

PSYCHOMETRIC CORRE-  
LATES WITHIN A YOUTHFUL  
OFFENDER POPULATION

D. Heiberg, 1968

*Published on demand by*  
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS  
*Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*  
*University Microfilms Limited, High Wycombe, England*

18894

This is an authorized facsimile  
and was produced by microfilm-xerography  
in 1975 by  
Xerox University Microfilms,  
Ann Arbor, Michigan,  
U.S.A.

This dissertation has been  
microfilmed exactly as received

69-11,401

HEIBERG, David Allison, 1933-  
PSYCHOMETRIC CORRELATES WITHIN A  
YOUTHFUL OFFENDER POPULATION.

University of Minnesota, Ph.D., 1968  
Psychology, clinical

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

PSYCHOMETRIC CORRELATES  
WITHIN A YOUTHFUL OFFENDER POPULATION

A THESIS  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

By  
David A. Heiberg

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December, 1968

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe thanks to many people, particularly Dr. Auke Tellegen, a prince among men in general and thesis advisors in particular. Dr. Douglas Anderson's generous and expert help with the computer programming and data analysis is also very much appreciated. My gratitude and thanks too to Dr. William Schofield, whose wise counsel and kind guidance were inspirational in pre-thesis graduate school days. I would also like to express my deep feelings of affection and respect for the late Dr. Ephraim Rosen, my undergraduate advisor.

Many people in the Minnesota Department of Corrections have been very helpful. I would like to especially mention Dr. M. J. Moran, whose support and encouragement have been deeply appreciated. Also, the three caseworkers, Mr. Kenneth Lundquist, Mr. Charles Johnson and Mr. Lynn Nelson, who assisted me with the rating data, were very generous with their time and support. I cannot here acknowledge all the counselors who aided me, and will thank their supervisor, Mr. James Parks, on their behalf for their fine cooperation. My appreciation also to Mrs. Linda Will and Mrs. Betty Cutts, for their generous assistance in typing and clerical chores.

And my deep love and appreciation to Verna, Laurie, Kris and Jim for being themselves and being there.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	iv
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II METHODS . . . . .	18
III RESULTS . . . . .	32
IV DISCUSSION . . . . .	65
V SUMMARY . . . . .	76
 APPENDICES	
A.1 Problem Checklist (Revised) . . . . .	78
A.2 Caseworker's Rating Scale . . . . .	80
A.3 Group Living Rating Scale . . . . .	83
B.1 Means and Standard Deviations on Test Data . . . . .	85
B.2 Items and Principle Factor Loadings of the Eight Factor Scales . . . . .	87
C. Representative Diagnostic Evaluations	89
 REFERENCES . . . . .	 118

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Means and Standard Deviations for the 24 Items of the Revised Problem Check List	33
2	Means, Standard Deviations and Interrater Reliability Coefficients for the 19 Items of the Group Living Rating Scale	34
3	Means, Standard Deviations and Interrater Reliability Coefficients for the 32 Items of the Caseworker's Rating Scale	36
4	Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for Revised Problem Check List	39
5	Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Group Living Rating Scale	43
6	Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Caseworker's Rating Scale	46
7	Corrected and Uncorrected Interrater Reliability Coefficients for the Eight Factor Scales	53
8	Coefficients of Internal Consistency for the Eight Factor Scales	54
9	Means, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations for the Eight Factor Scales	56
10	Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Eight Factor Scales	57
11	Correlation Coefficients Between Test and Factor Score Variables	59
12	Correlations between the Alpha and Beta ESSI Scales and the Major Factor Scales of the Caseworker's Rating Scale	71

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

Hathaway (1965), in a review of personality inventories, concluded that the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) has been "moderately successful" in fulfilling the purposes for which it was intended, including particularly the separation of those persons whose personality problems and societal adjustments are significantly incapacitating, from "normals" whose difficulties fall within tolerable ranges of personal discomfort and community tolerance. Lingoes (1965) is somewhat more generous in his evaluation of the MMPI as "an excellent screening device," but notes that "there is much conflicting evidence as to the test's sensitivity in discriminating within the abnormal group itself." He concludes his review by stating that broad diagnostic groupings can be reliably separated, but that "finer distinctions within any one of these nosological groups, however, have been in the main, unproductive."

This question of MMPI sensitivity has received encouraging attention within the abnormal populations of psychiatric facilities. First, Marks and Seeman (1963), and then Gilberstadt and Duker (1965) published actuarial data clarifying MMPI configurations within such psychiatric populations. In these studies, subgroups of subjects were identified whose problems might be generally described as involving character disorders or psychopathy

as opposed to neurosis or psychosis. The Pd scale of the MMPI has played a prominent and expected role in the identification of these subgroups.

One concern of the study reported here, then, involves the question of validity generalization of the MMPI when applied to a rather different domain, the correctional institution. To state the problem as a question: What are the correlates of MMPI scores within an incarcerated population?

Only a few studies have been addressed to this particular question of validity generalization within such a population and a review of such research must of necessity be brief. There is no dearth of studies demonstrating consistent test differences between delinquent or criminal groups and normal populations which cut across age and sex dimensions. Hathaway and Monachee (1963), Wirt and Jacobson (1966), Wirt and Briggs (1959), Mack (1967), Murphee et al. (1962), Levy et al. (1952), Jurjevich (1963) and Penton (1959) have all contributed in this area. Generally, statistically significant differences have been found on a number of MMPI scales, with scales E, Pd, Sc and Ma consistently elevated in delinquent groups. The results of investigations of personality differences within delinquent populations have been more inconsistent and ambiguous.

Of those investigations in which the MMPI was used to determine differences within the relatively homogenous populations

found in correctional institutions, perhaps the most thoughtful and encouraging has been the study of Shinohara and Jenkins (1967). These authors divided their delinquent adolescent sample into three groups on the basis of recorded delinquent behavior and observations of behavior in the institution. The groups were socialized delinquents, unsocialized-aggressive delinquents, and runaway delinquents, whose offenses consisted largely of absenting and truancy. The authors found that MMPI scores of the unsocialized delinquent group exceeded those of the socialized delinquent group on scales E, Hs, D, and Pa, at the 1% level of confidence, and at the 5% level for scale Sc. The scores of the runaway delinquent group exceeded those of the socialized delinquent group on scales D, Hx, Pd, and Pt at the 1% level, and on scales E, Ma and Sc at the 5% level. The runaway delinquent group scores also exceeded those of the unsocialized delinquent group on scale Ma (1% level) and were lower on Pa (5% level). The investigators concluded that the socialized delinquents, whose unacceptable behavior appeared to be more of a function of parental neglect than parental abuse, were psychologically a healthier group, displaying a form of "adaptive, goal-oriented" behavior through their delinquent acts.

A similar study of delinquent behavior was employed by Randolph et al. (1961), who divided their delinquent sample into 18 "solitary" delinquents, who committed their offense unaccompanied by others, and 37 "social" delinquents, whose offense was

committed in the company of other youngsters and whose social values were common to his subcultural group. The ages of the subjects ranged from 14 to 18. The authors found the "solitary" delinquents to be generally more intelligent, as indicated by the results of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, but also more psychologically disturbed as suggested by higher scores on MMPI scales Ma, D, Hx, Pd, Mf, Pa, Pt, Si and Ss.

Lefkowitz (1966) divided his sample of 42 juvenile delinquents into equal groups of those who had obtained "regular" discharges from a training school after successfully completing the school's rehabilitative program, and those who were given "irregular" discharges after failing to adjust to the school program. Although only the Ma scale discriminated between the two groups at an acceptable level of confidence, the author concluded that his results "tend to support the hypothesis of greater psychopathology among the failure group."

Craddick (1962) went to the available literature on psychopathy and developed a 12-item check list. He then rated 118 adult prisoners and, comparing the 27 highest scorers with the 27 lowest scorers, found that the more psychopathic inmates scored higher on K corrected scales Pd, Pt and Ma.

Craddick (1963) also found that by using MMPI "scatter" ("the algebraic sum of the deviations from the standard mean... for nine clinical scales") as a measure of psychopathy, he was

able to differentiate psychopathic prisoners from their non-psychopathic peers, but not from a group of psychiatric inpatients. Thus, in terms of absolute elevations, the psychopathic prisoners were similar to the mentally ill. Craddock did not discuss the discriminatory powers of individual scales.

Van Evra and Rosenberg (1963) studied an incarcerated population, all of whom had received a psychiatric diagnosis of sociopath, and the legal status of sociopathic personalities as defined by Ohio law. The investigators divided the inmates into groups of "primary psychopaths" and "neurotic psychopaths," and found statistically significant differences on several MMPI scales. These results are not surprising, however, as the division was based on scores on the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, an excellent measure of the first factor of the MMPI, a factor generally considered to be a measure of neuroticism, anxiety or ego strength. This factor will be discussed in the subsequent chapter.

The E scale of the MMPI was of particular interest to Gynther (1964). His subjects were 190 state hospital patients, all charged with legal offenses and referred to the hospital for sanity hearings. Illiterates and those too confused to respond to the MMPI were not included in the study. Gynther found a hierarchical arrangement when considering the relationship between type of offense and E scale elevations: the more severe

the offense, the greater was the E scale elevation.

Panton (1958a), however, had no success in finding MMPI differences among prisoners grouped by criminal offense. Using the usual clinical scales, Panton found that all groups deviated from normal standards, particularly in terms of elevated Pd scale scores, and lowered scores on scale Si.

Panton (1958b) went on to develop his Adjustment to Prison (Ap) scale, which on cross validation correctly identified 82% of each of two well adjusted prisoner groups, and 85%, 87% and 93%, respectively, of three groups characterized by inadequate and unruly adjustments to prison life. The Ap scale did not improve over clinical, judgmental predictions in the area of acceptable adjustment, but identified the poorly adjusted significantly better than did clinical predictions.

Panton (1962a) also found the Ap scale to work well in combination with the Pd scale in correctly identifying the chronic recidivist. This combination of scales has been termed the Habitual Criminal (HC) scale by Panton.

The same author (Panton, 1962b) also directed his attention to prisoners who mutilate themselves while in disciplinary confinement. He found statistically significant elevations on scales E, Pd, Pt and Si when comparing these men to model inmates. He also found differences on the anxiety index (AI) of the MMPI and on experimental scales Ap, Cr (Conversion reaction), In

(Inner maladjustment), Ph (Judged manifest hostility) and P<sub>Q</sub> (Psychotic tendency). However, in comparing his self mutilators with other prisoners whose disciplinary problems subjected them to the same custodial treatment, Panton found that only his Ap scale retained discriminatory worth. It would appear that the Ap scale scores are related to behavioral control and self discipline.

The MMPI did not fare well at all in a study by Erickson and Roberts (1966a). Two groups of institutionalized delinquent boys were given the MMPI. These boys differed in impulse control as judged by staff members who considered them to be trouble makers (SSs) or well behaved (GGs) within the institution. Scores on the usual clinical scales as well as on the Es scale (Ego strength) were tabulated, and only the Pd scale discriminated between the two groups. This difference disappeared in cross validation procedures, as did 19 discriminating items from the test proper. These authors (Erickson & Roberts, 1966b) also reported that the Q score of the Porteus Mazes did discriminate between the two groups, this difference withstanding cross validation procedures.

Denberg et al. (1961) found no significant relationships between MMPI scores on K and the ten usual clinical scales and the behavior of prison subjects in terms of disciplinary problems. These investigations certainly lost some information as they

dropped all tests with a raw score on the E scale of 10 or greater. Thus, 42 of an original N of 188 were lost.

Psychiatric diagnosis was the basis for classification in a study by Kingsley (1960). Twenty incarcerated subjects diagnosed as psychopaths failed to differ on the MMPI from 25 prisoners considered to have "no psychiatric disease." Each prisoner group did demonstrate the customary differences on scales E, Ha, Pd, Pa, Pt and Sc when compared with a normal group.

Caditz (1959) directed his attention to changes in MMPI scores over a period of institutionalization for 94 delinquent boys. He reported finding no test differences among his subjects when they were grouped according to severity of delinquent history.

Hill et al. (1962) focused their attention on MMPI differences between three groups. These were 200 penitentiary prisoners, 200 hospitalized narcotics addicts and 199 hospitalized alcoholics. The authors found that the addicts scored statistically significantly higher than the alcoholics on scales K, Pd, Hf and Ha, and higher than the prisoners on scales D, Hf and Ha. The alcoholics scored higher than did prisoners on scale D and lower on scales K and Pd. The investigators concluded, however, that the test differences were too small to be of diagnostic value since the overwhelming factor, both in test results, as revealed by elevated Pd and in social behavior, was one of common, profound social deviancy.

Levy et al. (1952) found that adult prisoners whose crimes involved sex and/or violence had higher profile elevations than their peers and that criminal recidivists obtained higher scores on the Pd scale than did non-recidivists. Tests of statistical significance and methods of analysis were not reported, and it appears that the investigators reached their conclusions simply by visual inspection of mean profiles.

We may mention in passing that a number of other more careful studies have been concerned with the relationships between MMPI scores and the variable of recidivism. Investigators in this area, e.g., Mack (1967), Gough et al. (1965), Mandel et al. (1963) and Mandel and Barron (1966) uniformly report discouraging results. No reliable relationships were found between MMPI scores and recidivism.

A recent experimental scale developed in a prison population by Magargee et al. (1967) is worthy of note. These writers reported that neither clinical MMPI scales nor 12 experimental scales "purporting to measure hostility or impulse control" (including the Ag scale) differentiated between assaultive and non-assaultive prisoners. They developed an empirical scale, the Over-controlled hostility Scale (O-H), designed to identify the individual who is usually inhibited in the expression of hostility, but who has been known to erupt into violently aggressive behavior often with devastating results. This carefully cross validated

scale effectively discriminated such persons from both normal individuals and from prisoners for whom aggression is rather a way of life. The authors state that a high score on their scale is indicative of "a conflict between strong aggressive impulses and strong inhibitions against the expression of aggression."

Finally, the investigations of Wirt and Jacobson (1966, 1967) at the Minnesota State Prison deserve consideration. In their investigation, the usual MMPI validity and clinical scales, numerous MMPI experimental scales, and scales of the Kuder Vocational Preference Record were included. The study is a large scale, long term project, and analysis of the data is still in progress. It is probably accurate to state that interesting relationships have been and will be found between the tests and a variety of criteria which include recidivism, disciplinary action, length of incarceration, response to psychotherapy and demographic variables. Because of a large N, more statistically significant than diagnostically useful results will be found, and further evaluation must await more complete data analysis. One conclusion supported thus far by reported results is that Kuder variables, when used as discriminators, may prove to be at least as effective as MMPI scales. Generally (and tentatively), elevations on the Kuder scales measuring more traditionally "masculine" values, e.g., outdoor or mechanical interests, have been associated with more socially favorable outcomes.

The studies mentioned above all deal with the central theme of generalized MPI discriminative validity within correctional populations. Results vary considerably in the extent to which they could be regarded as encouraging. Perhaps the most important variable to be considered is the reliability of the various criteria used in these investigations. Consider, for example, "seriousness of delinquent history," or the type of offense for which an inmate was incarcerated. Since the police do not solve every crime, and an investigator's knowledge of an individual's history is often incomplete to an unknown degree, the unreliable nature of such criteria is apparent.

Diagnostic criteria also suffer from unspecified unreliabilities. For example, Hill's (1962) groups of prisoners, alcoholics and addicts, surely reflected some overlap in that many prisoners characteristically abuse the use of alcohol and drugs, and many who are hospitalized for such indiscriminate tastes also have committed criminal offenses. Such criteria as the psychiatric diagnosis of psychopathy within a correctional institution is certainly not perfectly reliable, nor, surely, was Craddick's use of a symptom check list to diagnose psychopathy. He alone rated the subjects and no reliability data were offered. In the studies of Erickson and Roberts, the reliability of behavioral nominations is not discussed. In the two studies utilizing a social-solitary delinquency distinction, again the reliability of the diagnostic

judgments is not fully explored in print. The question of recidivism, too, has its obviously unreliable aspects in that the supervision and control of courts, police, and parole agents is not foolproof or all-encompassing. Finally, such variables as intra-institutional disciplinary action and type of institutional discharge in all likelihood contain elements of unreliability which have not caught the investigators' full attention.

The use of quantified behavioral rating scales dealing with problems of diagnosis in the correctional field has, unfortunately, been neglected. This situation stands in sharp contrast to the more medically aligned areas of psychopathology as attested, for example, by the Wittenborn Psychiatric Rating Scales, the Hospital Adjustment Scale and the Lorr-McNair In-patient Multidimensional Psychiatric Scales. There is one exception, namely, the Peterson Problem Check List (Peterson, 1961) which has received some attention in the field of delinquency. Peterson obtained school teachers' ratings of their pupils concerning absence or presence, to a mild or severe degree, of various adjustment problems. Subjects were in kindergarten or in the elementary grades. Factor analysis of the ratings suggested the presence of two major syndromes which Peterson labeled "conduct problem" and "personality problem." Quay and Quay (1965) extended Peterson's work to seventh and eighth grade students finding impressive continuity as well as the emergence of a third factor, labeled "immaturity," in the

eighth grade sample. While Peterson found high interrater reliabilities for his two major factors, the reliability data in the Quay and Quay samples were unfortunately less impressive for the personality problem factor scores and the immaturity factor scores.

In a study which is in many ways directly comparable to the investigation reported here, Quay (1964) introduced the Peterson Problem Checklist to a delinquent sample. Subjects were 113 incarcerated male delinquents. The mean age was 16.6, with standard deviation of .98, and the sample was 67% Caucasian and 33% Negro. Factor analysis again suggested the same two major factors, now relabeled by Quay as "unsocialized-psychopathic" and "disturbed-neurotic." A third factor emerged and was found to be difficult to interpret, but was labeled "inadequacy-immaturity" by Quay. Once more, Quay found interrater reliabilities to be disappointingly low, .17 for the scale measuring unsocialized-psychopathy, .07 for the scale measuring disturbed neurotic symptoms and .45 for the inadequacy-immaturity scale. By dropping from further consideration the most deviant three of his twelve raters, Quay boosted the interrater reliabilities to .57, .32 and .93 respectively. Quay also reported intercorrelations of factor scores. These were .33 between the psychopathic and neurotic scores, .49 between psychopathic and inadequacy and .73 between neurotic and inadequacy.

Mack (1967), building on Quay's work with the Peterson

Problem Checklist, found that parole agents, in retrospect, rated boys who violated their parole as more sociopathic, but here the scales measuring neurotic and inadequate-immature symptoms did not discriminate between violators and non-violators.

In addition, Quay and Peterson (1964) developed a self-rating questionnaire for use in the evaluation of the structure of delinquency, and derived three factor scales, measuring psychopathic delinquency, neurotic delinquency and subcultural delinquency. Correlations with behavior rating factors contained only one significant correlation (.30), that between the questionnaire factor of psychopathic delinquency and the rating of unsocialized-psychopathy.

In general, the Quay-Peterson analyses have been consistent with the general personality theory of Eysenck (e.g., 1953, 1963) who, through the application of factor analytic techniques applied to a variety of data, has come to propose two basic dimensions underlying human behavior, those called neuroticism and introversion-extroversion. Eysenck, who postulates biological determinants for these dimensions, expanded on Jung's typology in delineating the introversion-extroversion factor. The "typical" extrovert is described by Eysenck as one who is "sociable..., craves excitement, takes chances, often sticks his neck out, acts on the spur of the moment and is generally an impulsive individual...is care-free, easy-going, optimistic...tends to be aggressive and lose his

temper quickly...and is not always a reliable person." The "typical" introvert, Eysenck describes as "a quiet, retiring sort of person, introspective, fond of books rather than people; he is reserved and distant except to intimate friends...and distrusts the impulse of the moment. He does not like excitement...keeps his feelings under close control, seldom behaves in an aggressive manner, and does not lose his temper easily. He is reliable, somewhat pessimistic, and places a great value on ethical standards." (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964) Eysenck relates extroversion to the traditional psychiatric classifications of psychopathy and hysteria, and introversion to depression and anxiety. The independent dimension of neuroticism is considered by Eysenck to refer to emotionality and instability as determined by the functioning of the autonomic nervous system.

The Peterson Problem Checklist, then, appeared to be an instrument of general interest and one which was directly applicable to a correctional population. In spite of its use in the correctional field, examination of the items of the Peterson Problem Checklist suggested that its utility in the present study would be limited. Several items were judged to be quite inappropriate to the population under consideration (described in the subsequent section). Neither did the range of items appear to cover the behavioral and conceptual domains as completely as one might wish, nor did the items lend themselves naturally to use

by the raters available for the population under current investigation. Also, as noted above, interrater reliabilities have not been impressive.

Clearly, Quay's and Peterson's efforts have been well directed and have been valuable in conceptualizing the structure of delinquency and in providing criteria for investigations such as this. Just as apparent, however, has been the need for additional rating scales to supplement and expand their checklist.

On the basis of the preceding considerations, it is now possible to reiterate and expand the primary purposes of this study as follows:

1. To develop rating instruments composed of both behavioral and inferential items appropriate to the available raters to supplement the Peterson Problem Checklist and provide quantified criteria for test behavior.
2. To develop a number of psychologically meaningful scales based on the newly developed ratings. In order to develop such scales it was decided to apply factor analytic techniques comparable to those used in the derivation of the Peterson Problem Checklist. The advantage of developing factor scales in the present study would be twofold: first, the scales could be expected to

be substantially more reliable and valid (or meaningful) than any one of the items on which they would be based; secondly, factor analysis would be very likely to achieve a considerable and highly desirable reduction in the number of variables to be considered in further analysis. Such reduction would lessen the danger of capitalizing on chance fluctuations, which of course increases as the number of variables increase.

3. To investigate the relationships between the rating scales and other psychological test data including the MPI.

## CHAPTER II

## METHODS

Subjects and Institution

The subjects were 140 Youthful Offenders who were incarcerated at the Minnesota Reception and Diagnostic Center (MRDC) at Lino Lakes, Minnesota. The intention was to obtain a minimum  $N$  of 130, a number suggested by Cohen (1965), who determined that when the alpha level is arbitrarily and conventionally set at .05, an  $N$  of 130 will provide power of .80 when "moderate" effects can be anticipated. This level of power is again an arbitrary level, but has been suggested by Cohen on the basis of reasonable considerations. In the early stages of data collection, eight subjects failed to receive the Kuder and one subject took the WPI on Form R, a form which does not allow for easy scoring of the experimental scales used here. Thus, the total sample of 140 allowed for at least 130 subjects for each test scale.

The designation "Youthful Offender" is a quasi legal one, indicating a youth between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one who has been convicted of a felony or, occasionally, a gross misdemeanor. The commitment is through District Court. This age distinction is not entirely a rigid one since juveniles under the age of 18 are sometimes referred to District Court as Youthful

Offenders. Such court action is usually taken only if the crime is particularly serious and/or the past record is exceptionally lengthy and serious in nature. At the other end of the age range, occasionally a youth older than twenty-one is received at MRDC. This could occur if one committed a crime while twenty-one or younger, was given court probation and subsequently violated the terms of probation. Court action then calls for commitment to the institution for evaluation and disposition.

The mean age of the sample studied was 19.33 years with an SD of 1.48 and a range of 16-24 years.

The sample was predominantly Caucasian, with 122 (87%) subjects falling into this category. Ten subjects were American Indian, seven were Negro and one had a Caucasian-Filipino background.

The data were collected between March and October in 1967. During that time, 46 Youthful Offenders were admitted to MRDC who were not included in the research sample. Thirteen youths were too illiterate to read the tests. The criterion here was a Stanford Achievement Test reading score of less than grade level five. Two inmates refused to cooperate with the testing program. Twelve were youths who had previously been evaluated at MRDC but who were returned for brief re-evaluation following failure to conform to probation regulations or the rules of the receiving institution. Finally, 19 youths were not tested as

they were well known to correctional personnel and appeared to represent a clear threat to institutional security. MRDC is not a maximum security institution and it was considered expedient to transfer these individuals to a more secure facility. These last, lost subjects would very likely fall in the sociopathic end of the diagnostic spectrum. Some sample restriction, then, was necessary in order not to interfere with broad institutional policy and the best interests of the correctional system.

The goals of MRDC staff are primarily to evaluate each inmate's needs and abilities, submit recommendations regarding disposition and treatment to the Youth Conservation Commission (the paroling authority in Minnesota) and the administrative authorities of the Department of Corrections, and to prepare each inmate for the next step in the correctional process. The length of stay at the institution at the time of data collection was approximately four to five weeks. Diagnosis is approached through extensive interviews, review of the social history, and psychological testing. Tests routinely given are the MPI, Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests, Stanford Achievement Tests, the Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory and a brief Sentence Completion Form. Additional testing is at the discretion of the staff psychologist. Interviews are conducted by a psychologist, caseworker, clergyman and teacher. Psychiatric consultation is available for selected cases. The inmates live in dormitories

under the supervision of counselors and, less directly, security personnel. The counselors make regular log entries on each inmate's social adjustment and adjustment to the discipline of dormitory living. About three weeks from date of admission, each staff member involved in a case submits a written report. The case is then reviewed at a team conference and recommendations for placement and treatment are developed. Those recommendations and the service reports are sent to the Youth Conservation Commissioners, a board with the ultimate legal authority and power of transfer in each case. The Commission members review the written material, come to MRDC to interview the inmate and take action on the staff's recommendations.

The Commissioners' action amounts to a choice out of three major placement possibilities. One of these is the Minnesota State Reformatory at St. Cloud, Minnesota. This is generally considered to be the most severe action and involves a relatively lengthy period of incarceration under maximum security controls. Eighty-five subjects in the research sample were recommended by staff for placement at the Reformatory. The second major possibility is for transfer to the Willow River Forestry Camp, an institution with a more open atmosphere and a shorter stay than at the Reformatory, usually about seven months. Thirty-four subjects received a staff recommendation for such a transfer. Sixteen subjects in the sample received the relatively charitable

recommendation for probation directly from MRDC, the third major alternative. Youthful Offenders can, under rare conditions, be recommended for transfer to camps within the juvenile system, and four subjects received such a recommendation. Finally, for inmates considered to be in need of a mental hospital program, the staff can recommend transfer to supervision to the Department of Public Welfare. This transfer involves the Maximum Security Hospital at St. Peter, Minnesota. One inmate in the sample was recommended for such a transfer. In this case, hospital authorities did not consider the referral to be appropriate and ultimate disposition was to the Reformatory. Commission action is consistent with staff recommendations in approximately 95% of all cases.

#### Test Data

The decisions as to which tests to enter into the present analysis were in some instances difficult and to an extent arbitrary, although, of course, an attempt was made to exercise judgment and discretion. It was imperative, however, to limit the total number of variables since the  $N$  of 140 would not allow for selection of an excessively large number of scales.

The MPI was of paramount interest. The three validity scales, L, E, and K, the ten commonly-used clinical scales, Hs, D, Hy, Pd, Mc, Pa, Pt, Sc and Ma, as well as Barron's (1953)

Ego Strength Scale (Eg), were routinely scored and used in this study. Of interest, have been certain MMPI scales derived through factor analysis (Block 1965, Tellegen 1964, and Welsh 1956). Analysis of full length scales has invariably resulted in the discovery of two major sources of variance within the MMPI. The first factor has been interpreted in various ways, e.g., by Welsh as a measure of anxiety, by Lingoes (1960) as a measure of general maladjustment, and by Block as a measure of ego resilience. Investigators have suggested that the second major factor represents a dimension alternately considered to be repressive-expressive by Welsh, related to Eysenck's concept of extraversion by Tellegen, and one of ego control by Block. The parallels here to Eysenck's neuroticism and extraversion dimensions and to the Quay-Peterson unsocialized-sociopathic and disturbed-neurotic rating dimensions seem clear. In order to clarify the empirical correlates of such factor scales, Welsh's  $\Delta$  scale (1956) and Block's  $Ec-0$  or  $\text{Alpha}$  scale (1964) were included as representative of the first factor. Welsh's  $\beta$  scale (1956) and Block's  $Ec-51$  or  $\text{Beta}$  (1964) scale were added as measures of the second factor.

Although the first two factors are dominant, factor analytic MMPI studies have repeatedly identified an additional factor (e.g., Jackson & Messick, 1962). This third dimension appears to be a measure of motivation to present a socially desirable facade. Wiggins' (1965) Social Desirability Scale ( $Sd$ ) and Cofer's (1949)

Positive Lying Scale (La) are, along with L, positively loaded on this factor. Sd and Ma were scored and included in the data analysis reported here.

Magargoe's Q-H scale, which was mentioned in the introductory chapter, was also included in the analysis. Finally, Pantou's Adjustment to Prison Scale (Ap), also described in the preceding chapter, was included as being particularly appropriate for use in the present study.

The investigations of Wirt and Jacobson at the Minnesota State Prison stimulated interest in the correlates of the Kuder Vocational Preference Record. Therefore, scores on the V scale and the ten interest scales (Outdoor, Mechanical, Computational, Scientific, Persuasive, Artistic, Literary, Musical, Social Service, and Clerical) were also obtained in the present sample.

Large-Thorndike scores, the verbal and non-verbal intelligence quotients, are routinely obtained from all subjects at MRDC and were included as part of the basic descriptive information on the subjects.

Thus, a total of thirty-five test variables were incorporated in the study.

#### Bating Scales and the Batera

The Peterson Problem Checklist has already been briefly described. There are fifty-eight items in the original scale.

Quay, for his delinquent sample, discarded twelve items which had been checked in less than 10% of his sample. For the present study, eleven additional items were discarded, namely those which had their highest loadings on the ambiguous and unreliable third factor found in the delinquent sample. Nine other items which had significant loadings on more than one of the three factors were also dropped. The items that were retained each had a loading of at least .47 on their factor, with at least a difference of .20 between this loading and loadings on the other factors. Two other items, "truancy from school" and "doesn't know how to have fun; behaves like a little adult," were finally discarded as being inappropriate to our subjects and probably irritating to raters. Several of the items which were most closely related to the third factor, and which already had been eliminated, also fell in this category of inappropriate items. Peterson's instructions were also changed somewhat to a more appropriate format for the present subjects, e.g., "child" to "youth."

The item eliminations resulted in a revised problem check list (PCL) of twenty-four items. Fourteen of these were loaded on the unsocialized-sociopathic factor in Quay's study of delinquents, and ten were loaded on the disturbed-neurotic factor. These items, along with their factor loadings in Quay's sample, are presented in Appendix A.1.

In addition to the PCL, two other rating forms were included which were designed specifically for this study. The first of these, the Caseworker's Rating Scale (CRS), contains items of a rather inferential and abstract nature. These items were derived from case files in the following manner. Files were drawn randomly and statements were taken from caseworker's reports until ten consecutive reports yielded no new statements. The only departure from random selection was the provision that each staff caseworker be represented by at least two reports in this sample. Eleven caseworkers were represented in this sampling, covering reports from 48 files. The statements were then combined on the basis of content similarity whenever appropriate and rewritten for the sake of clarity, always in the terms most favored by the caseworkers. In this manner, 32 distinct statements were obtained, all of which were incorporated in the Caseworker's Rating Scale. The CRS is reproduced in Appendix A.2.

The same general procedures were used to develop the Group Living Rating Scale (GLRS) to be used by the counselors. These items are more concrete than those of the CRS and were based on observed behavior within the confines of the institution. The only procedural difference from those observed in sampling the caseworkers' reports was that not each counselor could be insured representation in the item sample because of the large number of counselors employed at MRDC. Thirty-nine files were used in this

sampling. The items obtained through inspection of the files were checked against an unpublished behavior rating scale by Mandel which was developed at the Minnesota State Reformatory for Women to insure that the behavioral domain was adequately covered. The 19 item GLRS is to be found in Appendix A.3.

While the PCL is a check list, the format chosen for the CRS and GLRS involved the use of a nine-point rating scale for each of the items. The nine-point scale was developed by Lorr et al. (1963), who selected as anchors nine adverbs of degree to modify the items. Lorr and Cluff (1959) found that such adverbs served to "stretch or compress the meanings of other words like adjectives." Lorr, starting out with forty adverbs of degree, arrived at nine which were roughly the same "distance" apart when scaled by the method of successive intervals. The nine adverbs are: (1) Not at all, (2) Very slightly, (3) A little, (4) Mildly, (5) Moderately, (6) Quite a bit, (7) Distinctly, (8) Markedly and (9) Extremely.

In the present study, the MRDC counselors were to provide the ratings on both the PCL and the GLRS. The duties of these counselors involve daily direct supervision of the inmates. They supervise general work assignments, assist in recreational activities and are responsible for dormitory cleanliness, discipline and security. Although their jobs have important aspects of control, they are encouraged to stress the counseling activities of

their work which their title implies. They maintain notes on each inmate's behavior and are involved in team decisions and recommendations. A high school diploma is the only educational requirement for this position and, in the opinion of this writer, they are a quite heterogeneous group in terms of ability, sensitivity and interest in their work as well as age and drive for achievement and educational advancement. Two counselors filled out the rating forms for each subject. No counselor was included as a rater unless he had at least four weeks of experience in working with Youthful Offenders and had worked at least three eight-hour shifts with the subject to be rated. The counselors filled out the rating forms at the time they submitted their anecdotal reports for staffing, around three to four weeks after each subject's arrival. They were, of course, ignorant of the rater's test results at that time. A total of seventeen counselors participated in the study with thirty-five combinations of counselors submitting ratings.

The caseworkers, who provided ratings on the CRS, have responsibilities similar to those of social workers in other settings. Caseworkers at MRDC must have a Bachelor's Degree (in no specified field) and they are supervised by an MSW. Three caseworkers were involved in the ratings. Two were in the process of obtaining their MSW Degrees at the time of the ratings, and the third had recently obtained a Master's Degree in Theology.

All were experienced in their jobs. Each caseworker filled out the CRS after several interviews with the subject, prior to writing his regular service report. By that time, the caseworker would have studied the Presentence Investigation, a report written by state parole agents for the court, presenting such information as the nature of the offense, past delinquent history, social and educational adjustment, family background and vocational experience.

The present investigator, functioning as a staff psychologist, obtained the same basic information through interviews and the Presentence Investigation, and rated each of the 140 subjects on the CRS so that it would be possible to estimate interrater reliability. Neither the caseworkers nor the author had test information available at the time of the ratings. While ordinarily a good deal of informal conversation is exchanged between caseworkers, counselors, and psychologists in the process of evaluation, firm—and, I feel, successful—attempts were made to restrict such communication about the research subjects prior to the time of the ratings in order to maintain independence of judgment.

With all raters, caseworkers as well as counselors, brief discussions of common pitfalls of ratings were held. Such difficulties as errors of leniency, errors of central tendency, and halo effects were mentioned.

### Data Analysis

The first task was to reduce the information contained in the ratings to workable proportions and to clarify the internal structure of the ratings. Each of 140 subjects had been rated by two raters on the seventy-five items contained in the three rating scales. The following steps were undertaken:

- A. Means, standard deviations, and inter-rater reliability coefficients were calculated for each item. The more unreliable items were discarded.
- B. For each rating scale, the remaining items were factor analyzed in order to reduce the number of variables by replacing scores on the 75 single items by scores on a reduced number of factor scales.
- C. Inter-rater reliabilities and internal consistency coefficients of the factor scales were determined.
- D. The factor scores obtained for each subject were in turn factor analyzed in order to determine interscale relationships.
- E. The relationships between test data and the rating data (which at this point were expressed in factor scores) were examined. Correlation coefficients were chosen to represent these relationships. Cohen (1965) has pointed out the advantages of relationship statistics in studies such as this. Correlation coefficients, unlike I-values

and E-ratios, directly express the strength of a relationship and are consequently less easily misinterpreted.

The results of the analysis outlined above will be presented in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER III

## RESULTS

Descriptive Test Data

The means and standard deviations of scores on the 35 test variables are presented in Appendix B.1. The reader will note that the mean verbal IQ as measured by the Large-Thorndike for this sample is 99.57 and the mean non-verbal IQ is 104.65. For the RPI, the mean coded profile of  $K$  corrected scores is  $4'87692 - 3501 / F-KL/$ . For scores without the  $K$  correction, the mean profile is coded  $4'692 - 783 501 / F-KL/$ .

Analysis of Ratings

Descriptive Data. Means and standard deviations of the PCL items are presented in Table 1. Item reliabilities were not computed on the PCL. Reliabilities of the PCL factor scales are reported in a subsequent section of this chapter.

Means, standard deviations, and interrater reliability coefficients for the 19 items of the GLRS are given in Table 2. The reliability coefficients of the single items are not high, ranging from .16 to .45. Only items with an interrater reliability of .35 or greater were retained for subsequent analysis; this meant the elimination of nine items. It should be noted that the means of about half of the items are quite low. These

TABLE I

Means and Standard Deviations for the 24 Items of the Revised  
Problem Check List  
(Items are to be found in Appendix A.1)

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation
1	.31	.51
2	.29	.49
3	.59	.53
4	.25	.44
5	.53	.50
6	.68	.54
7	.60	.53
8	.40	.41
9	.70	.53
10	.32	.41
11	.12	.32
12	.39	.60
13	.40	.53
14	.35	.61
15	.21	.33
16	.14	.32
17	.37	.37
18	.20	.34
19	.24	.34
20	.16	.35
21	.15	.32
22	.41	.43
23	.24	.35
24	.45	.49

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Interrater Reliability Coefficients  
for the 19 Items of the Group Living Rating Scale

Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability Coefficient
1	5.32	1.75	.41
2	5.64	1.11	.33
3	4.34	1.93	.16
4	1.89	1.34	.39
5	5.82	1.96	.26
6	2.05	1.49	.45
7	4.95	1.20	.36
8	1.72	1.33	.27
9	3.16	1.66	.40
10	4.86	1.82	.32
11	2.82	1.72	.21
12	5.45	2.02	.31
13	2.47	1.72	.17
14	1.98	1.43	.38
15	4.80	1.70	.36
16	5.16	2.01	.32
17	1.81	1.28	.37
18	2.14	1.72	.16
19	2.10	1.28	.37

items, in other words, were rarely applicable and their score distributions are quite skewed.

Interrater reliability coefficients, means, and standard deviations for the thirty-two items of the CRS are presented in Table 3.

Four reliability coefficients are presented for each item: the correlations between the ratings of the caseworkers and this writer, computed separately for the three subsamples rated by the caseworkers, and, in the final column, the interrater reliability coefficient of each item, computed for the total sample. These overall coefficients are more encouraging than those of the GLRS items, ranging from .23 to .75. Again, the more unreliable items were discarded. With .35 again as an arbitrary standard, this meant a loss of six items from the CRS. Only one item, number 29, is markedly skewed. This item deals with mental illness, and all raters came to the conclusion that it was rarely applicable in this population, so that the middle and upper ranges of the rating scale were rarely applied.

**Factor Analyses of the Rating Scale Items.** It was anticipated that the results of the factor analysis of the ratings would be consistent with the results of Quay's work with the checklist and the general theory of Eysenck. Factor analysis of the items in each rating scale was accomplished using the University of

TABLE 3

Means, Standard Deviations and Interrater Reliability Coefficients  
for the 32 Items of the Caseworker's Rating Scale

Item No.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Reliability Coefficient Raters 1-4 (N = 89)	Reliability Coefficient Raters 2-4 (N = 35)	Reliability Coefficient Raters 3-4 (N = 16)	Reliability Coefficient Raters 1,2,3-4 (N = 140)
1	4.46	1.46	.42	.53	.55	.46
2	5.74	1.57	.20	.31	.58	.28
3	4.72	1.57	.53	.37	.34	.51
4	4.95	1.43	.40	.32	.59	.41
5	3.96	1.62	.55	.43	.89	.56
6	5.81	1.54	.44	.58	.62	.50
7	5.65	1.33	.33	.22	.22	.28
8	4.71	1.54	.56	.62	.75	.54
9	5.46	1.29	.27	.38	.64	.35
10	5.40	1.41	.51	.09	.40	.39
11	5.79	1.23	.43	.05	.38	.35
12	5.97	1.35	.49	.41	.43	.45
13	4.96	1.91	.76	.77	.80	.75
14	5.95	1.31	.46	.72	.36	.41
15	5.51	1.46	.29	.63	.76	.44
16	5.37	1.42	.49	.45	.59	.48

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Means, Standard Deviations and Interrater Reliability Coefficients  
for the 32 Items of the Caseworker's Rating Scale

Item No.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Reliability Coefficient Raters 1-4 (N = 89)	Reliability Coefficient Raters 2-4 (N = 35)	Reliability Coefficient Raters 3-4 (N = 16)	Reliability Coefficient Raters 1, 2, 3-4 (N = 140)
17	5.62	1.32	.40	.27	.17	.38
18	5.08	1.63	.20	.21	.42	.27
19	5.32	1.46	.55	.47	.44	.45
20	4.58	1.44	.45	.34	.48	.41
21	5.30	1.40	.51	.48	.45	.50
22	4.55	1.53	.60	.27	.50	.51
23	4.03	1.51	.54	.42	.66	.52
24	4.17	1.48	.33	-.01	.58	.23
25	4.26	1.40	.48	.55	.52	.55
26	4.61	1.47	.48	.36	.43	.42
27	4.41	1.29	.46	.29	.14	.44
28	4.54	1.27	.56	.50	.64	.55
29	1.89	.91	.69	.1	.16	.56
30	5.77	1.37	.29	.17	.66	.29
31	5.08	2.12	.74	.60	.50	.67
32	5.23	1.61	.34	.24	.58	.32

Minnesota's electronic computer system. Each analysis was programmed so as to be as consistent as possible with Quay's methods. Quay analyzed his data by means of the principal axis method using the squared multiple correlation as the communality estimate, rotating orthogonally according to Kaiser's Varimax criterion (1958). The lower limit of eigen values allowed was .40. These same procedures were followed here.

Factor loadings for the items of the PCL are presented in Table 4. It was expected that this analysis would replicate Quay's results in producing two major factors.

Although five factors emerged, the first two factors did account for 79% of the variance. The first factor contains significant loadings on only the unsocialized-sociopathic items in Quay's analysis (items 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 24), albeit loaded in the negative direction, and is clearly a reproduction of Quay's first factor. Likewise, the second factor (items 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 13 and 17) clearly replicates Quay's disturbed-neurotic dimension.

The third factor to emerge is highly ambiguous. It shares item 13 with factor II, and has only two unique items, 12 and 14, each with high negative loadings. Item 13 was retained as a factor II item for further analysis and items 12 and 14 were discarded.

Factor IV is represented by an interesting group of items. Two items, 8 and 18, are also loaded on Factor I, although in a

TABLE 4  
 Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for Revised Problem Check List

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	$h^2$
1. Attention-seeking, show-off behavior	-.806	-.304	-.018	-.036	.106	.780
2. Disruptiveness; tendency to annoy and bother others	-.877	-.228	-.088	-.084	-.052	.882
3. Feelings of inferiority	.116	.730	.156	.142	.096	.715
4. Boisterousness; rowdiness	-.848	-.300	-.081	.012	.006	.827
5. Preoccupation; "In a world of his own"	.069	.736	.026	.241	.119	.198
6. Shyness, bashfulness	.253	.787	-.063	.091	-.142	.717
7. Social withdrawal, preference for solitary activities	.125	.826	-.092	.129	-.131	.746
8. Short attention span	-.568	.035	-.163	.423	.072	.541
9. Lack of self-confidence	.143	.650	-.230	.176	-.162	.673
10. Inattentiveness to what others say	-.718	-.005	-.134	.374	-.013	.676
11. Fighting	-.564	-.072	.018	-.080	-.403	.493

TABLE 4 (Continued)  
 Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for Revised Problem Check List

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	$h^2$
12. Laziness in school and in performance of other tasks	-.269	.013	-.793	.363	-.063	.841
13. Anxiety, chronic general fearfulness	.059	.413	-.644	-.120	.136	.623
14. Irresponsibility, undependability	-.405	-.024	-.805	.238	-.059	.874
15. Excessive daydreaming	-.119	.294	-.015	.622	.146	.513
16. Disobedience, difficulty in disciplinary control	-.863	-.060	-.053	.054	-.137	.809
17. Depression, chronic sadness	.089	.613	.053	.248	.300	.541
18. Uncooperativeness in group situations	-.575	.024	-.058	.472	.013	.016
19. Distractibility	-.645	.084	-.252	.313	.082	.600
20. Negativism, tendency to do the opposite of what is requested	-.826	-.031	-.076	.162	-.032	.746

TABLE 4 (Continued)

## Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for Revised Problem Check List

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	$h^2$
21. Impertinence, sauciness	-.765	-.171	-.093	.172	-.051	.724
22. Sluggishness, lethargy	-.183	.216	-.165	.756	-.107	.701
23. Drowsiness	-.114	.297	-.134	.700	.036	.614
24. Profane language, swearing, cursing	-.552	-.333	-.080	.120	.324	.545

**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 3**

negative direction. Three items (15, excessive daydreaming; 22, sluggishness, lethargy; and 23 drowsiness) are clearly loaded on this factor alone. These three items were represented in the disturbed-neurotic dimension in Quay's analysis. Although a factor scale containing only three items is rather short, the decision was made to include these items as a separate factor scale in further analysis. They do appear to represent a clear-cut dimension, hereafter called "apathy-withdrawal."

Factor V is represented by only one item, number 11, but this item had a higher loading on the first factor and was therefore included as a Factor I item.

Thus three clear factors emerged. Factor I is, again, Quay's unsocialized-sociopathic dimension. Twelve of its original items remain, as two were lost to the third factor. For continued analysis, factor loadings were reversed to make this dimension directly comparable to Quay's. Factor II is now represented by a seven-item scale, with three of its other original items now considered to be representative of the new Factor IV apathy-withdrawal.

Factor loadings for the GLRS items are contained in Table 5. Three factors emerged. These are not directly comparable to the Quay dimensions. The first factor, which has three clearly loaded items (4, 6 and 14), might be termed "energetic attention-seeking." The second factor is represented by items 1, 2, 7 and 15, all

TABLE 5  
 Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Group Living Rating Scale

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	$h^2$
1. A good worker, showing initiative, industry and a sense of responsibility.	-.172	-.792	.039	.658
2. Neat and clean, with good habits of personal hygiene.	-.375	-.522	-.002	.413
4. A pest, asking for special favors, begging the staff with special requests.	.771	.078	-.034	.602
6. Loud and boisterous — you always know he's around	.785	.200	-.431	.842
7. Liked and accepted by the other inmates.	-.175	-.564	-.225	.399
9. Socially withdrawn, a loner.	-.166	.263	.04	.462
14. A show-off, trying to gain recognition and attention through bragging or horseplay.	.744	.334	-.347	.785

TABLE 5 (Continued)

Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Group Living Rating Scale

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	$h^2$
15. One who responds positively to correction, instruction and constructive criticism.	-.081	-.787	.132	.643
17. A non-conformist, ignoring or resisting rules and regulations.	.601	.462	-.204	.616
19. Given to vulgar or profane language, even after being reprimanded.	.368	.348	-.620	.641

with negative loadings, and appears to refer to a dimension of "negativism." The third factor, represented only by items 9 and 19, is not at all clear. Subjects with high scores here are socially withdrawn and do not often use profanity, quite possibly as a function of their limited verbal output.

The first two factors here each appear to be related to Quay's unsocialized-sociopathic factor, while the third is possibly a miniature representation of the disturbed-neurotic dimension. It will be recalled that nine of the original GLRS items were discarded as being too unreliable. Perhaps these unreliably rated items would have more clearly represented the two anticipated dimensions, particularly the neurotic-disturbed factor.

The two-item third factor was not considered in further analysis. The first two factors, although not well represented, were included.

The results of the factor analysis of the CRS are presented in Table 6. Here the results are quite consistent with the results of the analysis of the PCL. Although seven factors emerge from the analysis, the first two account for 65% of the common variance. The first factor, represented by items 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21 and 25, appears to be a counterpart of Quay's unsocialized-sociopathic factor. The second factor, represented by items 4, 9, 10, 17, 28 and 29, can reasonably be considered an extension of Quay's disturbed-neurotic dimension.

TABLE 6

## Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Caseworker's Rating Scale

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Factor VI	Factor VII	R <sup>2</sup>
1. Pleasant and personable, possessing good social skills.	-.244	-.111	.804	.211	-.198	.098	.103	.821
3. Passive and apathetic, non-responsive	.043	.083	-.776	.137	-.086	-.068	-.203	.684
4. "Nervous" — tense and apprehensive	-.245	.533	-.105	-.152	-.209	-.359	.155	.575
5. Overtly hostile — belligerent, demanding, disrespectful,	.606	.248	-.215	-.445	.202	.211	-.057	.761
6. Lacking in appropriate feelings of guilt or remorse.	.734	-.136	.018	-.227	.268	.279	-.223	.808
8. Slick, superficial and shallow, an opportunistic manipulator.	.484	.018	.564	-.044	.144	.306	-.076	.675
9. Easily upset with shaky emotional control — moody.	.169	.809	-.056	-.032	.043	-.119	.011	.703
10. Unhappy with himself, holding himself in low esteem — feelings of inadequacy.	-.037	.518	-.190	.162	-.114	-.657	-.041	.778

TABLE 6 (Continued)

Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Caseworker's Rating Scale

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Factor VI	Factor VII	$h^2$
11. Unhappy with the world, feeling victimized, pushed around and treated unfairly.	.369	.419	-.115	-.512	.274	-.168	-.118	.705
12. Irresponsible and undependable, not meeting reasonable expectations.	.814	.008	-.048	.055	.152	-.189	.034	.728
13. Criminally sophisticated, wise in the methodology of crime, and ego involved in criminal activity.	.841	-.053	.113	.126	.259	.166	.127	.849
14. Concerned largely about short range goals, the needs of the moment.	.825	-.104	-.038	-.011	.132	-.243	-.173	.799
15. Lacking in "available anxiety," seeing no need to change.	.571	-.327	-.193	-.223	.216	.373	-.379	.849
16. Resentful of authority, rules and restrictions.	.729	.092	-.133	-.388	.240	.295	-.038	.854
17. Concerned, although not necessarily at a conscious level, about masculinity, with his difficulties involving "masculine proving" behavior.	.028	.778	.050	.026	-.156	.143	-.154	.687

TABLE 6 (Continued)  
 Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Caseworker's Rating Scale

Item	Factor	h <sup>2</sup>						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	
19. A generally inadequate fellow, unable to cope with life's demands and expectations.	-.064	.134	-.328	.099	-.017	-.634	-.275	.617
20. Maintaining emotional ties with his family, at least some members.	-.293	.009	.025	.032	-.850	-.126	-.007	.826
21. Involved in "thrill seeking" -- a taste for danger, excitement and "kicks."	.761	.183	.050	-.070	.039	.172	-.043	.654
22. Maintaining positive attitudes of affection and respect towards his mother (or mother surrogate).	-.204	.040	.001	.012	-.798	.026	-.023	.682
23. Maintaining positive attitudes of affection and respect towards his father (or father surrogate).	-.281	.015	-.037	.163	-.690	-.049	.002	.586
25. Maintaining a value system consistent with conventional, middle-class standards (regarding school, work, sexual behavior, temperance, etc)	-.712	.169	.135	.150	-.332	.209	-.034	.731

TABLE 6 (Continued)

## Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Caseworker's Rating Scale

Item	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Factor VI	Factor VII	$h^2$
26. Accepting of his correctional status — such matters as YCC commitment, violation, institutionalization, etc.	-.216	.061	-.027	.776	-.135	-.067	.173	.706
27. "Institutionalized" — most comfortable when under institutional control.	.273	.236	-.136	.512	.159	-.237	-.266	.595
28. A social misfit, unpopular with his peers, inept in social situations.	.015	.595	-.413	.057	-.102	-.265	-.316	.707
29. Demonstrating peculiar and idiosyncratic behavior and ideation which is difficult to comprehend from a "normal" frame of reference — mentally disturbed, "crazy."	-.121	.475	-.015	.025	.124	-.064	.150	.283
31. Involved in the excessive or inappropriate use of alcohol to the extent that it is an important factor in his social difficulties.	.059	-.011	-.123	-.063	-.017	-.070	-.427	.210

The remaining five factors are of lesser importance and varying degrees of psychological cohesiveness: Factor III shares item 28 with Factor II and item 8 with Factor I and appears to be a dimension of social grace. Its two exclusive items were not considered in further analysis. Factor IV shares one item, 5, with Factor I. This item, taken in conjunction with three more exclusive items, suggests a dimension of passive acceptance of institutionalization. This factor was also discarded. Three items, 20, 22 and 23, all have high negative loadings on Factor V. These have clearly to do with familial relationships. These items were retained and the factor named "negative family relationships." Factor VI is represented by only two items; one of these, item 19, loaded on Factor II as well. The items seem to represent a dimension of adequacy and appreciation of self-worth. Factor VII has only one loading of any magnitude, this on the item dealing with excessive drinking. Both Factor VI and Factor VII were discarded.

The result of these factor analyses, therefore, has been the reduction of seventy-five items to eight factor scales from the three rating scales. These factor scales are: Factor I CRS (unsocialized-sociopathic), Factor II CRS (disturbed-neurotic), Factor V CRS (negative family relationships), Factor I GLRS (energetic attention-seeking), Factor II GLRS (negativism), Factor I PCL (disturbed-neurotic) and Factor II PCL (apathy-

withdrawal).

In Appendix B.2., for the sake of clarity, the items of the eight-factor scales are listed with their loadings on their "own" factor. For the PCL items, the lowest loading is .413 for the "anxiety" item, and the smallest difference between loadings of the two factors on one and the same item is a difference of .365 for Factors II and IV on the "depression" item. For the GLRS items, the lowest is  $-.522$  for the "neat and clean" item, and the smallest loading difference is .147 between Factors I and II on that item. For the CRS, the lowest loading is .475 for the "peculiar behavior" item. The closest two loadings, differing by .351, are found for Factors II and V on that item.

Interrater Reliabilities and Internal Consistency Coefficients for the Factor Scales. Each subject was then scored on eight factor scales, which replaced the original seventy-five separate items. Each factor score was obtained by simply summing a subject's scores on all items assigned to a particular factor score. Scoring had to be reversed on one negatively loaded item of Factor I CRS for the sake of consistency. Item scoring was also reversed for all items included in Factor I PCL for the sake of consistency of direction of pathology (a high score now indicating greater sociopathy) and for Factor II GLRS, a high score now indicating greater negativism.

The interrater reliabilities of the eight-factor scales are presented in Table 7. Those coefficients obtained on the PCL were still not impressive by absolute standards, but compare quite favorably with the interrater reliabilities found in Quay's study and not atypical of ratings in general. Included in Table 7 are the interrater reliability coefficients (i.e., the correlations between the ratings of the two raters), as well as the Spearman-Brown corrected values which estimate the reliability of the ratings obtained by averaging the judgments of the two raters.

Measures of reliability of a different sort are given in the coefficients of internal consistency in Table 8. Since all interitem correlations were known, these coefficients were obtained by substituting the average interitem correlation within a given scale for the coefficient of reliability ( $r_{tt}$ ) in the Spearman-Brown formula, with  $n$  equal to the number of items. This gives a rough but usable measure of consistency (Gullford, 1954). By this estimate, all scales demonstrate admirable internal consistency. The discrepancy between the high internal consistency coefficients and the moderate interrater reliability coefficients suggests the intrusion of a halo effect in the ratings. The implications of our findings concerning reliability will be further considered in conjunction with the validity data in the next chapter.

TABLE 7

Corrected and Uncorrected Interrater Reliability  
Coefficients for the Eight Factor Scales

Factor Scale	Interrater Reliability Coefficient	Spearman-Brown Corrected Coefficient ( $r^2$ )
I CRS	.718	.836
II CRS	.552	.718
V CRS	.515	.679
I GLRS	.507	.673
II GLRS	.464	.633
I PCL	.532	.694
II PCL	.349	.517
IV PCL	.181	.306

TABLE 8

Coefficients of Internal Consistency  
for the Eight Factor Scales

Factor Scale	Coefficient
I CRS	.98
II CRS	.92
V CRS	.86
I GLRS	.88
II GLRS	.85
I PCL	.98
II PCL	.96
IV PCL	.81

**Factor Analysis of the Factor Scales.** The scores used in this analysis were obtained by averaging the ratings of the two raters. The Spearman-Brown corrected values indicated in Table 7 are therefore appropriate here. Inspection of these values suggests that the factor scales were reliable enough (with the exception of IV PCL) to warrant the factor analysis exploration of sources of common variance to be described in this section.

The means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for the eight factor scales are presented in Table 9. It will be noted that, orthogonal axis rotation notwithstanding, there are some positive relationships between scales from the same analysis. The relationships between the more behavioral and the more inferential scales of "sociopathy" and "neuroticism" are quite modest although all in the expected direction. It is apparent that the different domains covered by the two sets of raters are little related.

These relationships are demonstrated again in the results of the factor analysis of the factor scales, presented in Table 10. Here two factors clearly emerge and account for 95% of the common variance. As the table shows, the PCL scales clearly emerge as marker variables. The first of the second order factors is defined by the sociopathic factor of the PCL, with high loadings on the two GLRS factors and a loading of .393 on the sociopathic factor of the CRS. The second of the second order

TABLE 9

Means, Standard Deviations and Intercorrelations for the Eight Factor Scales

Factor	Mean	Std. Dev.	I CRS	II CRS	V CRS	I GLRS	II GLRS	I PCL	II PCL	IV PCL
I CRS	53.32	11.45	—	-.118	.502	.220	.297	.304	-.245	.032
II CRS	27.92	5.54		—	-.167	-.021	.042	-.038	.220	.023
V CRS	16.91	3.92			—	.059	.082	.071	-.131	.030
I GLRS	5.94	3.96				—	.330	.828	-.330	.007
II GLRS	19.38	4.63					—	.578	.163	.540
I PCL	3.02	3.63						—	-.237	.279
II PCL	3.81	2.60							—	.407
IV PCL	.86	.95								—

TABLE 10

Varimax Factor Loading Matrix for the Eight Factor Scales

Factor Scale	Factor I	Factor II	$h^2$
I CRS	.393	.320	.257
II CRS	-.032	-.232	.055
V CRS	.180	.261	.101
I GLRS	.743	.321	.654
II GLRS	.710	-.310	.600
I PCL	.887	.157	.812
II PCL	-.097	-.684	.477
IV PCL	.425	-.553	.486

factors is defined by a high negative loading on the neurotism factor of the PCL with a modest loading of  $-.232$  on the neurotism factor of the CRS. The negativism factor of the GLRS and the apathy factor of the PCL enter into each second order factor in a prominent but undiscriminating way. The sociopathic factor of the CRS is positively loaded on both second order factors, as is the first factor of the GLRS.

**Relationships Between Tests and Factor Scores.** The final steps in the data analysis involved the correlations between test data and rating data. The correlations between the thirty-five test variables and the eight factor scores are presented in Table II. Of the two hundred and eight coefficients, forty-five are significant at the 5% level of confidence. Of these, only nine are contained within the GLRS and the PCL factor scales. Thirty statistically significant correlations are found within the two major factor scales of the CRS. The striking preponderance of significant correlations with the CRS variables calls for an explanation. This author attributes it largely to the greater sophistication of the caseworkers as raters as well as to certain other factors to be discussed in the subsequent chapter. At this point, it was decided only to consider the two major CRS factors in further analysis. Although more correlations reach significance than would be expected by chance, it will be noted that

TABLE II

## Correlation Coefficients Between Test and Factor Scale Variables

Test Scale	I CRS	II CRS	V CRS	I GLRS	II GLRS	I PCL	II PCL	IV PCL
<b>Loeas Thorndike</b>								
Verbal I.Q.	.08	-.22	.13	-.13	.02	-.03	-.05	.06
Non-verbal I.Q.	.05	-.18**	.08	-.12	-.05	-.03	-.08	-.09
<b>Kuder</b>								
V	.03	-.11	-.03	-.08	-.08	-.04	-.10	-.11
Outdoor	-.34*	.24*	-.19**	-.08	-.05	-.08	.09	.11
Mechanical	-.27*	.10	-.08	-.03	-.02	.01	.08	.03
Computational	.02	-.20**	.05	-.01	.06	.00	-.02	.00
Scientific	-.21**	.16	-.10	-.19**	-.10	-.23**	.00	-.07
Persuasive	.22**	-.22**	.17	.06	-.03	.07	-.08	-.09
Artistic	.12	.02	.09	-.07	.16	.06	.08	.13
Literary	.22**	-.14	.18**	.11	.06	.10	-.15	.00
Musical	.24**	-.01	.03	.11	.05	.16	-.08	.01
Social Service	-.08	.08	-.08	-.02	-.19**	-.12	-.06	-.15
Clerical	.07	-.06	.05	-.03	.06	-.03	.05	-.02
<b>MMPI</b>								
L	-.02	-.11	-.06	.11	.10	.06	-.07	.02
F	.04	.29*	.13	-.03	.05	-.04	.14	.06
K	.21**	-.23*	.10	.08	.11	.09	-.21**	-.08

\* Significant at 1% level of confidence

\*\* Significant at 5% level of confidence

TABLE 11 (Continued)

## Correlation Coefficients Between Test and Factor Scale Variables

Test Scale	I CRS	II CRS	V CRS	I GLRS	II GLRS	I PCL	II PCL	IV PCL
<b>MPI (Continued)</b>								
Ha	-.09	.20**	-.01	.05	-.01	.02	.15	.07
D	-.11	.21**	.01	.11	.04	.03	.01	.01
Hy	.04	.00	.10	.03	.01	.00	-.04	-.05
Pd	.27*	.18**	.23*	.08	.07	.07	-.13	-.08
Mf	-.04	.07	.11	-.11	-.20**	-.17**	-.07	-.14
Pa	.00	.12	.06	-.02	-.03	.01	-.06	-.14
Pt	-.12	.34*	.03	.00	-.14	-.06	.03	-.07
Sc	.02	.35*	.10	.04	.00	.02	.03	-.01
Ma	.22*	.14	.24*	.15	.03	.10	-.11	-.05
Si	-.36*	.28*	-.11	-.12	-.07	-.16	.21**	.01
Ee	.23*	-.28*	.09	-.10	.02	-.04	-.12	-.01
Sd	-.11	-.06	-.16	.16	-.06	.08	-.10	-.06
A	-.13	.30*	.02	-.06	-.14	-.10	.06	-.07
R	.05	-.02	-.02	.02	.12	-.03	.02	.06
Alpha	.08	-.31*	-.04	.01	.07	.06	-.09	.00
Beta	-.33*	.02	-.24*	.00	.07	.02	.12	.08
Mp	-.01	-.25*	-.03	.18**	.06	.14	-.11	-.07
Ap	.42*	-.08	.27*	.12	.18**	.15	-.16	.06
O-H	.10	-.06	-.01	.05	.07	-.01	.03	.06

\* Significant at 1% level of confidence

\*\* Significant at 5% level of confidence

they are nonetheless modest, with only one (between Ap and Factor I CRS) in the forties.

At this point, then, the analysis converged on the problem of predicting the two CRS Factor scores from the available test scores, in order to determine the degree of relationship between rating data and test data. Two methods of further examining the relationships expressed in the correlation matrix were undertaken. The first of these involved the use of a priori judgments as to which test variables would be good predictors. By selecting scales in advance, a procedure which would not be affected by chance fluctuations within the sample, one eliminates the need for breaking up the sample for purposes of cross validation. To this end, this writer and four other psychologists\* predicted on an a priori basis which MMPI scales would be expected to correlate with the two primary CRS factors (unsocialized-sociopathic and neurotic-disturbed). There was unanimous agreement for the following scales: Pd, Ap and -Bata were singled out as predictors for the sociopathic factor and D, Pt, Sc and -Alpha were identified as predictors of the neuroticism factor. Next, the selected predictors were combined into unweighted composites to compute the

---

\* My thanks to Auke Tellegen, James Gilbertson, David L. Rouzer and Thomas Sturm for their expert assistance in this task.

appropriate correlation.\* By this formula, the correlation between the preselected MMPI predictors and the first rating factor,  $r_{\text{CRS I} \cdot \text{Pd, Pa, -Beta}} = .577$ . With the second factor of the CRS as a criterion, the correlation with the same MMPI composite is .041. The correlation between the selected MMPI scales and the second rating factor,  $r_{\text{CRS II} \cdot \text{D, Li, Sc, -Alpha}} = .347$ . The correlation of these test variables with the first factor of the CRS is .037. These measures therefore suggest moderate and differentially predictive relationships between the appropriate MMPI variables and the rating scale data, with a more impressive relationship along the sociopathic dimension. The lesser relationship found in the dimension of neuroticism is due, in part, to high redundancy of the MMPI predictor variables in this area as manifested in their generally high intercorrelations.

A priori selections of predictors were also made from among the Kuder scales. In this case the selections were based on the data analysis performed by Wirt and Jacobson on their Minnesota State Prison sample. Their analysis revealed positive relationships between scores on the literary, computational, and musical

---

\*  $\frac{\sum r_{ic}}{\sqrt{n + 2(\sum r_{ij})}}$ , where  $\sum r_{ic}$  = the sum of all correlations between predictors  $i$  and criterion  $c$ ;  $n$  = number of predictors,  $\sum r_{ij}$  = the sum of all correlations between predictors. For the derivation of this simplification of the formula for the correlation between sums, I am grateful to Auke Tellegen.

scales with the criterion of disciplinary action in the prison, and negative relationships between that criterion and the mechanical and outdoor scale scores. The assumption was made that these interest test scores would also be related to the sociopathic dimension of the rating scales. Entry of the appropriate statistics into the formula yielded a coefficient of .339 for Factor I CRS. For Factor II CRS, the corresponding coefficient is -.215. Thus it is apparent that the Kuder composite does not achieve the same degree of differential prediction as the MPEI composites. Combining the Kuder and MPEI composites and assigning these two equal weights results in a "second-order" composite which correlates .583 with the Factor I CRS scale. It should be noted that adding the Kuder composite to the MPEI composite yields an infinitesimal increment (from .577 to .583) to the prediction of this factor score, while the addition of the MPEI composite substantially improves (from .339 to .583) the predictive power of the Kuder composite. No a priori predictions were made regarding the relationships between the Kuder scores and the neuroticism factor, nor were we able to predict on any empirical basis what relationships might exist between Large Thorndike scores and the factor scores.

An alternative approach to the problem of prediction would be, of course, the derivation of an ad hoc multiple regression equation in one part of the sample, to be cross validated on the

remainder of the sample. This approach was initiated. The sample was divided in two on an odd-even basis, and multiple regression equations were derived for the two subsamples. Examination of the results of this analysis revealed very little correspondence between weights assigned by the two equations to the test variables. For Factor I CRS, eight test variables with non-zero beta weights were extracted for the first subsample and thirteen for the second subsample. Only Pd and -Beta from the MPI were assigned non-zero weights in each equation. For Factor II CRS, nine test variables with non-zero weights were extracted for the equation in the first subsample and eight entered into the equation for the second subsample. There was an overlap of only one variable, this being the computational scale from the Kuder.

On the basis of these unimpressive results, it was decided not to pursue further the multiple regression approach. The next logical step, applying beta weights from one sample half to the other appeared to be a fruitless endeavor and waste of computer time. In view of the large number of potential predictors, a substantially larger sample would probably have been necessary for obtaining better correspondence between the results obtained for the subsamples.

## CHAPTER IV

## DISCUSSION

The Rating Scales

Rating scales have long been the subject of dispute in the field of psychometrics. The possibilities for error and bias in ratings are numerous. Loevinger (1965), after discussing such sources of error as errors of leniency, errors of central tendency, halo effects, constant errors and proximity errors, concluded that rating scales are of little use in psychological measurement. Guilford (1954) also noted such possibilities for error but concluded that, partly in view of a lack of alternative quantitative techniques, rating scales will "find welcome use for years to come." Norman and Goldberg (1966) were concerned with a particularly vexing problem in ratings which may be obtained solely through "shared implicit personality theories" of the raters without any necessary correspondence to the actual organization of personality traits in the ratees. Each of the three rating forms used in this study will be briefly discussed with these points in mind.

As far as the present study is concerned, the results obtained with the revised Problem Check List have generally not been very encouraging. It is true that on the positive side it can be

pointed out that the factor scales as developed here were largely consistent with the structure Quay found in his delinquent sample, and that the scales have high internal consistency. In other words, there was good agreement concerning the covariance of traits within an individual personality. This consistency is particularly gratifying considering that over half of the original items of Peterson's were discarded for this study. However, the interrater reliability coefficients for items and scales, although more encouraging than those reported by Quay, were still not impressive. Neither were the correlations between PCL factors and the self report test data. These correlations simply clustered around zero.

This lack of correspondence with the subject's self report data, taken with the high internal consistency and relatively low interrater reliability data suggests that a powerful halo effect pervaded the PCL ratings. Since the PCL factors did serve nicely as markers in the analysis of factor scales, one may conclude that the two higher order factors isolated in the analysis of factors were also actually not more than halo factors. This negative conclusion is of course based on the presumption that a valid behavioral indicator would have shared a more substantial portion of its variance with the MMPI variables (without necessarily coinciding with the MMPI).

There are several possible reasons as to why the PCL and

GLRS did not show more promise as reliable and valid instruments, and these involve both the nature of the scales themselves and the raters used in this study.

The PCL items which were retained for this study may well have been too inferential for use by relatively untrained personnel. Also, the items were originally developed on a much younger and more heterogeneous group than was under observation here and may be more appropriate to the public school system or an out-patient clinic setting. Mack (1967) in his study on recidivism concluded that the Peterson Problem Check List had little contribution to make to the understanding of the complexities of recidivism and predicted that it would be of little use in predicting parole outcomes.

Another aspect to the rating scales which should be reconsidered at this point, is the number of steps used in the GLRS and the CRS. Nine steps may not have been optimal. A review of this subject by Guilford (1954) led that author to the conclusion that the more untrained and disinterested the raters are, the fewer should be the number of rating steps. No hard and fast rules have been developed in this area, but Guilford's reasoning led him to suggest that up to twenty-five scale divisions could be optimal for sophisticated raters in certain situations, but seven or fewer divisions is usually more appropriate for untrained raters.

It has been noted that the counselor's position does not have stringent educational requirements, and these men are a heterogeneous group in many respects. They receive little training or formal guidance in the systematic observation and appraisal of their charges. The counselor's ratings may have also been affected by errors of leniency. A marked skewness of many rating scores suggests such errors. As has been noted, many items of the Group Living Rating Scale had unexpectedly low mean values. This could reflect confusion regarding the adverbial modifiers used to anchor the scales, but could also partly reflect a counselor's reluctance to judge the inmates too harshly. It has been a fairly common experience at MRDC for counselors to "stick up" for an inmate who is regarded by other staff members as an outright renegade and to make a plea for a favorable disposition on the basis of a problem-free adjustment to dormitory living. I would speculate that there is less psychological distance between the counselors and the inmates than is the case with the caseworkers and psychologists. This may well be a healthy situation in general, but probably is a hindrance in evaluation.

For all these reasons, the PCL and GLRS do not, as used here, show a good deal of promise as research instruments. Neither the interrater reliability data nor the correlations with the test results suggest usefulness of these instruments as diagnostic

tools, particularly not when only two raters are involved as was the case in the present study.

The results with the Caseworker's Rating Scale are a little more encouraging. With respect to reliability, again, the operation of a halo effect could be inferred from the contrasting reliability and consistency coefficients. However, the inter-rater reliability with two raters for the sociopathic factor scale does approach respectability (.836) for individual diagnosis and indeed compares favorably with the usual reliabilities of rating data reported in the literature. Considering the highly inferential nature of the items, the amount of agreement represented here is acceptable.

It should be remembered that the institution, MRDC, is specifically set up for intensive and hopefully reliable diagnosis—diagnosis with rather profound practical consequences. Characteristically, clinical diagnosis is the function of two staff members, the caseworker and psychologist, with the teacher and clergyman adding information particularly relevant to their own special fields. Only one counselor submits a formal report on each inmate's intra institutional behavior, although he may draw upon the notes and reports of his colleagues in doing so. These data are thus pertinent to the practical procedures of MRDC staff. If one were to set an arbitrary figure of .80 as acceptable

Interrater reliability for individual diagnosis along any dimension of personality covered by the rating data, it would appear that sociopathy can be reliably judged by the caseworker-psychologist team. Other factors would need a greater number of raters to be reliably judged.

Examination of the raw data from the CRS rating suggests the possibility of one constant error. One of the caseworkers, who rated thirty-five subjects, tended to rate his subjects lower on the items loaded on the neurotic-disturbed factor than did the other three raters. His mean rating score on Factor II CRS for his subjects was 20.58 as compared to 29.35 for this writer and 27.74 and 29.35 for the other caseworkers. This could represent a constant error of leniency or possibly a constant contract error since ratings are likely to reflect, in part, attributes of the rater. The resulting skewness of the score distributions is likely to reduce the magnitude of relationships, but would not alter the appropriateness of the methods of analysis.

One practical implication of the study, then, would be to suggest that decisions based on MFC staff diagnosis of personality problems and dormitory behavior be weighed with the question of interrater reliability firmly in mind. More raters would have resulted in more reliable rating data and more diagnosticians would result in a more reliable evaluation of the individuals whose placement is under consideration.

As far as the validity of the CRS is concerned, the correlations between the CRS factor scales and the test data are rather encouraging. The coefficients are not high in absolute magnitude, but do reach statistical significance more often than would be expected through chance fluctuations, and are generally in the expected directions. The differential relationships between Block's Alpha and Beta scales and the sociopathy and neuroticism factors of the CRS are, for example, neat and tidy ones as shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12  
Correlations Between the Alpha and Beta  
MMPI Scales and the Major Factor Scales of the  
Caseworker's Rating Scale

	CRS I	CRS II
Block's Alpha	.08	-.31
Block's Beta	-.33	.02

These correlations suggest that the sociopathic and neurotic characteristics seen by the raters and expressed through the CRS are indeed "real" and represent something other than preconceptions of the raters and shared implicit personality theories.

To reiterate, the CRS, although quite inferential in item content, appears to be the most promising rating scale in terms of reliability, construct validity and applicability to other correctional settings. Examples of MRDC diagnostic evaluations of individuals in the research sample who scored exceptionally high or low on the two major CRS factor scales are presented in Appendix C. These are not presented as noteworthy examples of diagnostic reports, but as typical examples of MRDC evaluations which may add flesh to the bones of the CRS personality dimensions.

#### The Tests

The original question to which this study was addressed centered around the extent to which a personality inventory, the MMPI, had the generalized validity to discriminate meaningfully within a quite homogeneous population. That the sample is homogeneous along several important dimensions is beyond doubt. These are age (late adolescence), generally inadequate vocational and educational achievement, usually low socioeconomic class and a general lack of social control. All subjects were in serious trouble with the law and for only one subject did this represent an initial or isolated incident of antisocial behavior. This same subject was the only individual considered to be so emotionally disturbed that a psychiatric hospital placement was proposed, and even he was not considered to be sufficiently disturbed

by hospital authorities to warrant treatment in a psychiatric setting. Yet, if meaningful differences did not exist within such a population, such an institution as MRDC would have no usefulness, nor would there be a need for varied rehabilitative programs.

To the extent that personality differences as reflected in the most fruitful of the rating scales, the CRS, were predictable from the MMPI, it appears that the MMPI is moderately sensitive to such fine distinctions, particularly along the more reliable sociopathic dimension. The relationships revealed here add something to the construct validity of both the Caseworker's Rating Scale and selected scales of the MMPI. The various "first factor" scales of the MMPI (Ct, Sc, Es, A and Alpha) all demonstrate moderate but expected relationships along the dimension of neuroticism, and the Pd and Bata scales vary with ratings of sociopathy, again to a moderate degree. Pantan's Ap scale also continues to demonstrate some discriminatory functions within this incarcerated group.

The method used in this study is, of course, only one possible approach to investigation of the meanings of MMPI scores within a correctional setting. Studies of predictive validity in the long term sense also deserve consideration, but are not within the scope of this study. The question of incremental validity is certainly relevant here, particularly in terms of the relationships

between rating data and the MMPI and Kuder data. It appears from the moderate nature of the correlations that the appropriate MMPI scales are neither unrelated to the ratings, nor are they simply redundant equivalent measures. In plain words, the rating scales (that is, the CRS scales) and the MMPI scales inter-correlate sufficiently to indicate that both "measure something," and at the same time the correlations are low enough to suggest that both add something to our knowledge about our subjects. Further research in incremental validity could proceed from the relationships discussed here; for example, exploration of the role of different assessment procedures used in arriving at institutional decisions. MRDC inmates are often not reticent in calling into question the validity of staff assessments and the information and data on which assessments are based. (It has been the unexpected experience of this author that such complaints are rarely if ever directed towards testing but are more concerned with what inmates feel to be over-reliance on past record and current offense as well as what they perceive as too brief and sketchy interviewing. ["How can you tell what a guy is really thinking after talking to him for only an hour?"] Inmates' complaints may or may not be justified, but their questioning per se certainly is.)

Scores on the Kuder scales also generally demonstrate the relationships one would expect from examination of Wirt and

Jacobson's prison data. That is, the more sociopathic subjects tended to deviate towards more "feminine" interests, e.g., literary and musical, and less "masculine" interests, e.g., outdoor, mechanical. (These terms are used advisedly and correlations with the MMPI Hf scale would not justify this use.) Relationships here, however, are slight and add virtually no increment to MMPI predictions of the ratings.

In summary, this study demonstrates a moderate degree of validity generalization for the test scales, particularly the appropriate MMPI scales. Scales Pd and Boia continue to measure ego control and such first factor scales as Pt and Alpha continue to measure ego resilience, even within such a constricted population.

## CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY

The primary focus of this study was to investigate the rated behavioral correlates of MMPI and Kuder Vocational Preference Record scales within a correctional population of Youthful Offenders at the Minnesota Reception and Diagnostic Center. To provide criterion data, three rating scales were used. The first of these was a revised version of Peterson's Problem Check List. Two others were developed at the Minnesota Reception and Diagnostic Center from file material. One of these, the Caseworker's Rating Scale, containing items of an inferential nature, was for the use of caseworkers and this investigator. The other, the Group Living Rating Scale, was used by dormitory counselors, who also rated the subjects on the Problem Check List.

The three rating scales were factor analyzed, and several major factors emerged from the rating data. The results were interpreted as in part consistent with those obtained in Quay's study of delinquents and with findings of other investigators. Interrater reliability coefficients and coefficients of internal consistency were obtained and suggested that several factor scales can be of utility as research instruments in studies of this sort.

Correlational analysis of test scores and rating scale factor

scores revealed that there was little relationship between test scores and counselors' behavioral ratings, but a number of statistically significant relationships with the caseworker's more inferential ratings. In general, Multiphasic scales were moderately correlated with the major caseworker rating factors with the appropriate and predicted MMPI scales functioning as anticipated. These relationships suggested neither equivalence nor independence of MMPI scores and rating data, and it would appear that the caseworker's ratings, within the limits of their reliability, would add to the assessment procedures at MRDC. The Kuder scales, while not unrelated to the rating data, did not to any appreciable extent add to the predictive power of the MMPI.

One implication of this study is that the MMPI retains a meaningful degree of useful discriminatory power, in spite of the restricted and homogeneous nature of the sample of correctional cases.

## APPENDIX A.1

PROBLEM CHECKLIST

(Revised)

Name of Youth \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Rater \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate which of the following constitute problems, as far as this youth is concerned. If an item does not constitute a problem, encircle the zero; if an item constitutes a mild problem, encircle the one; if an item constitutes a severe problem, encircle the two. Please complete every item.

				FACTOR LOADINGS, QUAY (1964)			
				I	II	III	$h^2$
0	1	2	1. Attention-seeking, show-off behavior	.70	-.07	.20	.53
0	1	2	2. Disruptiveness; tendency to annoy and bother others	.77	-.05	.11	.62
0	1	2	3. Feelings of inferiority	.05	.47	.27	.31
0	1	2	4. Boisterousness; rowdiness	.71	-.14	.18	.56
0	1	2	5. Preoccupation; "In a world of his own"	.14	.60	.28	.45
0	1	2	6. Shyness, bashfulness	-.23	.54	.13	.39
0	1	2	7. Social withdrawal, preference for solitary activities	-.06	.67	.04	.45
0	1	2	8. Short attention span	.59	.11	.28	.43
0	1	2	9. Lack of self-confidence	.12	.66	.30	.54

			I	II	III	R <sup>2</sup>		
0	1	2	10.	Inattentiveness to what others say	.64	.24	.18	.50
0	1	2	11.	Fighting	.60	.06	.02	.37
0	1	2	12.	Laziness in school and in performance of other tasks	.55	.20	.00	.34
0	1	2	13.	Anxiety, chronic general fearfulness	.31	.51	.19	.39
0	1	2	14.	Irresponsibility, undependability	.75	.34	.00	.67
0	1	2	15.	Excessive daydreaming	.08	.70	.26	.56
0	1	2	16.	Disobedience, difficulty in disciplinary control	.74	.11	.00	.55
0	1	2	17.	Depression, chronic sadness	.11	.61	-.06	.38
0	1	2	18.	Uncooperativeness in group situations	.74	.15	.01	.57
0	1	2	19.	Distractibility	.62	.30	.34	.59
0	1	2	20.	Negativism, tendency to do the opposite of what is requested	.59	.20	.33	.50
0	1	2	21.	Impertinence, sauciness	.62	.21	.29	.51
0	1	2	22.	Sluggishness, lethargy	.22	.62	-.05	.43
0	1	2	23.	Drowsiness	.13	.53	.02	.30
0	1	2	24.	Profane language, swearing, cursing	.52	-.06	-.01	.28

APPENDIX A.2

CASEWORKERS' RATING SCALE

Subject's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Rater's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Please rate each of the following statements with the number of the description that most closely gives your opinion of the person being rated.

- |                  |                |
|------------------|----------------|
| 1. Not at all    | 6. Quite a bit |
| 2. Very slightly | 7. Distinctly  |
| 3. A little      | 8. Markedly    |
| 4. Mildly        | 9. Extremely   |
| 5. Moderately    |                |

Note: The standard of comparison should be the characteristics of the typical member of this population. Base your ratings on all information available to you—interview, behavior, case history material, violation reports, etc. Rate each item on what is most typical or characteristic of the subject, considering each statement independently. Use extreme ratings when warranted.

. . . . .

Compared to the typical inmate, to what extent is the subject...

- \_\_\_1. Pleasant and personable, possessing good social skills.
- \_\_\_2. Defensive, lacking insight, unwilling or unable to take a good look at himself (rationalization, denial, projection, etc.)
- \_\_\_3. Passive and apathetic; non-responsive.
- \_\_\_4. "Nervous"; tense and apprehensive.
- \_\_\_5. Overtly hostile; belligerent, demanding, disrespectful.
- \_\_\_6. Lacking in appropriate feelings of guilt or remorse.

- \_\_\_7. Accepting of diagnostic material, including critical comments, in a constructive fashion.
- \_\_\_8. Slick, superficial and shallow; an opportunistic manipulator.
- \_\_\_9. Easily upset with shaky emotional control; moody.
- \_\_\_10. Unhappy with himself, holding himself in low esteem; feelings of inadequacy.
- \_\_\_11. Unhappy with the world, feeling victimized, pushed around and treated unfairly.
- \_\_\_12. Irresponsible and undependable, not meeting reasonable expectations.
- \_\_\_13. Criminally sophisticated; wise in the methodology of crime, and ego involved in criminal activity.
- \_\_\_14. Concerned largely about short range goals, the needs of the moment.
- \_\_\_15. Lacking in "available anxiety," seeing no need to change.
- \_\_\_16. Resentful of authority, rules and restrictions.
- \_\_\_17. Concerned, although not necessarily at a conscious level, about masculinity, with his difficulties involving "masculine proving" behavior.
- \_\_\_18. Peer dependant, suggestible, hungry for peer recognition and acceptance.
- \_\_\_19. A generally inadequate fellow, unable to cope with life's demands and expectations.
- \_\_\_20. Maintaining emotional ties with his family, at least some members.
- \_\_\_21. Involved in "thrill seeking;" a taste for danger, excitement and "kicks."
- \_\_\_22. Maintaining positive attitudes of affection and respect towards his mother (or mother surrogate).
- \_\_\_23. Maintaining positive attitudes of affection and respect towards his father (or father surrogate).

- \_\_\_24. Insightful regarding family dynamics; the role the family situation may have played in his predicament.
- \_\_\_25. Maintaining a value system consistent with conventional, middle-class standards (regarding school, work, sexual behavior, temperance, etc.).
- \_\_\_26. Accepting of his correctional status; such matters as VCC commitment, violation, institutionalization, etc.).
- \_\_\_27. "Institutionalized"; most comfortable when under institutional control.
- \_\_\_28. A social misfit, unpopular with his peers, inept in social situations.
- \_\_\_29. Demonstrating peculiar and idiosyncratic behavior and ideation which is difficult to comprehend from a "normal" frame of reference; mentally disturbed, "crazy."
- \_\_\_30. Lacking in frustration tolerance.
- \_\_\_31. Involved in the excessive or inappropriate use of alcohol to the extent that it is an important factor in his social difficulties.
- \_\_\_32. Guarded, wary and suspicious.

## APPENDIX A.3

GROUP LIVING BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

Subject's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Rater's Name \_\_\_\_\_

1. Please rate each of the following statements with the number of the description that most closely gives your opinion of the person being rated.

- |                  |                |               |
|------------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1. Not at all    | 4. Mildly      | 7. Distinctly |
| 2. Very slightly | 5. Moderately  | 8. Markedly   |
| 3. A little      | 6. Quite a bit | 9. Extremely  |

NOTE: The standard comparison should be the characteristics of the typical member of this population. Base your ratings on what you have observed of the manner in which this individual has conducted himself in the group living situation, disregarding other information you might have—social history, type of offense, etc. Rate each item on what is most typical or characteristic of the subject, considering each item independently. Use extreme ratings when warranted.

.....

Compared to the typical inmate, to what extent is the subject...

- \_\_\_1. A good worker, showing initiative, industry and a sense of responsibility.
- \_\_\_2. Neat and clean, with good habits of personal hygiene.
- \_\_\_3. "Peer dependent"—a follower, suggestible and easily led.
- \_\_\_4. A pest, asking for special favors, begging the staff with special requests.
- \_\_\_5. Polite, courteous and friendly to staff.
- \_\_\_6. Loud and boisterous; you always know he's around.
- \_\_\_7. Liked and accepted by the other inmates.

- \_\_\_8. Antagonistic to his peers; belligerent and hostile.
- \_\_\_9. Socially withdrawn, a loner.
- \_\_\_10. Active, participating in games and activities with enthusiasm.
- \_\_\_11. "Nervous"; tense, worried and apprehensive.
- \_\_\_12. Cooperative with the staff, showing a willing and positive attitude towards the program.
- \_\_\_13. "Moody"; easily upset, irritated or depressed.
- \_\_\_14. A show off, trying to gain recognition and attention through bragging or horseplay.
- \_\_\_15. One who responds positively to correction, instruction and constructive criticism.
- \_\_\_16. One who has a positive attitude towards counseling; is willing to and able to discuss his problems in a serious and realistic way.
- \_\_\_17. A non-conformist, ignoring or resisting rules and regulations.
- \_\_\_18. One who feels discriminated against; indulges in self-pity.
- \_\_\_19. Given to vulgar or profane language, even after being reprimanded.

Any Special Incidents? Please comment:

SUMMARY:

## APPENDIX 8.1

## MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON TEST DATA

<u>Variable</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
<u>Large Thorndike</u>			
Verbal I.Q.	140	99.57	15.02
Non-verbal I.Q.	140	104.65	16.71
<u>Kuder Vocational Preference Record</u>			
Validity	132	38.88	4.20
Outdoor	132	42.32	15.47
Mechanical	132	41.44	12.39
Computational	132	26.29	7.28
Scientific	132	36.62	11.03
Persuasive	132	40.27	11.14
Artistic	132	27.33	9.74
Literary	132	17.63	6.82
Musical	132	11.97	7.02
Social Service	132	46.36	12.29
Clerical	132	47.39	11.13
<u>Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory</u>			
L	140	3.92	2.30
F	140	7.32	4.36
K	140	13.81	4.97
Hs	140	5.46	4.57
D	140	21.36	4.75
Hy	140	20.85	5.09
Pd	140	23.60	4.25
Wf	140	23.23	4.31
Pa	140	12.08	3.43
Pt	140	16.19	8.18
Sc	140	15.75	10.20
Mh	140	18.59	4.84
Si	140	29.79	9.80
Es	139	46.53	6.13
Sd	139	15.20	3.83
A	139	15.88	8.85
R	139	15.82	4.42

## APPENDIX B.1 (Continued)

<u>Variable</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
Alpha	139	74.50	14.01
Beta	139	33.65	9.35
Hp	139	14.21	3.38
Ap	139	17.21	3.92
O-H	139	13.42	3.16

## APPENDIX B.2

## THE ITEMS AND PRINCIPLE FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE EIGHT FACTOR SCALES

Factor I PCL ("Unsocialized-sociopathic")

- .806 Attention-seeking, etc.
- .877 Disruptiveness, etc.
- .848 Boisterousness, etc.
- .568 Short attention span
- .718 Inattentiveness, etc.
- .564 Fighting
- .863 Disobedience, etc.
- .575 Uncooperativeness, etc.
- .645 Distractability
- .826 Negativism, etc.
- .765 Impertinence, sauciness
- .552 Profane language, etc.

Factor II PCL ("Disturbed-neurotic")

- .730 Feelings of inferiority
- .736 Preoccupation, etc.
- .787 Shyness, bashfulness
- .826 Social withdrawal, etc.
- .650 Lack of self confidence
- .413 Anxiety, chronic, etc.
- .613 Depression, chronic sadness

Factor IV PCL ("Apathetic withdrawal")

- .622 Excessive daydreaming
- .756 Sluggishness, lethargy
- .700 Drowsiness

Factor I GLRS ("Energetic attention seeking")

- .771 A pest, etc.
- .785 Loud and boisterous, etc.
- .744 A show-off

Factor II GLRS ("Negativism")

- .792 A good worker, etc.
- .522 Neat and clean, etc.
- .564 Liked and accepted, etc.
- .787 One who responds, etc.

## APPENDIX B.2 (Continued)

Factor I CBS ("Unsocialized-sociopathic")

- .606 Overtly hostile, etc.
- .734 Lacking in appropriate, etc.
- .484 Slick, superficial, etc.
- .814 Irresponsible, etc.
- .841 Criminally sophisticated, etc.
- .825 Concerned largely about, etc.
- .571 Lacking in "available, etc.
- .729 Resentful of authority, etc.
- .761 Involved in thrill, etc.
- .712 Maintaining a value system, etc.

Factor II CBS ("Disturbed-neurotic")

- .533 "Nervous", etc.
- .809 Easily upset, etc.
- .518 Unhappy with himself, etc.
- .778 Concerned, although not necessarily, etc.
- .595 A social misfit, etc.
- .475 Demonstrating peculiar, etc.

Factor V CBS ("Negative family relationships")

- .850 Maintaining emotional ties, etc.
- .690 Maintaining positive...father, etc.
- .798 Maintaining positive...mother, etc.

## APPENDIX C

The following diagnostic evaluations are included to represent relatively pure delinquent types, as measured by factor scores I (unsocialized-sociopathic) and II (disturbed-neurotic) of the Caseworker's Rating Scale. These reports are the routine evaluations submitted by MRDC staff to the Youth Conservation Commission. In each case, names have been changed and other identifying data omitted or changed. Cases were selected as being greater than one standard deviation above or below the mean of the factor scales of interest.

**CONTINUED**

**2 OF 3**

## CASE A HIGH I, LOW II

Factor scores of 67.5 for factor I and 19.5 for factor II were obtained on the GRS. This case, then, represents quite clear cut and uncomplicated sociopathy. The raw scores of 13PI experimental scales were: SD=17, A=8, B=20, Alpha=35, Beta=26, Kp=18, Ap=22, Q<sub>11</sub>=12, and Es=61.

Name: Lockman, Carroll John

Offense or Delinquent Act: Burglary

PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION

MMPI: L-43, F-55, K-59, Hs-44, D-60, Hy-45, Pd-71, Mf-59, Pa-53, Pt-62, Sc-50, Ma-47, Si-47.

Intelligence Test Data:

Large Thorndike - Verbal I.Q. 117, Non-verbal I.Q. 114.

Vocational Interest Test Data:

On the area scales of the Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory, Carroll is particularly high in interest in the areas of sales office work, health service occupations and "clean hands" work in general. He is particularly low in interest in the areas of electronics and mechanical work.

Other Tests Given:

Sentence Completion Test, diagnostic interviews.

Intellectual Functioning:

Intelligence is above average in the "bright normal" range. Carroll should have little difficulty completing his high school work if so indicated or in engaging in an appropriate vocational training.

Personality Functioning:

MMPI results are of the sort commonly associated with delinquent behavior and suggest that Carroll is a rather

childish person, impulsive, egocentric and irresponsible. Frustration tolerance is low and tense moodiness and unacceptable behavior are likely to follow upon frustration of egocentric needs. Test scores are of the sort commonly associated with excessive drinking and marital and vocational difficulties.

In interviews, Carroll is composed and at ease. He volunteers little information and answers questions in a courteous but guarded fashion. He can in no fashion account for his several years of under achievement and antisocial behavior.

Summary:

Carroll is a young man of above average intelligence. All available data, including current test results, point to a fairly severe character disorder and I would regard Carroll as a quite unreliable and untrustworthy individual. He seems to have little in the way of a sense of responsibility or concern about other people and I would not expect him to have the capacity or the motivation to enter into anything approaching serious or meaningful counseling at this time.

David Heiberg, Staff Psychologist

EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

An official transcript is not available, however the high school has been contacted and indicates that Carroll has successfully completed the 10th grade. He also was enrolled in the 11th grade and has earned credit in 11th grade Social Studies but has failed to receive credit in 11th grade English or his other elective courses.

The boy was elected president of his sophomore class and was considered to have good potential if motivated. At the present time, Carroll is interested in completing his high school education by taking the High School Equivalency Test. Beyond this point, his vocational goals include either sales or service occupations.

It is recommended that an 11th grade course of study be made available to Carroll or that he be allowed to take the High School Equivalency Test.

Thomas Grogan, Special Teacher YO Unit

RELIGIOUS SUMMARY

Carroll was formerly affiliated with the Methodist Church. He is not aware of the pastor's name there, and this man cannot be considered a resource for him. Carroll has been inactive for a number of years, although he has been baptized and confirmed. Carroll seems to be a somewhat passively hostile boy who does not consider religion a resource for himself. He denies the validity of all basic Christian teaching. Routine chaplain contacts are recommended for him for the near future.

Bruce Murphy, Protestant Chaplain

GROUP LIVING REPORT

In group living Carroll has been very good. He has been real quiet, minds his own business and does his work details without question. Carroll was sent directly to SRM by mistake and was there a month and then sent here. One comment he made was, "The way the fellows are treated here is a joke, wait till they get to the joint."

Carroll is quiet but takes an active part in activities inside and out. He likes to play softball and tries hard at it. He causes no trouble and never has to be told to do this or to do that. He knows what is to be done and does it. Carroll was a construction worker and his work was seasonal. He has good personal hygiene habits and has been polite and friendly to staff and his fellow men.

Alfred Peterson, C.O. 1

CASEWORK SERVICE REPORT

Subject is a divorced 21 year old whose good social skills seem apparent in the interview situation. He appears relatively free of anxiety, polite, friendly, and no real overt expressions of hostility. There's some briskness which could reflect some passive aggressive feelings. The history indicates that the subject has been having difficulty with the law since 1959 which would place him at thirteen years of age. Most of his activities have been burglary of nature. There seems to be some identification with a delinquently oriented peer grouping which apparently did some extensive burglarizing together. Subject claims that he does not know why he committed the offense, but states that over the years his object has been money. He expresses no feelings of guilt, and on only two occasions did he ever once consider the victims of his burglaries and then only for a short passage of time. This would seem to indicate a rather self-seeking individual whose main concerns

are basically superficial and centered in immediate material gains.

The subject is able to verbalize no feelings of hostility towards his parents, but is able to state that he definitely feels that he was sufficiently disciplined as a youngster. The history material also suggests that the parents are basically normal in all respects, with the exception that they did not offer adequate supervision of the subject at any time of his development. There are also several other facts that tend to support the idea that the subject's main difficulty is a grist lack of self discipline in his relationships to people and society in general. He states that he can work on a job or produce in any area when he is doing something he "likes" to do and that he cannot tolerate doing something that does not appeal to him. He appears to have little frustration tolerance for disagreeable tasks. The history material indicates that he has been quick tempered in the past, and this might reflect an immature and childish approach to solving problems and interpersonal stress situations. Subject's past relationships with the opposite sex also indicate a selfish emphasis on self gratification.

The two evaluations done by the Mental Health Center in ( ) have suggested that the subject is a "sullen, hostile, antagonistic youth who resists treatment attempts. The subject would appear to be pretty well defended against realizing any elements or past relationships which would make him this way, for he tends to verbalize a basic live and let live philosophy of life.

The subject sees his problem as being primarily a financial one. He sees the solution lying in his acquiring a job which appeals to him and earning his money rather than stealing it. He is presently divorced, however, he intends to re-marry as soon as possible. He claims his ex-wife and himself have discussed the situation and have agreed upon this course.

Treatment goals should include an emphasis on cause and effect therapy with special attention given to offering the subject some markable skill or ability which has some appeal to him.

Kenneth Lundquist, Caseworker

FINAL STAFFING SUMMARY

Carroll Lockman is a 21 year old, Caucasian youth from..., Minnesota, here following conviction on the felony of burglary to what seems to have been an error in judicial proceedings, Carroll was sent directly to St. Cloud following his conviction.

He stayed there approximately a month, entering into their orientation program, before the error was discovered and rectified. Carroll has a quite lengthy juvenile record and has been in some difficulty as an adult, these problems largely involving drinking, driving and fighting. His past record is adequately outlined in the pre-sentence investigation. Carroll, although a fairly intelligent youth, has never really effected a good adjustment. He is a high school dropout and has been married, his marriage ending in divorce. His work record is not a particularly positive one. He has maintained himself well in the group living situation at MRDC but has impressed staff members as an exceptionally shallow and superficial, sociopathic youth.

#### TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Placement:  
Carroll has been involved in considerable antisocial activities and he is not regarded as the sort of offender who is likely to profit from a camp setting. Transfer to the State Reformatory for Men at St. Cloud is recommended.
- B. Occupation/Education:
1. Work - At this time, work experience should be secondary to completion of high school coursework. To the extent that it is possible, Carroll could be prepared for sales and service occupations which would be in keeping with his interest. Possibly food or health service work would be appropriate.
  2. School:
    - a. Grade - Carroll has completed the 10th grade and an 11th grade placement would be appropriate.
    - b. Course of instruction - Regular 11th grade program.
    - c. Remedial Requirements - None
  3. Vocational Goals and Training - Counseling is recommended as Carroll's goals are rather vague. His general interests are sales work or people-oriented work in general.
- C. Supervision Needs In:
1. Group Living - At MRDC, Carroll has been quiet and well behaved, causing no difficulties.
  2. The Community - To the extent that this can be anticipated at this time it is apparent that tight controls have to be exercised.
- D. Social Development:
1. Peer Relationships - Peer Relationships are not remarkable within a delinquent population. No specific recommendation.

2. Recreation - Carroll enjoys athletics and is a quite active individual who should be encouraged to develop his athletic skills.
  3. Religion - Carroll is an inactive Methodist with a passively hostile attitude towards religion.
- E. Therapy:
1. Physical Health
    - a. Dental Attention - Routine care as needed.
    - b. Medical Attention - Routine care as needed.
  2. Psychological Health
    - a. Individual Counseling - Although intelligent, Carroll does not seem prepared to accept counseling in a productive fashion at this time. He seems to have little positive anxiety about himself. He is likely to respond to firm controls and guidance.
    - b. Group Counseling - Carroll is a quiet, passive participant in group counseling and seems to have little interest in such. Recommended only if easily available.
- F. Family Relationships:
1. Family Role Changes Needed - Carroll has expressed some interest in re-marrying his former wife and claims that she shares this interest.
  2. Family Interviewing or Counseling Needed - Marriage counseling might be beneficial if Carroll and his ex-wife feel ready to embark on a realistic appraisal of their problems.

Summary By: David Heiberg, Staff Psychologist

## CASE B    LOW I, HIGH II

Factor scores of 22.5 on factor I and 36.0 on factor II were obtained on the CRS. This case represents a youth considered to be clearly "neurotic-disturbed" but not sociopathic. The raw scores on MMPI experimental scales are: SD=22, A=12, B=16, Alpha=76, Beta=42, Ma=20, Ac=15, Q-1=20, and Es=48.

The offense which is referred to in these reports was an attempt to seduce a 14 year old girl at a beer party. This was unsuccessful, as the subject was unable to maintain an erection.

Name: Jones, Sheldon Alvin

Offense or Delinquent Act: Attempted Carnal Knowledge

PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION

Tests Administered:

Large Thorndike, MMPI, Sentence Completion Test, Diagnostic Interviews.

Large Thorndike	
Verbal I.Q.	82
Non-Verbal I.Q.	79

MMPI: L-62, F-58, K-57, Ma-52, D-60, Hy-51, Pd-66, Mf-51, Pa-50, Pt-53, Sc-53, Ma-63, Si-64

Intellectual Functioning:

Current group intelligence testing places Sheldon's level of functioning within the dull normal range. This is consistent with past test results and with clinical impressions. Low intelligence has undoubtedly been a major factor in Sheldon's past difficulties in school and he does not seem a likely candidate for advanced vocational training or further classroom programming.

Personality Functioning:

MMPI results suggest a test taking attitude of mild, naive, defensiveness and interpretation must be somewhat cautious. Clinical scores are within acceptable limits and therefore present an unusual picture within the context of a delinquent population. There are suggestions here that Sheldon is a somewhat introverted and socially awkward young man, mildly rebellious and impulsive.

Sheldon is extremely uncomfortable in an interview situation. He has a difficult time expressing himself and seems shy and inarticulate. He states that he believes his crime (attempted carnal knowledge) is a very serious one and there is a ring of sincerity and what seems to me to be a genuine regret as he discusses this. It is apparent in talking to Sheldon that he feels very inadequate and unhappy with himself.

Summary:

Sheldon is an unhappy young man of dull normal intelligence. He is painfully aware of his limitations and seems to regard himself as a quite inadequate and inept person. He seems to me to be criminally unsophisticated, frightened, concerned about the future and feelings of some real regret about the incident which led to his incarceration.

David Heiberg, Staff Psychologist

EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

An official transcript is not available however, from available information it appears that Sheldon withdrew from school after completing the 10th grade at a high school in Minnesota. His most recent school attendance occurred in 1966. The boy was not a discipline or control problem but did have academic difficulties.

Sheldon has no intention of returning to school and he seems somewhat pessimistic regarding his learning capabilities. His immediate goal is to return to the area and obtain employment as a factory worker. Vocational interests testing indicates a very high interest in warehouseman and carpentry and in general it is felt that Sheldon's plans are realistic.

Tom Grogan, Special Teacher

RELIGIOUS SUMMARY

Sheldon is affiliated with the Episcopal Church. The pastor should be considered a resource for this boy in the community. Sheldon has been baptized and confirmed and was significantly involved in the activities of the congregation through his childhood and adolescence. His level of activity has deteriorated, however, and his attendance has been infrequent for the past four years. Sheldon appears to be a very dependent young man who has difficulty functioning adequately on his own. He does not appear to be delinquently oriented. Religion is a source of some personal support for him but it is not really influential in helping him avoid self-defeating behavior. He responds positively to support and pastoral counseling is definitely recommended.

Bruce Murphy, Protestant Chaplain

GROUP LIVING SUMMARY

Sheldon is quiet, well mannered, and scored. He works well and appears to get along with his peers.

James T. Wilbert

CASEWORK SERVICE REPORT

Sheldon was committed to the YCC on a charge of attempted carnal knowledge (please refer to the PSI for details). The youth has no juvenile record. His difficulties as an adult are of a relatively recent origin dating back to February of 1957 and include two incidents of traffic violations, larceny and intoxication. When discussing Sheldon's involvement in the committing offense he becomes very emotional. He has shed tears and other such signs indicating remorse which incidentally appear to be genuine. He assumes responsibility for the present and past offenses and attributes this to his poor judgment and vulnerability to borderline companions. He describes himself as quiet and lacking social skills and confidence in this area. He claims he has never dated girls nor had sexual relations and after his involvement in the committing offense it is somewhat doubtful that he will approach girls again in the near future.

I tend to believe Sheldon is correct in his assessment regarding his vulnerability to borderline peers. Sheldon is somewhat dull intellectually, certainly naive in many social situations.

On the other hand, he does not tend to identify or have much in common with delinquent or criminally oriented youths. I suspect that he selects younger, borderline companions out of personal feelings of inadequacy and need for acceptance. Judging from both Sheldon's and the field agent's description of the home, I suspect there are fairly strong ties in this family and that they have functioned fairly well as a unit especially in view of the stressful circumstances that exist. Sheldon appears to be emotionally dependent on his family and I suspect he is undergoing some separation anxiety at the present.

Considering the youth's intellectual capacity and self-concept at the present, he may not be capable of anything beyond unskilled work. This needs further exploration. Sheldon has impressed me as the type of youth who can respond well to support, guidance, encouragement, etc. as his relationships with people seem to have some depth. Any type of a community plan would require well defined limits and structure in day-to-day life management.

Lynn Nelson, Caseworker

#### FINAL STAFFING SUMMARY

Sheldon Jones is a nineteen year old, Caucasian youth from Minnesota, here following conviction on the charge of attempted carnal knowledge. The details of this unhappy experience are contained in the PSI, as is Sheldon's past record, which largely involves relatively minor offenses of recent origin. He has adjusted reasonably well to the MRDC program, causing no difficulty whatsoever in dormitory living and remaining somewhat withdrawn from his more delinquent peers. He is a young man of dull intelligence and has impressed the staff as being frightened, unsophisticated and lacking in antisocial orientation. It should be noted that the agent who wrote the presentence investigation, expressed himself in that document as favoring a probationary setting for Sheldon. Also, the agent who had supervised Sheldon on probation has visited Sheldon at MRDC and indicated to staff members in informal conversation that he would be advised to a release on probation at this time.

#### TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Placement: The staffing team unanimously feels that the best placement for Sheldon would be a return to the community on probation status and so recommends to the Commission. This is

based on Sheldon's lack of criminal sophistication, his self concern and deep regret over the incident, what appears to be a positive and favorable family situation, and on the helpful opinions of the agent involved in this case.

**B. Occupation/Education:**

1. Work - Sheldon's interests are in the line of general manual labor of a semi-skilled variety, possibly factory work, and these ambitions are realistic and in keeping with his abilities.
2. School
  - a. Grade - Sheldon withdrew after completion of the tenth grade at ...high school in Minnesota.
  - b. Course of Instruction - Sheldon's low intelligence and feelings of failure regarding high school militate against a continuation of high school programming.
  - c. Remedial Requirements - Sheldon is low in all academic areas ranging from fourth to sixth grade abilities. If available and if he is motivated, help in polishing up these skills would be beneficial. However, formal schooling is not recommended.
3. Vocational Goals and Training - Continued counseling regarding job possibilities is recommended.

**C. Supervision Needs In:**

1. Group Living - Sheldon is timid and withdrawn, appearing out of place in the typical Youthful Offender population. Supervision needs are minimal.
2. The Community - Strong supportive contacts and firm guidance from the agent, are seen as the sine-qua-non of rehabilitative efforts. At the discussion of the agent, it might be helpful to obtain supportive counseling and psychotherapy from local mental health agencies as Sheldon tends to become depressed and easily discouraged.

**D. Social Developments:**

1. Peer Relationships - Because of his low intelligence and feelings of inadequacy, Sheldon is susceptible to influence from a variety of sources—anyone who will take an interest in him. This could be a difficulty on probation but Sheldon appears to be aware of the dangers involved in bad associates.
2. Recreation - Any positive outlets of energy which could aid in ego building would be recommended.
3. Religion - Sheldon is a member of the Episcopal Church and the pastor should be considered a potential source of help for him. Sheldon seems to be susceptible to pastoral counseling and this avenue should not be overlooked.

**E. Therapy:****1. Physical Health**

- a. Dental Attention - Routine care as needed.
- b. Medical Attention - Routine care as needed.

**2. Psychological Health**

- a. Individual Counseling - Sheldon is a dependent young man, not hostile, and should be susceptible to strong supportive contacts and firm, common sense guidance.
- b. Group Counseling - Not recommended if within the typical sociopathic group found in correctional institutions.

**F. Family Relationships:**

- 1. Family Role Changes Needed - Not apparent at this time.
- 2. Family Interviewing or Counseling Needed - It appears that the family is maintaining their interest in Sheldon and would be an additional source of strength to him were he on probation. We anticipate that they would work with the probation officer in a positive fashion.

David Heiberg, Staff Psychologist

## CASE C HIGH I, HIGH II

Factor scores of 73.0 on factor I and 34.0 on factor II were obtained on the CRS. This youth was seen as quite deviant in a rather general, undifferentiated fashion. The raw scores on MPI experimental scales were: Sd=15, A=26, B=11, Alpha=60, Beta=22, Mr=13, Ar=20, Q11=9, and Er=49. A History Summary is included with this material, as a Presentence Investigation was not ordered by the court.

Name: Marshall, Willard Walker

Offense or Delinquent Act: Theft

HISTORY SUMMARYFamily Data:

The subject is a 17 year old youth who is bound over to District Court and convicted of theft for his part in the stealing of an automobile. The subject was on run from the Training School when the offense took place, and the specific offense was surrounded with other admitted offenses. A presentence investigation was not done because the subject had compiled an extensive record with the Department of Corrections at the time of his offense.

The subject is the oldest of 4 children born to the mother during her first marriage. She was married in 1947 and divorced in 1961. She married her present husband in 1963. In the past, she has worked long hours away from home in order to help support the family.

The boy's natural father has since remarried and has two children from this marriage. The subject has seen his father occasionally since the divorce.

The stepfather is a surveyor's assistant and has worked at various jobs. He had been previously married and his wife died in 1949

in an airplane accident. The records indicate that the home situation has not been positive and that the stepfather has had a drinking problem. Due to the number of job changes and other reasons the father has not lived up to his full responsibility of providing for family needs. There has never, apparently, been enough stability in the boy's family background to provide him with the direction and support that he needed to achieve an adequate adjustment. The family is Lutheran, and religion has played only a small part in family life. The subject has had good health, and at age 14 had his appendix removed.

Marital Status:

The subject has never been married.

Military Status:

The subject has not been classified in Selective Service as yet.

Education:

The subject has not completed his high school career as yet, and he apparently has at least another half year of the 12th grade remaining.

Work Experience:

The subject has had no significant work experience.

Previous Offenses:

12-65	Committed to the Youth Conservation Commission following his involvement in approximately 16 burglaries and 4 auto thefts between the months of June to December of 1965.
1-4-66	Transfer to the Youth Vocational Center at Rochester.
1-12-66	Ran away from Rochester Camp and was involved in an auto theft.
1-18-66	Return to Lino Lakes Reception Center.
2-8-66	Transfer to STS.
4-16-66	Ran away from STS, apprehended the same day.
9-22-66	Paroled from Training School.
1-12-67	Return to the Reception Center at Lino Lakes. The boy was involved in car theft and approximately 10 burglaries. In being returned he attempted to run away from Hennepin County Sheriff's officers but was apprehended immediately.
1-24-67	Parole revoked and transferred to the State Training School.
3-10-67	Granted a home visit and failed to return. It was during this run that the subject committed the present committing offense.

Committing Offense:Official Version. None.

Youth's Version. The subject states that he got out of the Training School on March 10 for a home visit and went home. He had returned to the Training School and was actually on the grounds when he decided that instead of returning he would run. He claims to have done well for the three weeks, but then he went to a party and obtained some pills. The taking of pills that caused him a great deal of difficulty in the past, and it was his intention to stay away from them, however, when he took them at the party he embarked on a steady consumption of them until he was arrested on the present offense. The offense took place as he and his brother were apparently burglarizing their way across Minnesota and North Dakota. He stole an automobile, which was simply one of the many offenses committed, and he was charged with theft.

Kenneth Lundquist

PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION

MMPI: L-42, F-70, K-49, Hs-52, D-65, Hy-57, Pd-93, Mf-48, Pa-82, Pt-79, Sc-90, Ma-83, Si-52.

Intelligence Test Data:

Large Thorndike Verbal I.Q. 92, Non-Verbal I.Q. 93. (An I.Q. of 104 was obtained on the Otis in 1962. The same test yielded an I.Q. of 96 in 1963. I.Q.'s of 93/88 were obtained on the Large Thorndike in 1965.)

Vocational Interest Test Data:

On the occupational scales in the Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory, Willard is exceptionally high (standard score greater than 45) on the following scales: baker, warehouseman and truck driver.

He is exceptionally low (standard score less than 20) on the following scales: tab machine operator, pressman, industrial education teacher and radio-TV repairman.

On the area scales of this test, he is relatively high in interest in outdoors occupations.

Other Tests Used:

Sentence Completion Test, Diagnostic Interviews.

Intellectual Functioning:

Intelligence is within average limits.

Personality Functioning:

MMPI scores suggest an exceptionally negative picture, even when taken in the context of a delinquent population. Willard here appears to be an exceptionally hostile and uncontrolled youth rather confused and angrily alienated from the world. Test scores are associated with gross anti-social behavior, often of the sort which seems to the observer to be bizarre, vicious, and without obvious rational foundation. Scores are often associated with lines of gross underachievement and marginal living. He here appears to be an exceptionally unstable, suspicious, and destructive individual.

In interviews, Willard seems extremely bitter, angry and disheartened. He discusses his recent adjustment with what appears to be frankness and little feeling. He states that while on the run from STS he was involved in several burglaries, car theft, larceny and armed robbery, and he attributes his long standing anti-social behavior to his fondness for drugs. Although he talks about his use of narcotics, it appears that he is misusing this term as his particular affinity is for the sedatives—Morbital, Ecconal, sodium amatoil, etc. Willard feels that he must be "kind of nuts," as he is concerned about his explosive temper. He states that he used to just fight with his fists but now he goes for a weapon immediately and feels that anyone who does this must have something wrong with him. He states that he does not really care whether or not he lives or dies and that a recent suicide attempt in jail was a genuine one. He states he has nothing to live for, no goals or plans, and no interest in the future. His discourse is filled with self-pity. Although he regards himself as one who represents a real threat to society, he doesn't quite feel that incarceration is fair. He expresses a vague interest in psychiatric help, but admits that he has never been able to tolerate any sort of probing or questioning regarding personal concerns.

Summary:

Willard Marshall is of average intelligence. So much for the positives. He strikes me as one of the most unstable, sociopathic and emotionally disturbed youthful offender seen at this institution. Although disturbed, he is not grossly psychotic and does not fit the criteria for admission to the state hospital system. I feel that attempts to obtain extensive psychiatric and psychological counseling should be made within the limits of the institutional program. It is, however, questionable whether Willard

has the ego strength or the interest in himself to enter into anything approaching a therapeutic relationship. In my opinion, he is an exceptionally dangerous and untrustworthy individual. I would hope that psychological evaluation could precede his release to the community. I feel that he represents a considerable threat to community safety and stability at the present time.

David Heiberg, Staff Psychologist

#### GROUP LIVING REPORT

Since intake Willard has done a satisfactory job in all his assigned duties. He remains respectful at all times toward the staff and cooperates most readily with any requests.

R. Lange, COI

#### EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

During the 1966-67 school year Willard was enrolled in the 12th grade at the State Training School. He withdrew from school in March and received the grade of incomplete for the 3rd quarter. The boy has completed the 11th grade at the State Training School with approximately a C-average. A juvenile school evaluation written 12-22-65 indicates that Willard has not had an exceptionally difficult school history. He was known as a fairly well adjusted student and also did quite well in the MRDC juvenile school program.

At the present time Willard is somewhat ambivalent about returning to a full time school program. He has, however, adjusted favorably in the MRDC remedial school program and it is strongly advised that Willard be programmed at the 12th grade level if he is transferred to another correctional institution. The boy has the ability to complete his high school education and seems to be comfortable in a school environment. Willard is significantly retarded in the area of English grammar, however, he is capable of 10th grade arithmetic and his reading level is adequate to handle senior high school material. After completion of a high school program Willard has an interest and some ability in the area of auto mechanics and this would seem to be the appropriate vocational training program for him.

Tom Grogan, Special Teacher

RELIGIOUS SUMMARY

Willard is presently not affiliated with a community church. He attended functions at both an Episcopal and a Lutheran church when he was younger, but has been completely inactive for the past six years. He has been baptized, but has not been confirmed nor received communion. Willard is a boy who presently has a very low self-concept and who verbalizes negative feelings toward religion. This is due, no doubt, to his general hostility toward the established social order in institutions. Routine chaplain contacts are recommended.

Bruce Murphy, Protestant Chaplain

CASEWORK SERVICE REPORT

The subject is very polite and cooperative during the interview situation. He seems very depressed and emotionally exhausted. He expresses very little hope for the future and appears to be genuinely sorrowful that he is in the present pathetic situation that he is. He takes barbituates and claims that this is his main problem. He also feels that it will be very difficult to stop taking them and generally admits that prognosis is very poor in this area. He ties his criminal activity very closely to taking pills.

He does not seem to express much genuine remorse with the committing offense, however, he does seem to convey the feeling that he would prefer to remove himself from this kind of activity if only he had the will power. The subject is probably more ego involved in this type of activity than he generally expresses in the interview.

The family dynamics have no doubt contributed to the subject's failure to adjust. The subject is not bitter toward either parents and minimizes family difficulties.

The subject certainly needs a secure setting because of his tendency to escape stressful situations. It would appear that his depression at the present time is significant enough to warrant special consideration, and some encouragement should be given to him to make the best of his situation. The "narcotics" problem probably presents a crucial issue, and the subject's addictive personality will probably make it difficult for him to adjust in the future.

Kenneth Lundquist, Caseworker

FINAL STAFFING SUMMARY

Willard Marshall is a 17 year old, Caucasian youth from...who was convicted of the felony of theft in District Court. This felony was only one of several he committed while on run from the State Training School during the months of March and April. Willard was first committed to the YCC in 1965 and has been at YVC as well as Red Wing. His run record is quite substantial and, as a juvenile, he was involved in many burglaries and auto thefts. He attributes his difficulties to his need for drugs, particularly sedatives. He is expressing some self concern at this time and appears to be rather perplexed and disheartened by his unhappy condition. Willard has maintained himself well to date in the group living situation but has impressed staff as an unstable and sociopathic youth.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Placement: The staffing team, noting Willard's long record of anti-social behavior, his current serious involvement in crime, and his history of escapos from juvenile institutions, feels that a program at the State Reformatory for Men at St. Cloud would be most appropriate to his needs and so recommends.
- B. Occupation/Education:
  1. Work - Work program should be secondary to school at this time but Willard's interest in auto mechanics may be capitalized on in the future.
  2. School:
    - a. Grade - Willard has completed the 11th grade at STS and would be eligible for a full-time 12th grade program. He seems to be well motivated to obtain his high school diploma.
    - b. Course of Instruction - Full-time 12th grade program.
    - c. Remedial Requirements - English grammar is a weak point and remedial work would be beneficial here.
  3. Vocational Goals and Training - Continued counseling is recommended, and Willard's budding interest in auto mechanics should be encouraged.
- C. Supervision Needs Int:
  1. Group Living - At least medium supervision would be required. Willard has "drifted" in juvenile institutions in the past. His drug habit seems to be a fairly serious one and should be considered in planning his program.
  2. The Community - Not applicable at this time.
- D. Social Development:
  1. Peer Relationships - Adequate within the delinquent population.

2. Recreation - Willard has been demonstrating little interest in recreational programs and should be encouraged to develop positive ways of relaxation and having fun.
3. Religion - Willard's religious orientation is technically Protestant but virtually non-existent. His attitudes toward religion are negative.

E. Therapy:

1. Physical Health:
  - a. Dental Attention - Routine care as needed.
  - b. Medical Attention - Routine care as needed.
2. Psychological Health:
  - a. Individual Counseling - He is expressing some interest in himself and a good deal of anxiety and self concern which could be capitalized on in individual counseling. His low frustration tolerance is a likely deterrent to meaningful therapy, however. Within the limits of the institutional program, attempts should be made to offer him as intensive counseling as is possible to see if he can capitalize on this.
  - b. Group Counseling - Willard's feelings toward group counseling are almost wholly negative. Not particularly recommended.

F. Family Relationships:

1. Family Role Changes Needed - Emancipation from an unhealthy family situation is recommended.
2. Family Interviewing or Counseling Needed - Routine informative contacts by the agent.

Summary By: David Holberg, Staff Psychologist

## CASE D    LOW I, LOW II

Factor scores of 39.5 on factor I and 15.5 on factor II were obtained on the CRS. This subject was seen as a relatively well adjusted young man. The raw scores on MPI experimental scales were: SD=16, A=17, B=12, Alpha=37, Beta=37, Mp=15, Ac=14, Q-H=10, Es=54.

Name: Kosio, David Edward

Offense or Delinquent Act: Unauthorized Use of Motor Vehicle

PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION

MPI: L-46, F-47, K-51, Ho-41, D-53, Hy-47, Pd-57, MF-48, Pa-68, Pt-52, So-51, Ma-55, Sl-52.

Intelligence Test Data: Large Thorndike    Verbal I.Q. - 118  
Non-Verbal I.Q. - 120

Other Tests Given: Sentence Completion Forms, Diagnostic Interview.

Intelligence Testing - Interpretation:

Intelligence is above average, in the "bright-normal" range.

Personality Testing - Interpretation:

Test results suggest that Dave is a rather hyper-sensitive, skeptical, suspicious and hostile person. He is likely to be usually on guard and distrustful of others' motivations. There is no evidence here of really gross maladjustment or of the impulsive rebelliousness so often found in the delinquent population. One would expect Dave's greatest social difficulties to result from distrustful attitudes and a lack of confidence of others.

Clinical Impression:

Dave is fairly pleasant to interview, being quiet, soft spoken and polite. He engaged in a good deal of rationalization regarding his probation violations at first, later stating that he really had

no excuse and was unable to account for resistive behavior. He does not appear to be particularly anxious or depressed and no overt hostility was noted. Although cooperative during interviews, he volunteered little and seemed quite wary.

Diagnostic Impression:

The impression is of an adjustment reaction of early adulthood, related to rather mild paranoid-like feelings of alienation, distrust, hypersensitivity, and hostility which is likely usually well controlled.

Summary:

Intelligence is above average, in the bright normal range. Test results do not reflect the usual gross anti-social characteristics which are usually found in delinquent population, but suggest that Dave is a suspicious, guarded person. He appears to be the sort who would have a great deal of difficulty establishing a working relationship with his agent, as indeed was the case. However, his attitude and general personality makeup do not point to an actual criminal orientation and one would expect his behavior to be reasonably well controlled under usual circumstances.

David Heiberg, Staff Psychologist

EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

Past Achievement History:

(An official grade transcript is not available, however, the social history information indicates that Dave graduated from the 12th grade in June of 1964.)

Since that time Dave enrolled in a Vocational School where he completed a one year electrical lineman's course. Grades and verification of Dave's enrollment are not immediately available, however, this is assumed to be correct since the boy has been employed for the past year, in this capacity. Dave's earlier school years were quite erratic. His grades declined during the 8th grade and he was described by teachers as being indifferent and having no respect for rules. In 1963, he was achieving at approximately a D average and withdrew from school. He was subsequently enrolled in the academic school program at the State Training School and at the Youth Vocational Center in Rochester. While in the Correctional School Program, Dave received B average grades and was considered to have above average potential. He completed the 11th grade at the Youth Vocational Center and was subsequently paroled and re-enrolled in the 12th grade in the public schools. Dave was able

to graduate with his original class and his final 12th grade marks included an A in mathematics, a C in Economic Geography and a B- in Business.

Educational Test Data:

Stanford Achievement Test Advanced Battery  
 March 1967 (Grade 12 Graduate) — Reading ..... 12.5  
 Spelling ..... 11.4  
 Language ..... 11.3  
 Arithmetic ..... 12.3  
 Battery Median... 11.9

Educational/Vocational Goals and Planning:

At the present time Dave is a qualified lineman electrician and has been employed in this capacity for the past year. He states that he would have little difficulty returning to his most recent employment and Dave's vocational prognosis in general, appears to be excellent. Dave appears to be very much absorbed in his occupation and there would seem to be little that the correctional programs might offer him in terms of academic or vocational training at the present time. The boy displays a good deal of maturity and judgment concerning his future and it is therefore recommended that he be allowed to pursue his chosen occupation in the community.

Thomas Grogan, Special Teacher

GROUP LIVING SUMMARY

Received Dave at ERDC on 3/14/67. He seemed very polite and respectful. In his time here he hasn't given anyone a bad time. Dave seems concerned about what will happen to him. He knows he has made a mistake and states he is awful sorry for this. Of Dave's background, family wise, I don't know too much but maybe this could be his main trouble. Dave is about average in personal hygiene and habits.

Dave seems to mix well with the others in group but seems to pick his own friends. For the staff and Dave's peers, Dave shows respect but stays aloof. Seems to be a deep seated sort of youth. Dave is working in the kitchen area and does a very good job. Has been doing good since he has been here.

Dave participates in what the Center has to offer in sports and recreation. He plays hard. Seems to enjoy just about everything but states he dislikes writing. A lot of us have poor penmanship so this could be the reason for this dislike.

Dave has no physical problems that I know of. He seems to sleep well nights and have heard no complaints.

The way to work with Dave is to tell him what you want done. The job is done and the way you would want it done too! Dave is a lineman (Elec.). He has a very good skill. There is a lot of potential in this youth, but only he can put his best forth. As for Dave's future, I do believe he can become just what he wants to be.

Richard Eckdahl, Correctional Counselor

#### RELIGIOUS SUMMARY

##### Affiliation and Activity:

Dave claims the Lutheran Church located in...Minnesota, as his home church. Dave points out that it is not necessary that I try to contact the minister regarding his presence here at the Reception Center as, "he has never heard of me and I don't expect to go back there." Dave does claim to have been baptized, confirmed and to have participated in the Sacrament of Holy Communion. His activity in the church has not been significant at any point in his life consisting of infrequent and irregular involvement in Sunday morning worship which was initiated at about 13 years of age and continued on up until about 18 years of age. Other than fairly frequent attendance at confirmation classes between ages of 13 and 14 Dave has known no other consistent involvement with the community church. Dave points out that neither parent is involved with the church to any extent and he does not consider either parent got to be an active Christian. Although none of his siblings live at home, Dave does consider his older sister, age 22, to be the dominant religious influence in their family. Generally Dave says that religious influence in his home environment is altogether absent. Dave suggests that his friends maintain a kind of antagonistic bravado regarding religion although he thinks that basically they respect and possibly "fear" the precepts of religion.

##### Attitude and Knowledge:

Here at the Reception Center Dave's verbal attitude toward religious participation remains relatively positive. He does have the capacity to be quite indifferent although he says particularly in this setting he really doesn't mind attending and does feel as though he gets some type of benefit from it. Dave does acknowledge basic Christian doctrines. Dave's religious knowledge is adequate and does demonstrate the capacity to verbalize satisfactorily regarding the basic Christian concepts. Dave has the capacity to verbalize appropriate responses to hypothetical value situations and does so fairly consistently.

SUMMARY:

Dave presents a veneer of toughness and attempts to appear quite sophisticated. Dave apparently has known little support or encouragement in the development of his religious life and has learned over the years to survive pretty much by using his own resources. At least this is the impression that he likes to give, despite the fact that he has known little encouragement. Dave has gained a basic response to the religious community which does enable him to draw some personal comfort from religious precepts. On the other hand he has not known the kind of involvement that would enable him to utilize religion as a source of strength which would alter or significantly modify his behavioral patterns. Dave does seem to respond to supportive pastoral contacts. Most of his thinking in the area of religion appears to be quite rational but rather superficial. It is expected that Dave could learn more of the Christian faith and come closer to the point where he can draw real strength from religion with appropriate help and guidance. His motivations to receive this however remain questionable at the present time and will be a matter for continuing evaluation.

Don E. Johnson, Senior Resident Chaplain

CASEWORK SERVICE REPORT

Dave was committed here on a violation of probation. His original offense occurred in February of 1965 at which time he was charged with URMV. The youth has a juvenile record dating back from 1961 through 1964 including such offenses as breaking and entering, burglary, escape from the Youth Vocational Center in Rochester and three misdemeanors. His present offense took place in February of 1965 and has been on probation since that time. His violations consisted of illegal possession, absconding from probation supervision and general failure to adjust.

The youth apparently completed vocational training at some vocational school as a lineman electrician and worked for a long period of time in Indiana. At that time he claims that he was under the supervision of a woman parole agent with whom he had a great deal of difficulty communicating. He claimed that he did not like this person and she was continually on his back. When he came back to Minnesota he continued to foul up on probation by primarily not reporting and doing a certain amount of drinking. He has committed no felonies while on probation.

The youth is characterized as one who looks upon himself as kind of a wanderer. He enjoys traveling from place to place and

this is possible with his present vocational choice. He works as an electrician's lineman in construction companies that move around from place to place throughout the state and works apparently very diligently. His employer apparently wants him back and claims that he does a good job while employed.

Dave appears to be one who is not particularly alert and bright although his interest in his vocational field is certainly to be commended. He looks like a youth who probably has had his share of juvenile problems due somewhat to his family involvement but one who appears to be making a certain amount of progress as far as delinquent youth goes. He claims now that he is through with his ramming around and just wants to get back out and work on the job that he likes so well.

The probation officer who wrote the violation report indicated that he wanted the youth incarcerated, but the probation officer who wrote the preliminary home evaluation on behalf of the county recommends that he be given another chance on probation. The agent indicates that he would have no objection to this youth to be given probation because of the fact that he can work successfully and he can maintain himself.

The agent also indicates, however, that the relationship with his parents is not good. The parents apparently make light of Dave's difficulties and insist that everything he has done has been someone else's fault. The youth does not impress this caseworker as one who is minimizing his activities too much and tends to agree that his parents have been perhaps shielding him most of his life. He is anxious in the interview and very concerned about the outcome of his staffing. He doesn't seem to be accepting of incarceration at this point but is anxious to attempt to prove himself. His manner in the interview is polite and friendly and certainly puts on a good appearance for this caseworker. Outside of the fact that he is a bit shallow in his approach I do believe his attempt to convince this worker that he has changed are fairly sincere on his part. The youth does have something going for him in terms of vocational opportunities and I feel that he perhaps has been jolted by his stay at the Reception Center.

In summary while the youth has had a sufficiently bad juvenile record to warrant serious consideration for strong controls, I think that we should take into consideration the fact that he has apparently made some improvement over the last several years. He has had a difficult time with parole officer in Indiana but has not done too much in terms of being involved in illegal activity in

Minnesota. The youth again appears to be sincere in his efforts to change and apparently is unaccepting of the possibility of incarceration.

Charles Johnson, Caseworker

#### FINAL STAFFING SUMMARY

In February of 1965, Dave was charged with unauthorized use of a motor vehicle and was placed on probation. He is currently at MRDC as a result of a violation of this probation. Specifically Dave has been charged with absconding from probation supervision, general failure to adjust and drinking. The boy has a juvenile record dating back to 1961, including such offenses as breaking and entering, burglary, various misdemeanors and an except from YVC.

Although Dave has a significantly serious juvenile record, it appears that the boy has made some definite progress recently. Dave was able to return to the 12th grade and graduate with reasonably high grades from his community school. He also enrolled in the Vocational School and completed a course in lineman construction. Since that time Dave has secured employment with various construction firms as a lineman and was currently employed by a construction company at the time of his violation. The MRDC staff is of the opinion that the boy's general personality make-up does not point to a criminal orientation and there is no reason to believe that his behavior should not be reasonably well controlled under usual circumstances. There is no evidence of gross maladjustment or impulsive rebelliousness usually found in the delinquent population. It also appears that Dave has significantly profited from his brief experience here at MRDC.

Dave's agent has suggested that the boy might be returned on probation if it is felt he has been impressed with the seriousness of his violation. The MRDC staff has checked with the boy's previous employer and he apparently would be able to get the job back. It is therefore recommended that Dave be returned to the community on probation.

#### TREATMENT RECOMMENDATION

- A. Placement: Return to the community on probation.
- B. Occupation/Education:
  - 1. Work - Dave will be able to obtain his previous job as a

- construction lineman.
2. School
    - a. Grade - Dave has completed the 12th grade and a vocational course of study at a vocational school.
    - b. Course of Instruction - No further educational or vocational programming is indicated.
    - c. Remedial Requirements - None.
  3. Vocational Goals and Training - At the present time the boy is quite interested and absorbed in his field as a construction lineman and should be encouraged to remain in this field.
- C. Supervision Needs Int:
1. Group Living - Minimum supervision.
  2. The Community - Dave's employment requires a good deal of mobility and definite reporting procedures and adherence to specific rules will have to be worked out.
- D. Social Developments:
1. Peer Relationships - Peer relationships seem adequate.
  2. Recreation - The boy participates well here at MRDC and no further recommendations are made.
  3. Religion - Dave is of the Lutheran faith and routine religious involvement is recommended.
- E. Therapy:
1. Physical Health
    - a. Dental Attention - No treatment recommendation.
    - b. Medical Attention - No treatment recommendation.
  2. Psychological Health
    - a. Individual Counseling - Life management counseling along practical lines is recommended.
    - b. Group Counseling - Not indicated.
- F. Family Relationships:
1. Family Role Changes Needed - The MRDC caseworker suggests that Dave not return to the parental home and that he secure instant living arrangements as soon as possible.
  2. Family Interviewing or Counseling Needed - It appears that Dave can secure living arrangements with a sister initially, however, it is recommended that independent arrangements be made as soon as possible.

Summary By: Thomas Grogan, Social Teacher

## REFERENCES

- Block, J. The Challenge of Response Sets. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.
- Caditz, S. B. Effects of training school experience on the personality of delinquent boys. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23, 501-509.
- Cliff, M. Adverbs as multipliers. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 27-43.
- Cofer, C. N., Chance, J. E. & Judeon, A. J. A study of malingering on the MPI. Journal of Psychology, 1949, 27, 491-499.
- Cohen, J. Some statistical issues in psychological research. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.) Handbook of Clinical Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Craddick, R. A. Selection of psychopathic from non-psychopathic prisoners within a Canadian prison. Psychological Reports, 1962, 10, 495-499.
- Craddick, R. A. MPI scatter of psychopathic and non-psychopathic prisoners. Psychological Reports, 1963, 12, 238.
- Dahlstrom, W. G. & Welsh, G. S. An MPI Handbook: A Guide to Use in Clinical Practice and Research. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1960.
- Denberg, M. L., Phillips, R. L. & Sperrazzo, G. The relationship between the MPI and prison disciplinary reports. In The Proceeds of the 91st Annual Congress of the American Correctional Association, 1961, pp. 233-236.
- Erickson, R. V. & Roberts, A. H. An MPI comparison of two groups of institutionalized delinquents. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment, 1966, 30, 163-166. (a)
- Erickson, 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)
- Eysenck, H. J. The Structure of Human Personality. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1953.

- Eysenck, H. J. Biological basis of personality. Nature, 1963, 199, 1031-1034.
- Eysenck, H. J. & Eysenck, B. G. Manual of the Eysenck Personality Inventory. London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1964.
- Gilberstadt, H. & Duker, Jan. A Handbook for Clinical and Actuarial EPI Interpretation. Philadelphia and London: W. B. Saunders Co., 1965.
- Goldberg, L. R. The differential diagnosis of psychosis versus neurosis from the EPI. Third Annual Symposium on Recent Developments in the Use of the EPI. University of Minnesota, 1968.
- Gough, H. G., Wenk, E. A. & Rozyko, V. V. Parole outcome as predicted from the CPI, the EPI and a base expectancy table. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, 70, 432-441.
- Gullford, J. P. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- Gynther, M. D. Crime and psychopathology. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 378-380.
- Hathaway, S. H. Personality inventories. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.) Handbook of Clinical Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965, pp. 451-476.
- Hathaway, S. H. & Monachesi, E. D. Adolescent Personality and Behavior, EPI Patterns of Normal, Delinquent, Dropout and Other Outcomes. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1963.
- Hill, H. E., Haertzen, C. A. & Davis, H. EPI factor analytic study of alcoholics, narcotic addicts and criminals. Quarterly Journal of Studies in Alcoholism, 1962, 23, 411-431.
- Jackson, D. N. & Messick, S. Response styles on the EPI: Comparison of clinical and normal samples. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 65, 285-289.
- Jurjevich, R. M. Normative data for the clinical and additional scales for a population of delinquent girls. Journal of General Psychology, 1963, 62, 143-146.
- Kaiser, H. F. The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1958, 23, 187-200.

- Kingsley, L. MPI profiles of psychopaths and prisoners. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1960, 16, 302-304.
- Lefkowitz, M. M. MPI scores of juvenile delinquents adjusting to institutionalization. Psychological Reports, 1966, 12, 911-914.
- Levy, S., Southcombe, R. H., Cranor, J. R. & Freeman, R. A. The outstanding personality factors among the population of the state penitentiary: a preliminary report. Journal of Clinical and Experimental Psychopathology, 1952, 13, 117-130.
- Lingoes, J. C. MPI factors of the Harris and the Wiener subscales. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 74-83.
- Lingoes, J. C. In O. K. Buros (Ed.) The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965, pp. 316-317.
- Lorr, M., Klett, C. J. & McHair, D. E. Syndromes of Psychosis. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1963.
- Loevinger, J. Measurement in psychological research. In B. B. Wolman (Ed.) Handbook of Clinical Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965, pp. 78-94.
- McHemar, G. Psychological Statistics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964, pp. 206-208.
- Mack, J. L. An objective comparison of parole successes and failures in terms of their history and personality adjustments. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1967.
- Mandel, N. G., Collins, B. S., Moran, E. R., Barron, A. J., Gelbmann, F. J., Gadois, C. B. & Kaminstein, P. Crima Revisited. St. Paul: Department of Administration, State of Minnesota, 1963.
- Mandel, N. G. & Barron, A. J. The MPI and criminal recidivism. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1966, 57, 35-38.
- Marks, P. A. & Seeman, W. The Actuarial Description of Abnormal Personality. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Co., 1963.

- Negargee, E. I., Cook, P. E. & Mandelsohn, G. A. Development and validation of an MPI scale of assaultiveness in overcontrolled individuals. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1967, 72, 519-528.
- Murphree, H. B., Karabelas, M. J. & Bryan, L. L. Scores of inmates of a federal penitentiary on two scales of the MPI. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1962, 18, 137-139.
- Norman, W. T. & Goldberg, L. R. Paters, rates and randomness in personality structure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 681-691.
- Panton, J. H. MPI profile configuration among crime classification groups. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1958, 14, 305-308. (a)
- Panton, J. H. Predicting prison adjustment with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1958, 14, 308-312. (b)
- Panton, J. H. The responses of prison inmates to seven new MPI subscales. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1959, 15, 196-197.
- Panton, J. H. Identification of habitual criminalism with the MPI. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1962, 18, 133-137. (a)
- Panton, J. H. The identification of predisposing factors in self-mutilation within a state prison population. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1962, 18, 63-37. (b)
- Peterson, D. R. Behavior problems of middle childhood. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25, 205-209.
- Quay, H. C. & Peterson, D. R. The questionnaire measurement of personality dimensions associated with juvenile delinquency. Unpublished pages, 1964.
- Quay, H. C. Personality dimensions in delinquent males as inferred from the factor analysis of behavior ratings. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1964, 1, 33-37.
- Quay, H. C. & Quay, L. C. Behavior problems in early adolescence. Child Development, 1965, 36, 215-220.
- Randolph, M. H., Richardson, H. & Johnson, R. C. A comparison of social and solitary male delinquents. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1961, 25, 293-295.

- Shinohara, M. & Jenkins, R. L. An MPI study of three types of delinquents. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 156-163.
- Tellegen, A. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. In L. E. Abt and B. F. Riese (Eds.) Progress in Clinical Psychology. Vol. VI. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1964.
- Van Evra, J. P. & Rosenberg, B. G. Ego strength and ego dysfunction in primary and secondary sociopaths. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1963, 12, 61-63.
- Welsh, G. S. Factor dimensions A and R. In G. S. Welsh and W. G. Dahlstrom (Eds.) Basic Readings on the MPI in Psychology and Medicine. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1956.
- Wiggins, J. S. Interrrelations among MPI measures of dissimulation under standard and social desirability instructions. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1959, 23, 419-427.
- Wirt, R. D. MPI characteristics associated with outcomes in group psychotherapy with prisoners. Conference on Recent Developments in the Use of the MPI. University of Minnesota, 1967.
- Wirt, R. D. & Briggs, P. F. Personality and environmental factors in the development of delinquency. Psychological Monographs, 1959, 73, Whole No. 485.
- Wirt, R. D. & Jacobson, J. L. The Man in Prison in Minnesota. The Minnesota Department of Corrections and the University of Minnesota, 1966.

**END**

7 26-62/11121