors associated with repeated delinquency among preadolescent boys. This was contrasted with a group of adolescent-aged delinquents. Results of this study showed the following as most associated with repeating (at a .05 confidence level): (1) "boy did not express a favorable

attitude toward his home environment" and (2) "parents showed a punitive attitude toward the boy in the interviews concerning his offense". At a .10 level, the parents of repeaters showed a tendency to: (1) "be indifferent toward efforts to work out plans for the boys" and (2) "seldom take part in recreation with the boy".

A research project was conducted by Kvaraceus (1959) for the purpose of providing more effective communication between court and school personnel. The primary aim was to help the school personnel in understanding the predelinquent and delinquent student. The following are some of the guidelines established in this research: (1) the school or court designates a court-school liaison person who works on a year-round basis; (2) the school, court, and police recognize truancy as a significant clue to potential delinquency, analyze local records, and develop a procedure for combating delinquency; and (3) the school and court work out programs and procedures for the norm-violating youngster awaiting trial, on probation, under detention, or released from probation or detention.

Robins (1966) used court records to facilitate a longitudinal study of 524 child guidance clinic patients, most of whom had been diagnosed as "sociopathic". Information at time of their follow-up showed that 12% of the sociopathic group had given up their anti-social behavior, and an additional 27% had reduced it markedly. The remaining 61% were seriously anti-social. The most valid predictor was the frequency and seriousness of anti-social behavior; 88% of the "sociopathic" children studied had committed four or more arrestable acts. It was also found that 55% of all severely anti-social children who became sociopaths went to a juvenile correctional institution, compared with 33% of those who did not become sociopaths.

The Court Delinquency Report was a pilot study, constructed by Rapp and Blazer (1970) to evaluate differences between social characteristics of recidivist and non-recidivist male delinquents. Subjects taken from court files of a given year were presented the Court Delinquency Report. The findings of this study supported the significance of the following items ( $X^2=.05$ ): custody of the child, age, and court counselor's personal evaluation. The research plan was designed to determine the degree of significance in which recidivist and non-recidivist delinquents could be differentiated.

Another study, Quay (1964), relied on legal material in assessing case histories of 115 institutionalized male delinquents. A factor analysis was performed on behavioral trait ratings. The factors were based on Jenkins and Glickman's (1947) syndrome analysis, as well as additional traits associated with the subjects. Four factors that accounted for 68% of the total variance were: Socialized-Subcultural, Unsocialized-Psychopathic, Disturbed-Neurotic, and Inadequate-Immature. These findings suggested clear-cut confirmation of the earlier work (Jenkins & Glickman, 1947).

Larson, Fitzgerald, and Martin (1971) evaluated the influence of social class on reported parental behavior, as a significant factor in social and solitary delinquent status. 46 delinquents were selected and classified by social class and type of delinquent behavior. These subjects were then tested with a modified Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire. Results showed that social class was not a significant factor in differentiating social and solitary delinquents.



Another study, Taylor (1970), used probation records to define misbehavior of unincarcerated adolescents. 100 males were given a delinquency inventory and follow-up structured interview for self-report on misbehavior. Interview responses were rated and inventory items correlated by the Pearson  $r$ . The following three factors were found to be significantly correlated with misbehavior: (1) disregard for public opinion, (2) conflict feelings toward family, and (3) expression of conflict over behavior.

It can be seen from the above research that court records furnish an invaluable amount of information, not only in counseling delinquents, but in the devising of questionnaires as well. The Robins study particularly stands out in showing the value of court information and points out the degree of anti-social behavior as the best single childhood predictor of sociopathic personality. The idea of social class as a valid measurement of delinquent sub-types is still in doubt. Although the class-status relationship between social and solitary delinquents remains unanswered, the latter type of delinquents are on the average of lower-class status.

#### Psychological Test Data

The most practical method of predicting delinquent types has been the use of psychological tests. Here, profiles have unraveled huge quantities of guidelines and concrete evidence to work with various types. Along with this goes the usual parsimonious approach of how much can be gained from such techniques. One must consider here the purpose of the test and how well it measures the subject's personality.

### Actuarial Tests.

One of the earlier studies utilizing test data to investigate delinquency was the classic Hathaway and Monachesi (1951) work with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). These authorities conducted a two-year follow-up on 1834 delinquent males, all of whom had completed the MMPI. Follow-up evaluations reflected a recidivist rate of 421 per thousand delinquents. Aside from this, 70 percent of those classified as "recidivist" in the follow-up report had high scores on the MMPI Psychopathic Deviate (Pd) and Hypomania (Ma) scales. In addition, more than 50% of the recidivists were conveniently categorized into three types: (1) those who had committed several serious offenses; (2) those who had committed one serious offense and several minor offenses; and (3) those whose contact with the law involved only minor offenses.

Hathaway and Monachesi (1953) cite the general findings of Hathaway, Hastings, Bell, and Capwell as consistent with the data reported above. Their study centered around the post-institutional careers of delinquent girls relative to MMPI tests administered in reform school. At the .03 level of confidence, a chi-square test showed that Pd and Ma scales were considered predictive of recidivism. Profile patterns also showed few clinical scales beyond the standard score of 54.

Research dealing with two different classes of delinquents was conducted by Randolph, Richardson, and Johnson (1961). They compared social and solitary male delinquents with regard to several sociological and psychological variables. Tests were administered to 57 delinquent boys, aged 14 to 18, in an institutional setting. The sample included 39 "social" and 18 "solitary" delinquents. Mean profile differences between the two groups on the validating scales L, F, and K were

not significant. All mean differences for the diagnostic scales were significant except for the Ma scale. Differences on *Mf*, *Pa*, and *Si* scales were significant beyond the .05 level. Differences on the *Ms*, *Hy*, *Pd*, *Pt*, and *Sc* scales were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. Results implied that solitary delinquents were more likely to come from a higher socioeconomic level, but appear somewhat more disturbed.

Another study, by Erikson and Roberts (1966a), attempted to compare two groups of boys already classified as delinquents. The MMPI was administered to two groups (matched for age and IQ), "less-troublesome delinquent" and "most-troublesome delinquent". Groups were compared using t-tests for matched groups. Results indicated that only the *Pd* scale reflected a significant difference between the two groups (at the .05 level of confidence). The importance of this *Pd* scale was also brought out in previous studies (Hathaway & Monachesi, 1953; Randolph, Richardson, & Johnson, 1961).

Similar findings were cited by Mack (1969), who investigated differences between Recidivist and Non-recidivist Delinquents on the various MMPI scales. His hypothesis was that recidivists would be detected by the *F*, *Pd*, and *Ma* scales and non-recidivists by the *Hs*, *D*, *Hy*, and *Si* scales. Results showed there to be no invalidating K or L scores (*T* scores > 75). Recidivists did score significantly higher on the *Pd* scale ( $p < .05$ ) than Non-recidivists. No other significant differences were found, although the recidivists showed slight tendency to have the *Sc* scale more highly ranked within their profiles ( $p < .13$ ).

On the other hand, Shinohara and Jenkins (1967) found significant differences when more than two delinquent categories were used. From case records of boys at the Iowa State Training School, the subjects were classified as "socialized delinquents", "unsocialized-aggressive", and "runaway delinquents". The "socialized delinquents" scored significantly lower on each of the MMPI scales ( $p < .01$ ), than did the other two groups. The "socialized delinquents" responses indicated better family relations ( $p < .01$ ); "unsocialized-aggressive" group appeared more impulsive, suspicious, and catastrophe-minded ( $p < .01$ ); and "runaway delinquents" showed signs of peer rejection, less decisiveness, and less adequate than other groups ( $p < .01$ ). The investigators discussed the results as implying that socialized delinquents possess adaptive goal-oriented motivation; possibly learned from other delinquents.

McKegney (1965) investigated the hypothesis of a high MMPI F score being a realistic reflection of certain usual attitudes, feelings and behavior actually found in delinquents as a group. Delinquent test responses were measured against interjudge agreement, and significance was determined by the  $\chi^2$  test. The relationship between item meaning and delinquent's response was also investigated. It was found that only certain meaningful F items contributed to delinquent-elevated F scores. Interjudge agreement was found in 73% of 960 comparisons, significant at the .01 level of confidence. It was also found that certain F items have particular meaning for delinquents as a group ( $p < .05$ ). This confirmed the hypothesis.

Briggs, Wirt, and Johnson (1961) were more interested in the identification of potentially delinquent boys. From a sample of 13-year-old boys, the MMPI was used to supplement family history evaluation. Al-

though delinquents and non-delinquents were screened, the authors were able to measure degrees of delinquency. The "less severe" showed an estimated delinquency rate of 41%, while the "more severe" delinquents reflected a rate of 32%. It was concluded that the selection of delinquents through some particular set of criteria will provide a very special sub-population of delinquents; a random sample which is not characteristic of all delinquents.

Other actuarial tests have been used in identifying delinquents. One of the first tests, other than the MMPI, to consider delinquent traits was the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI). Robin (1957) used this technique to investigate C. M. Frank's recidivism typology of "introversion" and "extraversion". This pilot study used two groups of male recidivists and explored their environment and family histories. No significant differences were found between the two groups. It was concluded that no environmental differences existed between the two groups.

Another test that has gained prominence during the last few years, has been the High School Personality Questionnaire (HSPQ). In one of the earlier studies, this HSPQ was administered to male juveniles (ages 14 and over) at the Washington Bureau of Rehabilitation (Pierson & Kelly, 1963a). The investigators found nine personality factors which distinguished these juveniles at the .01 level. These were: (1) casual mannerisms, (2) carelessness, (3) low anxiety level, (4) mean and adventurous, (5) impulsiveness, (6) frivolousness, (7) unable to perceive own problem, (8) difficulty in getting along with others, and (9) lack of a spontaneous sense of humor. A formula called "delinquency stem" (DELST) was given to measure the degree of delinquency potential in a single score.

The DELST was again administered a few months later (Pierson & Kelly, 1963b) to 850 male delinquents at the Bureau. In addition, the Index of Idiosyncrasy (which expressed the variation of "delinquent personality factors" from the population mean), was also used in evaluating the subjects. Through intercorrelation and factor analysis, the findings (significant at the .01 level of confidence) showed a "low anxiety level", "high extraversion", "high Index of Idiosyncrasy", and "high DELST pattern". The results of this study served to verify earlier findings (Pierson & Kelly, 1963a).

Stern and Grosz (1969) carried the HSPQ further, in an attempt to obtain norms for institutionalized girls; as well as to determine the reliability of test factors over time. Of 287 girls tested at the Indiana Girl's School (IGS), one randomly selected sample of 30 girls was retested after two months and a second after 10 months. It was found that: (1) the IGS girls scored higher on Ego Strength and lower on "self-reliance"; and (2) reliability coefficients of IGS girls were generally lower for those girls tested after 10 months than for those retested after two months. Five factors did not reach statistical significance on the IGS samples retested.

Another study of delinquency has involved research with the Minnesota-Briggs History Questionnaire (MBHQ). Rouzer (1970) was the first to use this particular technique for that purpose. Interested in construct validation, he investigated changes in cluster scores as a function of age. A total of 251 delinquent males, ranging from 13 to 17 years of age, were used in this study. Statistical analysis revealed a high degree of agreement between age groups or individual mean MBHQ cluster scores, and MMPI scores did occur in the predicted directions. It was concluded that the

MBHQ could be used in a delinquency-prediction system.

Barden (1970) used the MBHQ for differentiating institutionalized delinquents. In this particular study, 102 boys and 52 girls were matched for age and used as subjects. The test showed both sexes as reporting family dissention, conflict with parents, achievement and behavior problems in the schools, and a self-perception as "social misfits". The girls received significantly higher mean scores on the scales of Family Disunity, Conflict with Parents, Health Awareness, and Social Misfit. Thus, the various scales showed much predictive value.

Other questionnaire methods have also gained attention in delinquency research. The development and cross-validation of shorter, objective scales were needed to provide alternatives to the MMPI. One such device was developed by Quay and Peterson (1958). Item selection was based on the self-concept theory of Carl Rogers, as well as clinical records of delinquent males. With 116 male delinquents used, item analysis was conducted by using the Phi coefficient. Only those 40 true-false items showing the greatest differentiation were retained for the actual scale (those at the .05 level or above were retained. Reliabilities ranged from .53 to .82. Pearson coefficients were found with the Gough-Peterson Scale ( $r=.72$ ) and the cross-validation institution samples ( $r=.64$ ).

Further use of questionnaire tests in analyzing delinquency involved a study conducted by Baer (1970). From a taxonomic analysis of a 75-item Biographical Questionnaire, three groups of delinquents were identified. The groups were found to differ significantly ( $X^2 p < .05$ ) with regard to the type of offense committed prior to their existing parole. Delinquent groups 1 and 3 were found to possess more Stubbornness and Runaways,

whereas Group 2 consisted mostly of Larceny and Theft cases. It was concluded that taxonomic analysis of biographical data has considerable merit in classifying youthful offenders.

In regard to actuarial tests, these studies have shown a trend toward questionnaire techniques as adequate guidelines for study. One aspect that seemed clear is that different types of delinquents can be classified. There also seemed to be a foregone conclusion that clinically separable delinquents can be differentiated on the basis of MMPI profiles, as stressed in most of the studies cited in this section.

#### Projective Techniques.

Despite a vast amount of criticism from skeptics, projective tests continue to be used in the clinical assessment of deviant behavior. Although their use with delinquents has been sparse, the research conducted has stimulated enough interest to mention here.

Strickler (1961) was one of the earliest investigators to assess delinquency with a projective device---the Symond's Picture Story Test. He investigated the relationship between crimes committed and personality traits. Two hundred eighty-eight male adolescents, ages 13-17, were selected according to type of offense. Five personality traits---hostility, rejection, anxiety, guilt, and egocentrism---were measured by having the subjects rate stories whose content reflected one of the above traits, as well as how it applied to the Symond Pictures. Results showed that both burglary and sex crimes exhibited greater rejection than the assault and battery group. No differences with respect to hostility and egocentrism were obtained.

The Holtzman Inkblot Technique (HIT) was used by Megargee (1965), for a normative study of 75 male delinquent protocols. A factor analy-



sis was performed for assessing the HIT variables. Low mean scores were obtained on the variables of Form Appropriations ( $\bar{X}=40.6$ ), Form Definiteness ( $\bar{X}=73.8$ ), Integration ( $\bar{X}=3.2$ ), Movement ( $\bar{X}=22.1$ ), Humen ( $\bar{X}=12.4$ ), and Pathognomic Verbalization ( $\bar{X}=2.5$ ). It was concluded that "immaturity" was the behavior most predictive of the delinquent's confinement period.

Another projective device, the Porteus Maze Test, was used by Erikson and Roberts (1966b) in comparing two groups of institutionalized delinquents. This technique served as a partial replication of a previous study (Erikson & Roberts, 1966a), which used the MMPI with the same groups. Wilcoxon's Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks test showed no significant quotient differences in either study. The Qualitative score was significant at the .025 level of confidence in the previous study and at the .05 level in the present study. In addition, group differences were found to be significant beyond the .05 level of confidence.

Further use of projective methods was made by Wetzel, Shapiro, and Wagner (1967). These investigators used the Hand Test to differentiate recidivist and non-recidivist delinquents. The study used 381 first-referrals whose offense history later revealed subsequent referrals. A "local" criterion of recidivism was achieved through cumulative percentages. Subjects were also matched for age, intelligence, sex, race, and nature of first offense. Results showed that the Acting-out Score (AOS) correctly categorized 66% of the subjects ( $p<.05$ ). The Aggressive Score (AGG) also yielded significant differences between the groups (Wilcoxon  $p<.05$ ), by correctly identifying 68% of the subjects. Thus, the technique provided a valuable guide in predicting recidivism rates.

A test for assessing psychopathology in delinquents was investigated by Lefkowitz (1968). He attempted to validate Zullinger's Z-test, a

three-card inkblot technique, with scoring in four categories for use in psychopathology. The sample consisted of 125 male delinquents ( $\bar{X}$  age=15 years;  $\bar{X}$  IQ=99); all inmates of a residential training school. The tests administered were scored for Movement, Pathognomic Verbalization, Anxiety, and Hostility; according to a modification in the technique developed by the HIT. The validity of Z-test scores was examined in terms of its relationship to the following criteria: (1) nominations of disruptive behavior by institutional staff members and (2) MMPI measurement of psychopathology. Results of a  $X^2$  analysis showed a significant relationship between Z-test scores, behavioral nominations of staff members, and MMPI measurement ( $p < .05$ ). The authors concluded that psychopathology was manifested in Z-test responses, as indicated by  $X^2$  significance beyond the .05 level of confidence.

Ostrov, Offer, Marohn, and Rosenwein (1972) studied delinquency through the Rorschach. They constructed an objective-composite "impulsivity index", made up of three measures of reactivity to color and amount of discrepancy between performance and verbal IQ on the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC). The hypothesis investigated was: impulsiveness as measured by this index would be associated with self-perception of impulsiveness. Also, that objective or subjective impulsivity would tend to be associated with a history of greater and more frequent delinquency. In a test of this index with twenty-five 13-17 year-old psychiatric delinquents, the major hypotheses were confirmed ( $p < .05$ ). In addition, the authors suggested that delinquents from higher socioeconomic levels may be more impulsive than their lower-class counter-

parts. This seemed to confirm an earlier study (Shinohara & Jenkins, 1967).

Problems derived from using projective techniques to predict delinquency are very much a reflection of the tests themselves. Since many projective tests are highly subjective, the lack of accurate measurement stands out. The Porteus Maze Test, to mention one, brings out a need for further investigation. A more unidimensional predictor of impulsive behavior would be desirable in this particular case.

Finally, limited research with projective tests has spawned an urgent need for more investigation. One useful method for objective measurement would be to correlate projective test findings with court records.

One of the more valuable findings from the above research has centered around the Hand Test. On the basis of preliminary findings, it would seem that juvenile recidivists have at least one personality trait in common which predisposes them toward repeated offenses; namely, a basic aggressive orientation toward the world.

#### Intercorrelations of Tests.

One of the first studies involving more than one test was conducted by Becker (1965). He was interested in further classifying the meaning and validity of "psychopathic", "neurotic delinquent", and "delinquent syndromes". A Delinquency Scale, the Taylor Manifest-Anxiety Scale, and the Gordon Personal Inventory were randomly administered to 609 Federal Reformatory residents. Using the Pearson Product-moment Coefficient, Becker failed to find any significant correlations between the three psychological tests.

When dealing with intercorrelations of tests, most studies have involved the MMPI; possibly because its scales have been thoroughly researched. One such investigation, conducted by Tsubouchi and Jenkins (1969), compared the MMPI with Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire data on 43 "socialized delinquents", 24 "unsocialized-aggressive delinquents", and 33 "runaways". The Neglecting score (NEG) on the PCR was found to be the only significant differentiation of any two groups. This NEG score was significantly lower ( $p < .05$ ) for mothers of the "socialized delinquents" group than for those in the "unsocialized-aggressive" and "runaway" groups combined. The D scale on the MMPI was presented to differentiate frustration-delinquents from motivation-delinquents. A chi-square test correctly identified 63% of the cases. A fourfold comparison of "socialized delinquents" with "unsocialized-aggressive" plus "runaways" resulted in a  $\chi^2 p < .01$ .

A very unique study involved the use of the MMPI and the Mini-mult, a 71-item short form of the MMPI. Here Armentrout and Rouzer (1970) administered both tests to a nonpsychiatric population of 100 male and 25 female delinquents. Results showed favorable intercorrelations. For males, all correlated scores were significant beyond the .001 level for all scales; for females, the correlations were significant at or beyond the .01 level for all scales but L and Ms. For each group, both mean profiles were highest on Pd and Sc in that order.

Follman (1972) was interested in the relationship between delinquency prediction scales and personality inventories. He

investigated relationships among and between two delinquency prediction scales (the KD Proneness Scale and Nye's Delinquency Scale), and two personality inventories (the MMPI and Edward's Personal Preference Scale (EPPS)). The tests were administered to a total of 67 white male (8-21 year old prisoners) of lower socioeconomic status. Analysis showed significant personality correlations between most of the MMPI and EPPS scales ( $p < .01$ ). In particular, the MMPI K scale correlated significantly with 14 of the 16 EPPS scales ( $p < .01$ ). This seemed to reflect an overlapping of personality measurement, particularly those scales dealing with "delinquent traits".

Another study, Kleinbaum (1972), also investigated personality patterns among juvenile offenders; but compared the MBHQ with the MMPI. One hundred eighty-four subjects from the Minnesota Department of Corrections were administered the MBHQ and MMPI. Test results were then correlated with court records. A cluster analysis was used to measure dimensions of personality within this population. No significant differences were found between groups tested. Three scales (Socialized Aggressive, Unsocialized Aggressive, and Disturbed) were intercorrelated with the MMPI and MBHQ scale scores. There were two significant correlations with the MBHQ: Cluster D with the Introversion Scale ( $p < .01$ ) and Cluster SA involving Socialized with the Family Disunity Scale ( $p < .05$ ). All significant MMPI correlations were with Cluster D (Depression, Paranoia, Psychonesthenia, and Social Introversion).

A study by Cowden, Peterson, and Pacht (1969) concerned

itself with the classification of institutionalized delinquents through use of the Jesness Inventory and the Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI). A total of 106 first-time offenders took both tests, then were rated for their most serious prior offense. It was found that boys rated by clinicians as having a negative prognosis scored significantly higher than those showing a positive prognosis on the Social Maladjustment ( $p < .01$ ), Value Orientation ( $p < .01$ ), Immaturity ( $p < .01$ ), Alienation ( $p < .01$ ), and Asocial Index ( $p < .01$ ) scales of the Jesness, as well as higher on validity ( $p < .05$ ) scale of the MCI. It was concluded that the MCI functioned somewhat more effectively than the Jesness in discriminating between sub-groups of boys showing a good vs. poor prognosis based upon social workers' reports, and boys showing a good vs. poor peer relationship.

This valuable showing of the Jesness inspired further research from Kissling (1970), who correlated it with the Personal Orientation Study (POS). With these two tests, he investigated delinquent typologies and their relationship to age and race. One hundred six confined male delinquents (52 White and 54 Black), ranging in age from 9 to 16 were given the tests. It was predicted that overall agreement in terms of Psychopathic factors would be low, and that this agreement would be lower for Blacks than for Whites. It was also predicted that Blacks would be overrepresented on the Psychopathic classification. Finally, it was predicted that an interaction effect of age and race would be evident in the higher scores of younger Blacks on the Psycho-

pathic factor. The results failed to confirm a significant relationship for any of the factors investigated.

Megargee (1969) also found no significant racial differences through intercorrelated tests. Using 26 Caucasians and 45 Black Delinquents (matched for social class and mental age), he administered the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study (PF), and the HIT. The analysis of variance showed no differences significant at the .05 level for any of the 69 TAT variables or any of the 7 PF scores. On the HIT, 3 of the 22 scores had differences significant at the .05 level: Pathognomic Verbalization (Caucasians higher,  $p < .03$ ), Anatomy (Blacks higher,  $p < .04$ ), and Popular (Caucasians higher,  $p < .02$ ). Megargee concluded that differences obtained between racial groups on projective tests should not be used to account for interracial personality differences, unless groups have been carefully matched for IQ and related factors.

Intercorrelation of two projective techniques---the HIT and TAT---was conducted by Megargee and Cook (1967). They were interested in studying contradictions between measures of aggression and overt aggressive behavior, as resulting from different scales on each of the two tests. HIT and TAT protocols of 76 delinquents were scored, and the scales were related to 11 different criterion of overt aggression. In addition, the test scores were related to four measures of anti-social behavior in the community. Three measures of aggressive behavior were observed by others, and four measures of aggressive habit patterns were reported by the subject himself. An analysis of variance showed School Conduct as the only criterion measure with which the four TAT scales had more than a chance

relation (significant at the .05 level). From this, it was found that HIT scales generally correlated somewhat higher with one another, as opposed to TAT scores. The HIT further differed from the TAT in the following aspects: (1) more significant relations between inkblot scores and the criterion of "overt aggressiveness"; and (2) while TAT related most closely to pre-offense behavior, inkblot scores related more closely to measures of physical aggression obtained after arrest.

One of the only studies dealing with correlation of actuarial and projective tests has been that of Mattocks (1969). The major interest of this investigator was to study the relationship between arousal and conflict in sub-groups of delinquents. From a population of institutionalized delinquents, four groups of 15 boys each were separated on the basis of Quay-Peterson's criterion scores into "psychopathic", "acting-out", "neurotic", and "sub-cultural delinquents". These delinquents were administered a modified version of the TAT, and physiological measurements of GSR and heart-rate were recorded. With the exception of heart-rate ( $p < .05$ ), no significant differences were found among the various test correlations.

Heiberg (1969) was also interested in personality correlates within a youth-offender population. One hundred forty male offenders ( $\bar{X}$  age=19) were administered the MMPI, Kuder Preference Record, Case-worker's Rating Scales, and a revised Peterson Problem Checklist. Encouraging results found that interreliability coefficients ranged between .306 and .836; and coefficients of internal consistency were higher, ranging from .81 to .98. Such discrepancy between types of reliability was attributed to the presence of a "halo effect" in ratings. Correla-



tion coefficients between factor scale scores and the test data showed that 45 out of a total of 280 coefficients reached the .05 level of significance. Scale 4 of the MMPI, Pantoni's Ap scale, and Block's Ego Control Scale all correlated .58 predicting the sociopathic factor scale scores and only .04 with neurotic factor scale scores. The most useful technique was found to be the Caseworker's Rating Scale.

In another study Song (1969) investigated self-concept variables, level of anxiety, and offenses of delinquent boys from both intact and broken homes. One hundred subjects (50 from each type of home setting) were matched for age, IQ, length of institutional stay, etc. They were then administered the following tests: Personal Data Sheet, Index of Adjustment and Values, and the Anxiety Scale of the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.  $X^2$  analysis failed to indicate any significant differences between the two groups.

The review of psychological test data has been extensive in relation to delinquent sub-types. One important implication concerns the question of which type of test is most valuable---actuarial or projective. It should be mentioned that both types of personality tests should be investigated with respect to other criteria. The integration of court records and behavioral baselines with psychological tests provides an objective criterion toward predicting delinquency and related trends. This was particularly brought out in the Research by Robins (1966) and Yates (1970).

## Methodology

### Subjects.

The sample for the present study consisted of 40 adolescents placed on probation in Jefferson County, Illinois. The sample included 23 male and 17 female delinquents with a mean age of 17 years. All subjects used in the sample were Caucasian. The sample was divided into recidivists and non-recidivists on the basis of whether there was one or more offenses designated on the court record. The offenses and percentage committed by each criterion group are listed in Table 1.

### Apparatus.

The measure used was the Social History Questionnaire (SHQ) Adolescent Form (Appendix 1), a 393-item, forced choice, pencil and paper, intake inventory (Best & Erikson, 1973). The SHQ includes the following scales: (a) 3 Validity Scales, (b) Emotional Disturbances, (c) Thought Disturbances, (d) Behavioral Disturbances, (e) Psychosomatic Disturbances, (f) Marital Problems, (g) Interpersonal Relations, (h) Childhood, (i) Education, (j) Relationship to Father, (k) Relationship to Mother, (l) Parental Relationships, (m) Vocational, and (n) Treatment. The items which fall under these various scales are listed in Appendix 2.

Items of the SHQ include elements primarily of a demographic, biographic, and symptomatic nature, designed to elicit information concerning the extent of certain behaviors in the adolescent's past and present life. The items and questions concern pathological symptoms, interpersonal relations, present attitudes and expectations, general personality characteristics, and other biographical information.

TABLE 1

Types of Offenses and Percentages Committed  
by Recidivists and Non-recidivists

Offense	Per Cent Committed by Recidivists
Curfew Violation-----	55%
Drug Possession-----	40%
Theft-----	20%
Beyond Control of Parents-----	20%
Criminal Damage to Property-----	20%
Runaway-----	15%
Burglary-----	15%
Disorderly Conduct-----	10%
Aggravated Assault-----	10%
Sexual Delinquency-----	5%
Reckless Driving-----	5%
Offense	Per Cent Committed by Non-recidivists
Drug Possession-----	20%
Disorderly Conduct-----	20%
Beyond Control of Parents-----	20%
Sexual Delinquency-----	20%
Theft-----	5%
Criminal Damage to Property-----	5%
Runaway-----	5%
Aggravated Assault-----	5%

In addition to questions in the questionnaire proper, the testee is required to give certain identifying information such as age, race, sex, etc.

Method.

The 40 subjects (20 Recidivists and 20 Non-recidivists) were selected from the court files by the probation officer. Assigned times for each subject's taking the test were arranged whenever convenient. In each case the SHQ was self-administered with no time limit.

The responses to items on the SHQ's completed by the subjects were transferred to IBM scoring sheets. Responses to each item were tabulated by an IBM-360 computer. This computer was utilized to derive number and percentage of true-false responses that Recidivists and Non-recidivists made to all 393 items.

## Results

### Item Analysis

Responses of 20 Recidivists and 20 Non-recidivists were compared on each of the 393 Social History Questionnaire items. The test of significance was a  $\chi^2$  item analysis, taken from Siegel (1956). The following formula was utilized:

$$\chi^2 = \frac{N \left( \left| AD - BC \right| - \frac{N}{2} \right)^2}{(A + B)(C + D)(A + C)(B + D)}$$

where N is the total number of subjects used; and A, B, C, and D refer to cell values in the 2 X 2 contingency table. Those items found to differentiate the two groups at the .05 level of significance were incorporated into a subscale. Differences for 18 items were significant at the .05 level, with the difference for one of these items at the .01 level. These differentiating items are presented in Table 2.

The 18 items were combined to make a subscale with a total of 18 unit weights; each item having a unit weight of one. The 18 unit weights represent scoring weights for the subscale. Hence, the maximum possible score is 18 while the minimum possible score is 0. A scoring key for the 18 items in the subscale is also presented in Table 2. This scoring key was derived by finding how 50% or more of the Recidivists responded to the 18 criterion items. For example item 22 was scored as "True" (T); since 75% of the Recidivists gave that particular response. A subscale score for each of the 40 offenders was obtained by using this scoring key.

### Norms for the Subscale

Norms for the subscale were established by computing a frequency distribution for all 40 scores of the delinquents on the subscale. Per-

TABLE 2  
Social History Questionnaire Items  
Differentiating Criterion Groups

Key	Item No.	Statement
T	22	Sometimes I get so angry that I almost lose control of myself.*
T	24	I often hold a grudge against people.*
F	27	I usually believe anything anyone tells me.*
T	35	Most of my problems are caused by bad luck.*
T	55	I often feel tense and nervous.*
F	60	People are always making trouble for me.*
F	106	Sometimes I have trouble breathing.*
F	119	I have taken drugs but only as prescribed by a doctor.*
T	141	I am a mild-mannered, peaceful person.*
T	155	I often feel that life is not worth living.*
T	190	I feel very guilty about some of the things I have done.*
F	198	Less than four of my brothers and sisters are still living.*
F	199	My childhood was happier than most.*
T	283	Skilled work (such as mechanics, carpentry, weaving, etc.) is something I would like to do.**
T	346	I enjoy doing things outside the home such as going to parties, movies, sporting events, etc.*
F	376	I lived with my father during most of the time I was growing up.*
F	392	There are many things wrong with my mind.*
T	393	I like to know what I am going to talk about before I get into a group discussion.*

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

centiles were obtained by calculating the cumulative frequencies of the scores for all 40 delinquents. Norms for the subscale are presented in Table 3.

Subscales for the total sample ranged from 6 to 15. Approximately 50% of the delinquents received a score of 11 or above, while the remaining 50% achieved a score of 11 or below.

Scores for the Recidivists ranged from 11 to 15, while scores for the Non-recidivists ranged from 6 to 14. Only one Non-recidivist received a score above 11; a relatively high score of 14. It was found that 80% of the Recidivists received a score of 11 or more, while 95% of the Non-recidivists received a score of 11 or less. Hence, a high score was more characteristic of a Recidivist and a low score more typical of a Non-recidivist. To obtain a more unified representation of the scores for Recidivists and Non-recidivists a frequency distribution of subscale scores was made. This data is presented in Table 4.

Although the Recidivist group showed a trend toward higher scoring, none of them attained a score above 15. On the other hand, the lower scoring pattern of the Non-recidivists never reached below a score of 6.

TABLE 3  
Norms for Initial Sample

Test Scores	f	cf	Percentile
18	0	40	100
17	0	40	100
16	0	40	100
15	5	40	100
14	4	35	88
13	5	31	78
12	3	26	65
11	5	23	58
10	4	18	45
9	0	14	35
8	7	14	35
7	6	7	18
6	1	1	3
5	0	0	0
4	0	0	0
3	0	0	0
2	0	0	0
1	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
N = 40			



Frequency Distribution and Percentage  
Distribution of Subscale Scores  
For Recidivists and Non-recidivists

Total No.	Number receiving each score		Test Scores	Per cent receiving each score		Total Per cent
	Recidivists	Non-recidivists		Recidivists	Non-recidivists	
			18			
			17			
			16			
5	5		15	100		100
4	3	1	14	75	25	100
5	5		13	100		100
3	3		12	100		100
5	4	1	11	80	20	100
5		5	10		100	100
			9			
7		7	8		100	100
5		5	7		100	100
1		1	6		100	100
			5			
			4			
			3			
			2			
			1			
			0			
40	20	20				

Tabular style adapted from Nunnally, 1970

### Discussion

The differences between delinquent Recidivists and Non-recidivists, as indicated by their responses to the 18 subscale items, are consistent with findings of previous investigations. Various studies (Hathaway et al., 1953; Quay et al., 1958; Mack, 1969; Robins, 1966; Shinohara et al., 1957) indicate that recidivists present a general aggressive behavior pattern toward the home environment. In the present study this is evident by the fact that Recidivists gave more "True" responses to Items 22, 24, and 346. The content of these items reflects "emotional anger" (Items 22 and 24), as well as interests outside the home (Item 346).

Another characteristic of Recidivists that appears consistent with earlier research is their unfavorable attitude toward the home environment (Wattenberg, 1954). This characteristic is reflected by a Recidivist trend of "False" response to SHQ-item 199 and the "True" response to Item 346. The pattern of an undesirable childhood situation is reflected from these responses.

Recidivists are often depicted as assaultive, emotionally unstable, poverty-stricken, admittance of guilt, heavier drinkers, immature, and generally "depressed". "True" responses to SHQ-items 22, 24, 55, 155, and 190 suggest agreement with the above-mentioned traits. In addition the "False" responses to Item 119 also reflect these traits as characteristic of most Recidivists.

Aside from this, most of the Recidivist group reported coming from a family of at least four siblings (Item 198). The Recidivists also reported not having the father in their home during childhood (Item 376). These results were consistent with earlier research (Wattenberg,

1954; Robins, 1966; and Taylor, 1970).

Some differences between Recidivists and Non-recidivists in this study have not been reported in previous research. Recidivists gave more "False" responses to one item dealing with "Psychosomatic Disturbances" (Item 106). Aside from this, Recidivists gave more "False" responses to Item 392. This item deals with being "Aware of Mental Problems".

Another differentiation concerned "Vocational Interest" (Item 283). This was the only item that differentiated between criterion groups at the .01 level of confidence. From this item, the Recidivists showed more interest in skilled work by giving a higher percentage of "True" responses.

Some inconsistencies between the current findings and previous research are evident. For example, several items on the SHQ that would appear to differentiate between delinquent sub-types were not significantly different. These items are: 5 and 23 (Homicidal), 29 (Repeated violations of the Law), 47 (Sexual Problems), 85 (Degree of Emotional Control), 137 (Problems with Drugs), 156 (Fights with others---More than once), 167 (Open Rebellion), 176 (Criminal Activities), 181 (Guilt Feelings), and 302 (Expelled or Suspended from School, at least once). Studies conducted on other delinquent populations (Jenkins et al, 1947 and Robins, 1966) showed that most repeaters exhibit behaviors that are described in the above items.

This inconsistency between the present study and that of Jenkins and Robins could possibly be due to the following differences: (1) the present study and previous researchers' investigation of delinquent

samples, (2) methods for defining criterion groups, and (3) the instrument employed for studying delinquent classifications. Considering these differences, it is not surprising that the findings reported by Jenkins, Glickman, and Robins were not confirmed in the present study.

### Limitations

Despite the valuable information gained from the present study, certain factors that could possibly have affected the results must be considered. It is quite likely that at least some of the subscale items were obtained by chance. A test such as the SHQ with 393 items would be expected to have 23 significant items ( $p < .05$ ) by chance alone. In the present study only 18 items - which is less than chance - were significant at the .05 level of confidence. Thus, the subscale obtained in the present study should be used with great caution until it is cross-validated.

### Suggestions for Future Research

The most obvious need stemming from the present research is that of cross-validation. The validity of the scale and its predictive capacity should be thoroughly investigated in future studies. The findings reported here, if properly used, can be of value to future researchers. This information should apply particularly to those researchers whose goal is to reduce the social problem of delinquency and adult crime.

## References

- Armentrout, J. A., & Rouzer, D. L. Utility of the Mini-mult with delinquents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1970, 34, 450.
- Baer, D. J. Taxonomic classification of male delinquents from autobiographical data and subsequent recidivism. Journal of Psychology, 1970, 76, 27-31.
- Barden, D. M. A comparison of the histories of delinquent boys and girls. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30 (8-B), 3860-3861.
- Becker, P. W. Some correlates of delinquency and validity of questionnaire assessment method. Psychological Reports, 1965, 16, 271-277.
- Best, R. H., & Erikson, J. The Social History Questionnaire. Charleston, Illinois. Authors, 1973.
- Briggs, P. F., Wirt, R. D., & Johnson, R. An application of prediction tables to the study of delinquency. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25, 46-50.
- Cloward, R., & Ohlin, L. Delinquency and opportunity. Glencoe: Free Press, 1960.
- Cohen, A. K. Delinquent boys. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1956.
- Cowden, J. E., Peterson, W. M., & Pacht, A. R. The MCI vs. the Jensen Inventory as a screening and classification instrument at a juvenile correctional institution. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 57-60.
- Erikson, R. V., & Roberts, A. H. An MMPI comparison of two groups of institutionalized delinquents. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1966, 30, 163-166. (a)

- Erikson, R. V., & Roberts, A. H. A comparison of two groups of institutionalized delinquents on Porteus Maze Test performance. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 567. (b).
- Follman, J. Delinquency prediction scales and personality inventories. Child Study Journal, 1972, 2, 99-103.
- Haney, B., & Gold, M. The juvenile delinquent nobody knows. Psychology Today, 1973, 6, 49-55.
- Hathaway, S. R., & Monachesi, E. D. The prediction of juvenile delinquency using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1951, 108, 469-473.
- Hathaway, S. R., Hastings, D. W., Capwell, D. F., & Bell, D. M. In Hathaway, S. R., & Monachesi, E. D. (Eds), Analyzing and predicting delinquency with the MMPI. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1953.
- Heiberg, D. A. Psychometric correlates within a youthful offender population. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30 (1-B), 382.
- Hewitt, L. E., & Jenkins, R. L. Fundamental patterns of maladjustment: The dynamics of their origin. Springfield: State of Illinois, 1946.
- Jenkins, R. L. Adaptive and maladaptive delinquency. Nervous Child, 1955, 11, 9-11.
- Jenkins, R. L., & Glickman, S. Patterns of personality organization among delinquents. Nervous Child, 1947, 6, 329-339.
- Kissling, E. J. A comparison of delinquent typologies and their relationship to age and race. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30 (8-B), 3870).

- Kleinbaum, J. S. Personality patterns among juvenile offenders. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33 (1-B), 443.
- Kvaraceus, W. C. Delinquent behavior: Principles and Practices. Washington: National Education Association, 1959.
- Kvaraceus, W. C. Dynamics of delinquency. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.
- Larson, J. D., Fitzgerald, B. J., & Martin, R. Social class, reported parental behavior, and delinquency status. Psychological Reports. 1971, 28, 323-327.
- Lefkowitz, M. Screening juvenile delinquents for psychopathology by use of the Z-test. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1968, 32, 475-478.
- Mack, J. L. The MMPI and recidivism. Journal of Abnormal Psychology. 1969, 74, 612-614.
- Mattocks, A. L. A study of the role of arousal and conflict in the differentiation of sub-types of delinquents. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30 (1-B), 382..
- Megargee, E. I. The performance of juvenile delinquents on the Holtzman Inkblot Technique. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1965, 29, 504-512.
- Megargee, E. I. A comparison of scores of White and Negro male juvenile delinquents on three projective tests. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1966, 30, 530-535.
- Megargee, E. I., & Cook, P. E. The relation of TAT and Inkblot Aggressive Content Scales with each other and with criteria of overt aggressiveness in juvenile delinquents. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1967, 31, 48-60.

- McKegney, F. P. An item analysis of the MMPI F scale in juvenile delinquents. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1965, 21, 201-205.
- Nunnally, J. Introduction to psychological measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Ostrov, E., Offer, D., Marohn, R., & Rosenwein, T. The "impulsivity index": Its application to juvenile delinquency. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1972, 1, 179-196.
- Pierson, G., & Kelly, R. HSPQ norms on a state-wide delinquent population. Journal of Psychology, 1963, 56, 185-192. (a)
- Pierson, G., & Kelly, R. Anxiety, extraversion, and personality idiosyncrasy in delinquency. Journal of Psychology, 1963, 56, 441-445. (b)
- Quay, H. Dimensions of personality in delinquent boys as inferred from the factor analysis of case history data. Child Development, 1964, 35, 479-484.
- Quay, H., & Peterson, D. A brief scale for juvenile delinquency. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1958, 14, 139-142.
- Randolph, M., Richardson, H. & Johnson, R. A comparison of social and solitary male delinquents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25, 293-295.
- Rapp, F. B., & Blazer, J. A. Social characteristics of recidivist and non-recidivist male delinquents. Psychology, 1970, 7, 67-81.
- Robin, A. A pilot study as suggested by recidivism, psychopathy, and personality. British Journal of Delinquency, 1957, 8, 139-141.
- Robins, L. Deviant children grown up. Baltimore: The Williamson and Wilkins Co., 1966.



- Rouzer, D. L. Construct validation of the Minnesota-Briggs History Questionnaire; Age and personality correlates. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31 (5-B), 3006.
- Shinohara, M., & Jenkins, R. MMPI study of three types of delinquents. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 156-163.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Song, R. H. Selected characteristics of Lincoln Hall delinquents from two family conditions. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30 (2-B), 855-856.
- Stern, H., & Grosz, H. J. HSPQ personality measurements of delinquent girls and their temporal stability. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 289-292.
- Strickler, J. T. Some personality traits of juvenile delinquents as indicated by a rating technique utilizing the Symond's Picture-Story Test. Dissertation Abstracts, 1961, 22, 919.
- Sykes, G., & Matza, D. Techniques of neutralization. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 664-670.
- Taylor, L. R. Dimensions of delinquent behavior. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30, (12-B), 5680.
- Tsubouchi, K., & Jenkins, R. L. Three types of delinquents: Their performance on MMPI and PCR. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 353-358.
- Vedder, C. B. (Ed.). The juvenile offender: Perspective and readings. Garden City; Doubleday, 1954.
- Wattenberg, W. W. Factors associated with repeating among broad adolescent

"delinquents". Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1954, 84, 189-196.

Wetzel, H., Shapiro, R. J., & Wagner, E. E. Prediction of recidivism among juvenile delinquents with the Hand Test. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1967, 31, 69-72.

Wirt, R. B., & Briggs, P. F. Personality and environmental factors in the development of delinquency. Psychological Monographs, 1959, 73, 15, Whole No. 485.

Yates, A. Behavior therapy. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.

## Appendix 1

## Social History Questionnaire\*

ADOLESCENT

## S O C I A L H I S T O R Y Q U E S T I O N N A I R E

This questionnaire contains a number of different statements. Read each statement and decide whether it is TRUE or FALSE for you.

Mark your answers on the special answer sheet you have. If a statement is true for you then put an X in the correct box under the F. If a statement does not apply to you or if you are uncertain about it, then do not mark the answer sheet for that statement.

Be sure the number on the answer sheet is the same as the number for the statement you answer. Make your marks dark so they are easy to see.

Answer every statement as correctly as you can. Try to give some answer to each statement.

Copyright 1973 by Randall H. Best

All rights reserved. No part of this booklet may be reproduced or copied in any form of printing or by any other means without the written permission of the publisher. Printed in the United States of America

Randall H. Best, Charleston, IL 61920

---

\*Reproduced with permission from the author.

---

Social History Questionnaire Items

(Adolescent Form)

1. My mental problems began very recently.
  2. I have never been in trouble because of the things I have done.
  3. I like taking the responsibility for getting things done.
  4. I cannot seem to get interested in anything.
  5. I have threatened to kill someone.
  6. I would much rather be alone than spend time with other people.
  7. I often have strange ideas that do not make much sense to me.
  8. I think I know what my mental problems are and how they began.
  9. I am very eager to please other people.
  10. My mental problems have troubled me for a long, long time.
  11. I have been in trouble because of the bad things I have done.
  12. I like to be the boss when I am with other people.
  13. I get angry whenever people make me do anything.
  14. I sometimes buy things that could be used to kill people.
  15. I am often disappointed by the things other people do.
  16. I often believe things that are not true.
  17. I do not know how my mental problems started.
  18. I want other people to take care of me.
  19. This is my first serious mental disturbance.
  20. I have never been arrested.
  21. I expect people to do whatever I tell them to do.
  22. Sometimes I get so angry that I almost lose control of myself.
  23. I have seriously planned to kill someone.
-

- 
24. I often hold a grudge against people.
  25. Sometimes I see things that are not really there.
  26. There is very little that I can do about my problems.
  27. I usually believe anything anyone tells me.
  28. I often hold a grudge against people.
  29. I have been arrested several times.
  30. I usually make a good impression on other people.
  31. I have been in trouble at least once for getting into fights with people.
  32. I tried to kill someone before.
  33. I am often jealous of other people.
  34. I sometimes hear people talking when no one is there.
  35. Most of my problems are caused by bad luck.
  36. I am a very cooperative person.
  37. Something bad happened to me and I have had a mental problem ever since.
  38. I am not satisfied with my sex life.
  39. Most of the time I act more important than I really am.
  40. Most of the time I do not feel any emotion.
  41. My girlfriend (or boyfriend) does not give me enough love and affection.
  42. I have no close friends.
  43. I have very few physical problems.
  44. I have never been in trouble because of sex.
  45. I let my friends tell me what to do too often.
  46. I feel very little tension or anxiety.
  47. I have been in trouble because of sex.
-

- 
48. I expect everyone to admire me.
  49. Sometimes my emotions are just the opposite of what they should be.
  50. I often feel very lonely even when my girlfriend (or boyfriend) is with me.
  51. I usually go out of my way to stay away from people.
  52. My health has been poor during the past six months.
  53. In the past, I received treatment for my mental problems at a mental health clinic.
  54. I always agree with people.
  55. I often feel tense and nervous.
  56. I often have thoughts about sex that make me uncomfortable.
  57. I have as much confidence in myself as most people my age.
  58. I always control my emotions and never lose my temper or get excited.
  59. Sex is a problem in getting along with my girlfriend (or boyfriend).
  60. People are always making trouble for me.
  61. I often worry about my health.
  62. In the past, I was a patient in a mental hospital.
  63. I am a friendly person.
  64. Lately I have been so scared and nervous that I could hardly stand it.
  65. Sometimes I am sexually attracted to others of my own sex.
  66. I am very proud and satisfied with myself.
  67. My emotions often change without warning.
  68. My girlfriend (or boyfriend) and I argue a lot.
-

- 
69. I believe other people are trying to hurt me in some way.
70. I often have trouble eating.
71. In the past I have been hospitalized on the psychiatric ward of a general hospital.
72. Most people like me.
73. I am tense and nervous almost all the time.
74. I have been involved in sex acts with others of my own sex.
75. Other people think I am conceited.
76. I often feel very happy and gay but then suddenly become very sad and depressed.
77. My girlfriend (or boyfriend) often criticizes me.
78. There is no one that I can really trust.
79. I often have stomach aches.
80. In the past I received private outpatient treatment for my mental problems.
81. I have many (more than ten) close friends.
82. Sometimes I get so nervous that I am unable to do things that I want to do.
83. I drink along with my friends.
84. Most of the time I am not concerned about other people.
85. It is very hard for me to keep my emotions under control.
86. My girlfriend (or boyfriend) is very selfish.
87. I am easily embarrassed.
88. I have had problems with ulcers.
89. In the past I received individual psychotherapy.
90. I usually like people.
-

- 
91. I often have sudden attacks of anxiety and severe tension.
  92. Although I am not an alcoholic, I could easily become one.
  93. I tend to be a very selfish person.
  94. Sometimes I lose all control of my emotions.
  95. My girlfriend (or boyfriend) is very jealous.
  96. It has always been hard for me to talk to people.
  97. I have had problems with asthma.
  98. In the past I have been in group therapy.
  99. I am an affectionate person.
  100. My problems with tension and anxiety began very recently.
  101. I have a definite problem with alcohol.
  102. I am a rather cold and unfeeling person.
  103. Even though I know there is nothing to fear I am still afraid of a few things.
  104. My girlfriend (or boyfriend) is dishonest and cannot be trusted.
  105. I am a very shy person.
  106. Sometimes I have trouble breathing.
  107. In the past I have been in family therapy with all (or most) of the members of my family.
  108. I love everyone.
  109. I have been tense and nervous for a long, long time.
  110. I am an alcoholic.
  111. I am very strict with people whenever it is necessary.
  112. I am afraid of many things even though I know there is no logical reason to be afraid.
  113. My girlfriend (or boyfriend) has been unfaithful to me.
-



- 
114. I often feel that I am just no good.
115. I often have trouble with backaches.
116. In the past I have had counseling for marriage.
117. I am usually a considerate person.
118. I often feel very sad and depressed.
119. I have taken drugs but only as prescribed by a doctor.
120. I am impatient with other people when they make mistakes.
121. I often worry about things that are not really important.
122. My husband (or wife) is lazy and does not work hard enough.
123. I am almost always ashamed of myself.
124. I have trouble with rheumatism.
125. In the past I have taken medicine for my mental problems.
126. I almost always forgive people when they make mistakes.
127. Most of the time I feel sad, unhappy and gloomy.
128. Taking drugs could become a problem for me if I am not careful.
129. I am often cruel and unkind with people.
130. It is almost impossible for me to stop my constant worrying.
131. Money is a big problem in getting along with my girlfriend (or boyfriend).
132. I usually do whatever other people want me to do.
133. I have trouble with arthritis.
134. In the past I received shock treatments.
135. I usually try to comfort everyone.
136. I have many crying spells.
137. I have (or had) a problem with drugs.

- 
138. I often criticize other people.
139. Sometimes I have to do certain things (like wash my hands) or else I get more and more nervous.
140. Drinking is a big problem in getting along with my boyfriend (or girlfriend).
141. I am a mild-mannered, peaceful person.
142. I am allergic to many different things.
143. I am satisfied with the treatment I received for my mental problems in the past.
144. I enjoy helping other people.
145. Whenever I am depressed I also feel tense and anxious.
146. I am addicted to drugs and will do anything to get them.
147. I am often angry with others and I let them know about it.
148. Sometimes it is hard for me to remember things.
149. My girlfriend (or boyfriend) makes me very nervous.
150. I almost always do what people want even when I really don't want to.
151. My skin is sensitive and I often break out in hives.
152. I believe the treatment here will help me with my mental problems.
153. I am too generous where other people are concerned.
154. I have had problems with depression for less than one year.
155. I often feel that life is not worth living.
156. I have been in trouble more than once for getting into fights with people.
157. I am often confused by the things that are happening around me.
-

- 
158. I don't get along with my girlfriend's (or boyfriend's) parents.
159. I have much respect for authority.
160. I have problems with high blood pressure.
161. I would like to have individual psychotherapy.
162. I often sacrifice myself for other people.
163. I have been depressed for a long, long time.
164. I have attempted suicide even though I did not wish to kill myself.
165. People do things that make me angry enough to kill or seriously injure them.
166. Sometimes I do not know what day, month, or year it is.
167. It is exciting for me to do things which are against the law.
168. I am a dependent person who wants to be led by other people.
169. I have trouble with headaches.
170. I would like to be in group psychotherapy.
171. None of my brothers or sisters are married.
172. I do not believe I should be punished for anything I did in the past.
173. I have made at least one serious suicide attempt in the past.
174. I do not like it when other people boss me and tell me what to do.
175. Sometimes I do not know where I am even though I have been there before.
176. I have been in trouble with the police before.
177. I do so many things to get people to take care of me that they usually think of me as a clinging vine.
-

---

they think of me as a clinging vine.

178. I often feel tired and listless.

179. I would like to talk to someone about the problem of marriage.

180. I get along very well with people my same age.

181. I often feel very guilty.

182. If I ever tried to kill myself I would leave a suicide note.

183. I often complain about the way people treat me.

184. Sometimes I do not know who I am or what my name is.

185. It is difficult for me to get interested in doing odd jobs around the house.

186. I believe I have a mental problem that cannot be cured.

187. I often feel so tired that it is almost impossible for me to do anything.

188. I would like to take medicine for my mental problems.

189. I am a member of at least one group at school.

190. I feel very guilty about some of the things I have done.

191. I have been unconscious for some time after a suicide attempt.

192. I rebel against doing almost anything that people want me to do.

193. I lost something very important to me within the last six months.

194. I did not have to wait very long before getting an appointment here.

195. I have at least one close friend.

196. Sometimes I have so much energy that I cannot rest but just have to keep going.

197. I would like to be hospitalized for my mental problems.

198. Less than four of my brothers and sisters are still living.

- 
199. My childhood was happier than most.
200. My father was almost always kind and loving with me.
201. My parents often get money from a welfare agency or from charity.
202. I am employed at the present time.
203. I started school when I was about 6 years old.
204. My mother was almost always kind and loving with me.
205. My mother was a housewife during most of the time I was growing up.
206. I have about the same amount of energy that I always had.
207. When I was little I had few friends.
208. My childhood was very unhappy.
209. When I was little my father watched me almost all the time so I would not get into trouble.
210. My father had a steady job during most of his life.
211. I work part time now.
212. I like school.
213. When I was little my mother watched me almost all the time so I would not get into trouble.
214. My mother worked outside the home when I was little.
215. Sometimes it is hard for me to do anything because I move so slowly.
216. Few people liked me when I was little.
217. I believe my mental problems began when I was a child.
218. My father usually let me do anything I wanted to do.
219. My father was often out of work when I was growing up.

- 
220. I am unemployed at the present time.
221. I did not like school.
222. My mother usually let me do anything I wanted to do.
223. I always listened to my mother and did what she told me to do.
224. I think of my family as being in the working class.
225. I was very shy as a child.
226. When I was born my parents were pleased that I was a girl  
(or boy).
227. My father was too strict with me when I was growing up.
228. My father only has a grade school education.
229. Both of my parents were born in the United States.
230. In school I liked English and history.
231. My mother was too strict with me when I was growing up.
232. My mother only has a grade school education.
233. Most of the time I am satisfied with my girlfriend (or boyfriend).
234. I was afraid of many things when I was little.
235. When I was a child my family was very large.
236. My father ignored me most of the time when I was little.
237. My father graduated from high school.
238. I have been steadily employed for a long time.
239. In school I liked math and science.
240. My mother ignored me most of the time when I was little.
241. My mother graduated from high school.
242. My girlfriend (or boyfriend) is the boss in our relationship.
243. I don't always do what my parents tell me to do.
244. I always got along well with my brothers and sisters when I
-

- 
245. My father neglected me when I was little.
246. My father graduated from college.
247. I never had any trouble holding a job.
248. In school I made good grades (mostly A's and B's).
249. My mother neglected me when I was little.
250. My mother graduated from college.
251. I live in or near the downtown section of my city.
252. I often had temper tantrums when I was little.
253. I have one or more brothers.
254. No matter what I did it was almost impossible for me to please my father.
255. My father continued going to school after he graduated from college.
256. I enjoy my work.
257. In school I only made average grades (mostly C's).
258. No matter what I did it was almost impossible for me to please my mother.
259. I lost someone very close to me during the last six months.
260. I live alone.
261. When I was a child I was so active and restless that I often got in trouble.
262. I have at least one sister.
263. My father almost never listened to anything I had to say.
264. My father was a heavy drinker.
265. I believe I would like working as a common laborer.
266. In school I make poor grades (mostly D's and F's).

- 
267. My mother almost never listens when I try to talk to her.
268. My mother was a heavy drinker.
269. I would return to the same place to live after being discharged from a mental hospital.
270. I had trouble with nightmares and bad dreams when I was little.
271. I was the oldest child in my family.
272. My father ruled the family when I was little.
273. My father often took drugs.
274. Semi-skilled work (such as practical nursing, ~~neat~~, cutting, or driving a taxi) is something I would like to do.
275. I failed at least one grade in school.
276. My mother ruled the family when I was little.
277. My mother often took drugs.
278. I have lived in the same place for more than one year.
279. When I was little I had trouble with bedwetting.
280. I was the middle child in my family.
281. My father almost always punished me whenever I <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ bad.
282. My father was unfaithful to my mother.
283. Skilled work (such as mechanics, carpentry, weaving, etc.) is something I would like to do.
284. I often skipped school.
285. My mother almost always punished me when I was bad.
286. My mother was unfaithful to my father.
287. I believe that people do not want me around anymore.
288. I cried a ~~lot~~ more than most children do when I was little.
289. I was the youngest child in my family.



- 
290. I never knew whether my father would punish me or just ignore the bad things I did.
291. My father had trouble with the law when I was little.
292. I would like to be a white-collar worker (such as an office worker, bookkeeper, secretary, etc.).
293. I missed many days of school because I was too sick to attend.
294. I never knew whether my mother would punish me or just ignore the bad things that I did.
295. My mother had trouble with the law when I was little.
296. I often feel annoyed and resentful toward my mother.
297. I was often cruel to animals when I was little.
298. I am an only child.
299. My father was cruel and brutal to me when I was little.
300. My father was usually in good health when I was little.
301. I would like to be a professional (such as a doctor, lawyer, or school teacher).
302. I was expelled from school at least once.
303. My mother was cruel and brutal to me when I was little.
304. My mother was usually in good health when I was little.
305. I went to a physician or mental health clinic for help with my mental problems before I came here.
306. When I was little I often set fires just for the "fun" of it.
307. I had no unusual childhood illness when I was little.
308. My father usually punished me too much when I was bad.
309. My father had much trouble with his health when I was little.
310. I think I would enjoy dangerous work.

- 
311. In school I often got into trouble with the teachers.
312. My mother usually punished me too much when I was bad.
313. My mother had much trouble with her health when I was little.
314. I would like to be a daredevil and do all kinds of dangerous things.
315. I attend church at least once each month.
316. I had no unusual accidents or injuries when I was little.
317. Even when I was bad my father almost never punished me.
318. My father had trouble with mental illness.
319. People expect more of me now than they did before.
320. I often had fights with the other children in school.
321. Even when I was bad my mother almost never punished me.
322. My mother had trouble with mental illness.
323. It is very difficult for me to talk to other people about myself.
324. My friends make fun of me because of my weight.
325. When I was young my family often moved from one place to another.
326. My father usually punished me by giving me a spanking.
327. My father died before I was ten years old.
328. People expect less of me now than they did before.
329. In school I had few friends.
330. My mother usually punished me by giving me a spanking.
331. My mother died before I was 10 years old.
332. I get along well with the other members of my family.
333. I feel uncomfortable around my friends because of my weight.

- 
334. My parents were divorced when I was a child.
335. My father usually punished me by scolding or by giving me a "lecture".
336. My father is still living.
337. I enjoy doing things at home such as watching T. V., gardening, or making minor repairs.
338. I have very little education.
339. My mother usually punished me by scolding or by giving me a "lecture".
340. My mother is still living.
341. I pay close attention to things other people say when I am in a group.
342. I almost always do the things that other people ~~tell me~~ to do.
343. During my childhood I was separated from one or both parents for several months.
344. Although my father often threatened to punish me he almost never did anything.
345. My parents were usually very warm and loving with each other.
346. I enjoy doing things outside the home such as going to parties, movies, sporting events, etc.
347. I have only been hospitalized once or twice for physical illness.
348. Although my mother often threatened to punish me she almost never did anything.
349. My parents were divorced when I was young.
350. My family and I do many enjoyable things together.
351. I feel uncomfortable around my friends because of my acne.
-

- 
352. I did not live with my parents when I was a child.
353. I love my father.
354. My mother and father were almost always very pleasant to everyone.
355. I like to spend my free time in social activities.
356. I have never been treated for a head injury.
357. I love my mother.
358. I lived with my mother during most of the time I was growing up.
359. I believe most other people like me.
360. I have very few crying spells.
361. My mother died before I was 10 years old.
362. I respect my father.
363. My parents argued much of the time while I was growing up.
364. I like to spend my free time either playing or watching sporting events.
365. I am a good person.
366. I respect my mother.
367. My mother remarried (if father died or left the family).
368. I get along well with the other people in a group.
369. I usually "jump" whenever I hear a sudden loud noise.
370. My father died before I was 10 years old.
371. I have no particular feelings of any kind toward my father.
372. My parents sometimes hit each other when they were angry.
373. I like to spend my free time by myself.
374. I believe people with mental problems should be hospitalized.
375. I have no particular feelings of any kind toward my mother.

- 
376. I lived with my father during most of the time I was growing up.
377. I am very cooperative when I am in a group of other people.
378. I do not have as many dates as my friends do because of my acne.
379. I dislike my father.
380. Sometimes my parents were separated when I was little.
381. I believe that whenever something happens it is for the best.
382. It was my own decision to get help for my mental problems.
383. I dislike my mother.
384. My father remarried (if mother died or left the family).
385. I get nervous and uncomfortable whenever I am in a group of strangers.
386. It is often hard for me to dress myself.
387. I always felt closer to my father than to my mother.
388. I was separated from one or both parents during childhood.
389. I am very proud of the many things I have accomplished in the past.
390. I do not want treatment for my mental problems to take very long.
391. I always felt closer to my mother than to my father.
392. There are many things wrong with my mind.
393. I like to know what I am going to talk about before I get into a group discussion.

## Appendix 2

Social History Questionnaire Scales  
and General Content of the Items\*

---

General Categories and Item Numbers

---

I. SYMPTOMS

A. Emotional Disturbances

1. General
2. Anxiety (Items 13, 46, and 91)
3. Depression (Item 76)
4. Guilt (Items 10 and 181)
5. Apathy (Item 4)
6. Anger (Items 13 and 22)
7. Affect (Item 40)
8. Emotional Control (Items 49, 58, 85, and 94).

B. Thought Disturbances

1. Phobias (fears) (Item 112)
2. Obsessions (worries) (Item 121)
3. Compulsions (Items 130 and 139)
4. Impaired memory (Item 148)
5. Confusion (Item 157)
6. Disorientation
  - a. Time (Item 166)
  - b. Place (Item 175)
  - c. Person (Item 184)
7. Delusions (Item 16)
8. Hallucinations
  - a. Visual (Item 25)
  - b. Auditory (Item 34)

C. Behavioral Disturbances

1. General (Item 2)
2. Sexual problems (Items 56, 59, 65, and 74)
3. Alcohol (Items 83 and 92)
4. Drugs
  - a. Only as prescribed (Item 119)
  - b. Problem with drugs (Item 137)
  - c. Addicted (Item 146)
5. Suicide (Items 164, 182, and 191)
6. Homicide
  - a. Threatened (Item 5)
  - b. Planned (Item 23)
  - c. Attempted (Item 32)

---

\* Information in this table was taken from Best and Erikson, 1973

---

#### D. Psychosomatic Disturbances

1. General (Items 43, 52, and 61)
2. Gastrointestinal Reaction
  - a. Trouble eating (Item 70)
  - b. Stomach-ache (Item 79)
  - c. Ulcers (Item 88)
3. Respiratory Reaction
  - a. Asthma (Item 97)
  - b. Trouble breathing (Item 106)
4. Musculoskeletal Reaction
  - a. Backache (Item 115)
  - b. Rheumatism (Item 124)
  - c. Arthritis (Item 133)
5. Skin Reactions
  - a. Allergies (Item 142)
  - b. Hives (Item 151)
6. Cardiovascular Reactions
  - a. High blood pressure (Item 160)
  - b. Migrane headaches (Item 169)
7. Disturbance of Energy Level
  - a. Tired and Listless (Item 178)
  - b. Lack of energy (Items 187 and 206)
  - c. Excessive energy (Item 196 and 206)
8. Frequent Worry about Health (Item 61)

## II. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

- A. Power-Oriented
  1. Likes Responsibility (Item 3)
  2. Dictatorial (Item 12)
- B. Autocratic
  1. Makes Good Impression (Item 30)
  2. Expects Admiration (Item 48)
- C. Narcissistic
  1. Self-Confident (Item 57)
  2. Conceited (Item 75)
- D. Egocentric
  1. Selfish (Item 93)
  2. Cold and Unfeeling (Item 102)
- E. Sadistic
  1. Impatient with Others (Item 120)
  2. Cruel and Unkind (Item 129)
- F. Aggressive
  1. Critical of Others (Item 138)
  2. Fights with Others (Item 156)
- G. Rebellious
  1. Resents Taking Orders (Item 174)
  2. Openly Rebels (Items 176 and 192)
- H. Distrustful
  1. Prefers to be Alone (Item 6)
  2. Trusts No One (Item 78)

- 
- I. Self-Effacing
    - 1. Easily Embarrassed (Item 87)
    - 2. Ashamed of Self (Item 123)
  - J. Submissive
    - 1. Passive and Unaggressive (Item 141)
    - 2. Always Submits to Others (Items 150 and 153)
  - K. Docile
    - 1. Respects Authority (Item 159)
    - 2. Wants to be Led (Item 163)
  - L. Dependent
    - 1. Eager to Please (Item 9)
    - 2. Wants to be Cared for (Item 177)
  - M. Cooperative
    - 1. Cooperative (Item 36)
    - 2. Always Agree (Item 54)
  - N. Affectionate
    - 1. Friendly (Item 63)
    - 2. Loves Everyone (Item 108)
  - O. Too Normal
    - 1. Considerate (Item 117)
    - 2. Comforts Everyone (Item 135)
  - P. Responsible
    - 1. Helpful (Item 144)
    - 2. Sacrifices Self for Others (Item 162)

### III. CHILDHOOD

- A. General
  - 1. Happy Childhood (Item 199)
  - 2. Unhappy Childhood (Item 203)
- B. Family Composition
  - 1. Large Family (Item 235)
  - 2. Siblings (Item 262)
  - 3. Ordinal Position (Items 271, 280, 289, and 298)
- C. Accidents and Illnesses (Items 307 and 316)
- D. Living Arrangements
  - 1. Family Moved Often (Item 325)
  - 2. Parents Divorced (Item 334)
  - 3. Separated from Parents (Item 343)
  - 4. Did Not Live With Parents (Item 352)
  - 5. Mother Died Early (Item 361)
  - 6. Father Died Early (Item 370)
- E. Education
  - 1. Began School at Regular Age (Item 203)
  - 2. Liked School (Item 212)
  - 3. Did Not Like School (Item 221)
  - 4. Grades (Items 248, 257, and 266)
  - 5. Failed One or More Grades (Item 275)
  - 6. Missed School (Item 284)
  - 7. Expelled or Suspended (Item 302)
  - 8. Trouble in School



- 
- a. With Teachers (Item 311)
  - b. Fighting (Item 320)
  - c. No Friends (Item 329)
- F. Childhood Symptoms
- 1. Few Friends (Item 207)
  - 2. People Disliked (Item 216)
  - 3. Shy (Item 225)
  - 4. Fearful (Item 234)
  - 5. Disobedient (Item 243)
  - 6. Temper Tantrums (Item 252)
  - 7. Hyperactive (Item 261)
  - 8. Nightmares (Item 270)
  - 9. Bedwetting (Item 279)
  - 10. Frequent Crying (Item 288)
  - 11. Cruel to Animals (Item 297)
  - 12. Set Fires (Item 306)

#### IV. RELATIONSHIP WITH PARENTS

##### A. Mother/Father

- 1. Loving and Affectionate (Items 200 and 204)
- 2. Overprotective (Items 209 and 213)
- 3. Overpermissive and Indulgent (Items 218 and 222)
- 4. Restrictive (Items 227 and 231)
- 5. Rejected Patient (Items 236 and 240)
- 6. Neglected Patient (Items 245 and 250)
- 7. Unrealistic Demands (Items 254 and 258)
- 8. Poor Communication (Items 263 and 267)
- 9. Dominated Family (Item 272 and 276)
- 10. Discipline
  - a. Consistent (Items 281 and 285)
  - b. Inconsistent (Items 290 and 294)
  - c. Cruel and Brutal (Items 299 and 303)
  - d. Severe (Items 308 and 312)
  - e. Lax (Items 317 and 321)
  - f. Physical (Items 326 and 330)
  - g. Verbal (Items 335 and 339)
  - h. Threatened Punishment (Items 344 and 348)

##### B. Attitude Toward Mother and Father

- 1. Mother/Father
  - a. Love (Items 353 and 357)
  - b. Respect (Items 362 and 366)
  - c. No Particular Feelings (Items 371 and 375)
  - d. Dislike (Items 379 and 383)
  - e. Closer to Mother/Father (Items 387 and 391)

#### V. INFORMATION ABOUT PARENTS

##### A. Mother/Father

---

- 
1. Employment
    - a. On Welfare (Item 201)
    - b. Steady Job (Items 210 and 214)
    - c. Often Unemployed (Item 219)
  2. Education
    - a. Grade School (Items 228 and 232)
    - b. High School (Items 237 and 241)
    - c. College (Items 246 and 250)
    - d. Post Graduate (Item 255)
  3. Habits
    - a. Drinking (Items 264 and 268)
    - b. Drugs (Items 273 and 277)
    - c. Unfaithful (Items 282 and 286)
    - d. Criminal Activities (Items 291 and 295)
  4. Health
    - a. Good (Items 300 and 304)
    - b. Poor (Items 309 and 313)
    - c. Mental Illness (Items 318 and 322)
    - d. Died when Subject was Young (Items 327 and 331)
    - e. Still Living (Items 336 and 340)
  - C. Relationship between Mother and Father (Items 345 and 349)

## VI. VOCATION

- A. Employment Status
  1. Full-Time (Item 202)
  2. Part-Time (Item 211)
  3. Unemployed (Item 220)
- B. Work History (Items 247 and 256)

## VII. Treatment

- A. Insight
    1. Aware of Mental Problems (Items 1, 19, and 392)
    2. Unaware of How Problems Began (Item 1)
    3. Can Do Little About Problems (Item 26)
    4. Problem Were Derived From Bad Luck (Item 35)
  - B. Previous Treatment
    1. None (Item 44)
    2. Mental Health Clinic (Item 53)
    3. Mental Hospital (Item 62)
    4. Psychiatric Ward (General Hospital) (Item 71)
    5. Private Out-Patient (Item 80)
  - C. History of Treatment
    1. Individual Psychotherapy (Item 89)
    2. Group Psychotherapy (Item 98)
    3. Family Therapy (Item 107)
    4. Marriage Counseling (Item 116)
-

- 
5. Drug Therapy (Item 119)
  6. Shock Treatment (Item 134)
  7. Satisfied with Past Treatment (Item 143)
- D. Treatment Expectations
1. Can be Helped (Item 152)
  2. Patient Wants
    - a. Individual Psychotherapy (Item 161)
    - b. Group Psychotherapy (Item 170)
    - c. Marriage Counseling (Item 179)
    - d. Drug Treatment (Item 188)
    - e. Hospitalization (Item 197)
-