

Fall 1930

Social and Ethical Judgments of Two Groups of Boys--Delinquents and Non-Delinquents

James M. Reinhardt

Fowler Vincent Harper

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

James M. Reinhardt, Fowler Vincent Harper, Social and Ethical Judgments of Two Groups of Boys--Delinquents and Non-Delinquents, 21 Am. Inst. Crim. L. & Criminology 364 (1930-1931)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

SOCIAL AND ETHICAL JUDGMENTS OF TWO GROUPS OF BOYS—DELINQUENTS AND NON-DELINQUENTS

JAMES M. REINHARDT¹ and FOWLER VINCENT HARPER²

This study is an attempt to objectify the attitude of the delinquent boy toward his environment by comparing his emotional reactions to a series of social and ethical problems which call for the formation of judgment to the reactions of the non-delinquent to the same situations. The cases were unselected, the delinquents being taken "as they came" before the juvenile court of Grand Forks, North Dakota, the non-delinquents taken in like manner from the public schools of the same city.

An examination of the data comprising Table I. showing the reactions to the question "What is your best quality?" revealed some interesting differences in the attitudes and judgments of the two groups of boys. Ten, or exactly 25% of the forty delinquents named "kindness" as the best quality. Six, or 12.5% said that they "liked parents." Only one non-delinquent denoted "kindness" as his best quality. None from this group referred to his parents with the word "kindness" though five of the non-delinquents enumerated obedience as the best quality as against six of the delinquent group and three others who said "obey parents."

One fact that stands out most clearly is the large number of qualities enumerated by the non-delinquent group which were not mentioned by any of the delinquent boys. For example, "honest" was named by six non-delinquents; "trustworthy" by four; "clean, fearless, thrifty, and faithful" were named separately or together by four other non-delinquents; while two non-delinquents said that their membership in the Boy Scout organization constituted their best quality; still two others answered "loyal" (or loyalty) and two said, "don't swear, smoke, or steal." Not a single juvenile delinquent named any one of these eleven qualities except "don't smoke." The one delinquent that said "don't smoke" added also "and drink," though drinking was not mentioned by any one of the non-delinquents. Two delinquents said,

¹Department of Social Science, College of the City of Detroit.

²School of Law, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind. Some of the data in this study was presented by Professor Reinhardt in a doctoral dissertation to the graduate committee of the University of North Dakota

"free hearted"; one said "good with tools—make things for people"; three, in addition to the six who said "like parents," said "work and obey parents"; while three others answered "like parents, brothers and sisters."

Summarizing the results of the data shown in Table I, we find some differences in character judgments of the juveniles as they are reflected in the self-estimates of the two groups of boys. Twelve, or 30% of the forty delinquents named either "kindness" or "free hearted" as the best quality. One other indicated a more definitely socialized attitude with the answer, "good with tools—make things for people." Twelve others included "parents" in the reply to this question; and nine of these twelve said, "like parents." Three of these, as we have seen, added "brothers and sisters." Turning our attention again to the replies of the non-delinquent group; we have already noted a tendency on the part of the non-delinquents to spread out over a wider range of qualities. The abstractions used so frequently by the non-delinquents show clearly the influences of institutional and organizational life. They remind one of the counsels of a "successful business man to young men." "Honest," for example, had the highest frequency among the non-delinquent boys; "trustworthy" came next; "clean, fearless, thrifty, and faithful" were also mentioned together and separately, as we have seen, by four non-delinquents. Then followed a scattering of more specific characteristics; "ambitious," "keep promises," "help others," "save money," "keep off streets," "go to school," "don't brag." One non-delinquent honestly suggested that he had no good qualities.

According to the data comprising Table I, some inferences seem plausible. In the first place the non-delinquent boys appear to have a wider range of values as a group than the delinquent boys. In the second place, the replies of the non-delinquent group show quite clearly that the current ethics and social point of view of the business and organizational life of the community as it expresses itself through various clubs and associations in the smaller cities had been more influential among the non-delinquents than among the delinquents. It is difficult to interpret some of the replies of the delinquent boys. Why twelve, or 30% of these boys should say "kindness" or "free hearted" and nine should say "like parents" is not clear. A possible hypothesis seems to be that these boys have been preached to a great deal concerning the importance of loving and obeying their parents. It is probable that most of them are giving the reply which according to their own experience seems to them to be the one expected by the

TABLE I

TABLE I SHOWS THE VARIETIES OF SELF-JUDGMENTS AS TO WHAT CONSTITUTES THE INDIVIDUAL'S BEST QUALITY

Best Quality	No. Individuals Stating Each Quality or Characteristic	
	Delinquent	Non-delinquent
Kindness	10	1
Like parents	6	—
Obedient	3	5
Go to church and Sunday school.....	3	—
Work and obey parents.....	3	—
Free hearted	2	—
Go to school	2	1
Study and work	2	—
Like parents, brothers, and sisters.....	3	—
Don't smoke and drink	1	—
Good with tools, make things for people.....	1	—
Good sport	4	1
Don't brag	—	1
Don't swear, smoke or steal.....	—	2
Honest	—	6
Trustworthy	—	4
Loyal	—	2
Ambitious	—	1
Keep promises	—	1
Boy scout	—	2
Don't swear	—	1
Have none	—	1
Scouts and mechanical workers	—	1
Clean, fearless, thrifty, faithful	—	4
Help others	—	1
Don't steal	—	1
Keep off streets	—	1
Save money	—	1
Feet and hands	—	1

examiner. This may not be the case with the non-delinquent group whose economic and social standing and whose family and group relationships have been of such a nature as to lead them to take these qualities for granted.

We are making no effort to account for these differences in responses of the two groups in clinical terms. It may be that deep-seated cause could be determined by proper psychological examinations. What we are mainly concerned with here is the fact that these differences do exist.

The data presented in Table II based upon the replies to the question "What makes a good citizen?" reveal some interesting differences in the reactions of boys in the two groups. The delinquents were inclined to think in terms of obeying laws. Fifteen, or 37.5%, of these specifically stated in their replies that one of the most important qualities was "to obey laws," as compared to one non-delin-

TABLE II

COMPARING THE REACTIONS OF BOTH GROUPS OF JUVENILES TO THE QUESTION:
 "WHAT MAKES A GOOD CITIZEN?"

Quality	Delinquents	Non-delinquents	Quality	Delinquents	Non-delinquents
Tell truth—obey laws...	10	—	Truthfulness	—	4
Education—obey laws ..	5	—	True qualities	—	1
Honesty—kindness	12	1	Respectable	—	1
Stay home—help family.	5	—	A gentleman	—	2
Religion—read Bible ...	3	—	True and brave	—	3
Don't steal	2	2	Sportsman	—	1
Not commit crimes	1	—	Clean	—	1
Be good	1	—	Courteous	—	1
Don't cuss or steal	1	—	Reverent	—	1
Honesty or trustworthy.	—	12	Faithful	—	1
Loyalty	—	3	Obey laws and help our		
Doesn't swear	—	2	town	—	1
Loves country	—	1	Just	—	1
			Good manners and polite	—	1

quent who included "obeying laws" specifically in the replies to this part of the form. Twelve of the non-delinquents specified "honesty" or "trust-worthiness" while the same number of delinquents named "honesty and kindness," either separately or together, though "kindness" was enumerated about three times as frequently as "honesty." "Kindness" was specifically stated, either alone or with "honesty" in nine out of forty cases, while only one non-delinquent used the term specifically. That the reaction of the delinquents had been influenced somewhat by the court circumstances can hardly be doubted. Three delinquents mentioned "religion" and one of these added "reading the Bible," as the first qualities of a good citizen. Not one of the non-delinquents included either religion or the Bible, though one said "reverent."

The non-delinquents appeared to show a deeper background in some of their replies and more community consciousness was demonstrated in the reactions of the non-delinquents. Such terms as "faithful," "help out town," "respectable," "a gentleman," "true and brave," "clean sportsman," "courteous," "good manners," "polite," "loyalty," "love country," were all found among the reaction of the non-delinquents. One delinquent answered "staying at home to help family."

Here again as in the replies to question 1, the non-delinquents were more varied and showed a wider range of community and institutional influences than did the delinquent group. The frequent references to "law obedience" by the delinquents seems accounted for as a result of their court experiences and the repeated counsel which

they had heard in regard to that subject. It may be that the freedom of the non-delinquents from court experiences, and the security of their home environments led them to place the emphasis upon loyalty, love of country, etc. On the other hand, in the case of the delinquents "obedience" probably has a specific application. It is the way to keep out of court.

The replies of the two groups of juveniles to the question, "If you had one hundred dollars, how would you spend it?" are depicted in Table III. In spite of the fact that only thirty-three of the non-delinquents responded to this part of the examination sheet as compared to forty of the delinquents, the replies are nevertheless significant. Five, or twelve and five-tenths per cent of the delinquents would "put the money in the bank," as compared to twelve, or slightly more than 36%, of the non-delinquents. Seven delinquents, or 17.5%, would "save the money" or appropriate it in such a way as to bring returns in the future as compared to eighteen, or 54.5%, of the non-delinquents. One other delinquent would "take a trip"; one would "buy some furniture"; another would "pay up the family bills"; one non-delinquent would "help his Dad"; another would "help parents and buy a bike"; still another would "spend it quick for golf clubs and a car"; another non-delinquent would "buy a camping outfit"; one would "spend the money for a Scout book and equipment"; another would "buy old coins"; and one wanted to "take aviation lessons"; while one poor fellow would "take the family and move to Iowa." Four of the non-delinquents would help one or both parents; while eight of the delinquents would include some other member of the family in the expenditure of his one hundred dollars. (If we include the one who would buy house furniture and so forth.) The most outstanding contrast in the replies of these two groups of juveniles to this question is the fact that twenty-eight, or 70%, of the delinquents specifically stated or included "clothes" as the principal object to be bought with one hundred dollars, as compared to five, or slightly more than 15%, of the non-delinquents. Eleven of the forty delinquents stated "clothes" alone, while two non-delinquents mentioned clothes apart from some other objects though it was quite clear in at least three of the cases where "clothes" were mentioned by the non-delinquent that they were not considered as actual necessities, but were looked upon as something extra, such as for instance "clothes and camping outfit."

Two things stand out clearly in the reactions of the juveniles to this situation. (1) The spending ideas of the delinquents are more

TABLE III

COMPARES THE REACTIONS OF INDIVIDUALS IN THE TWO GROUPS TO THE QUESTION:

"IF YOU HAD \$100, HOW WOULD YOU SPEND IT?"

Reaction	Delin- quent	Non- delin- quent	Reaction	Delin- quent	Non- delin- quent
Save for old age.....	1	—	Save it	—	4
Bank	5	10	Bank for college	—	2
Take trip	1	—	Bank, presents	—	1
Clothes and bank	7	—	Help Dad	—	1
Clothes	11	2	Parents and bike	—	1
Car	3	1	Clothes and good time..	—	1
House, furniture, etc....	1	—	Spend it quick, golf clubs		
Invest in property	1	—	and car	—	1
Eats and clothes	3	—	Clothes and camp outfit.	—	1
Clothes, self, brother...	2	—	Stamps and old coins...	—	1
Clothes, self, mother...	3	—	Clothes, bank, gas eng..	—	1
Clothes and B. B. unif..	1	—	Scout book, bike	—	1
Clothes and bike	1	—	Spend it	—	2
Pay up bills	2	—	Parents	—	1
Blank	—	7	Aviation	—	1
			Move family to Ia.....	—	1

intimately associated with the family needs and with the wants of other members of the family than is the case with the non-delinquents. This is not difficult to understand when we contemplate the circumstances of the families from which most of these delinquents came, and when we remember how all the money which found its way into the family had to be pooled to keep the family going. (2) The important place which "clothes" assumed in the desires of the delinquents as compared to the non-delinquents.

The reactions to the problem, "John sees a policeman coming down the street. There is an alley close by. What will John do?" presents some interesting contrasts. Sixteen, or 40%, of the delinquents stated that John would run, fifteen of these said that he would run in the alley, one said "look the other way," while another thought that John would ask a question. One of the delinquents felt that John would "stand still." One thought that he would look in a show window, and another thought that he would turn around and walk back, while still one other delinquent believed that John would "look the policeman in the eye." Thus, twenty-two, or 55%, of the delinquent group appeared to show some sign of uneasiness at the approach of a policeman on the street. In the case of the non-delinquent group, however, nineteen thought that John would go on walking; three of these said that John would speak to the policeman; eight thought he would run—two of these would run in the alley; one of the non-delinquent group thought John would lift his hat, and another sug-

gested he would hide. Thus 30% of the non-delinquent group indicate by their reactions to this part of the examination an uncomfortable feeling at the approach of a policeman as compared to 55% of the delinquent group. Apparently, the delinquent boys have developed an attitude toward policemen that is different from that of the boys in the non-delinquent group.

A comparison of the work likes and dislikes of the two groups presents some dissimilarities that are worth noting. The data are presented in Table IV. Sixteen, or 40%, of the delinquents wanted to be farmers, according to two types of work enumerated by each boy as the most desirable among all the occupations which he could think of. On the other hand, not a single non-delinquent boy named farming as a desirable occupation. Eight, or 20%, of the delinquents specified some form of mechanical work—a number of these simply said “a mechanic”—while only four of the non-delinquents named mechanical work. Seven delinquents wrote “carpenter” as compared to four non-delinquents, and five, or 12.5%, of the delinquents wanted to be railroad engineers, and five mentioned salesmen, though no non-delinquent mentioned railroad engineer, and only one mentioned salesman. Fifteen of the non-delinquent group wrote “aviator” as one of the two most desirable occupations, as against two delinquents. Thus it is clear that there exist real differences in the occupational and work ambitions of the two groups.

In order to get at the occupational likes and dislikes of the boys by a slightly different method, we asked the boys to number in order of preference the three types of work or professions, in a list of suggested terms, which they wanted to follow when “grown up.” The boys were also asked to letter (a, b, c,) the types of work or professions most disliked, beginning with the one last preferred and ending with the one which would be most acceptable of the three undesirable occupations or professions. Thirteen, or 32.5%, of the delinquent boys indicated baseball as a preferred profession, as compared to six, or only 15%, of the non-delinquents. Almost three times as many non-delinquents as delinquents wanted to be musicians. Exactly twice as many delinquents as non-delinquents wanted to be priests or preachers, one chap expressing the simple but holy ambition just “to believe in God.” Fourteen, or 35%, of the delinquent boys, as compared to 7.5% of the non-delinquent group wanted to be cowboys, though eleven non-delinquents wanted to be sailors, as compared to six delinquents. An equal number from each group indicated a desire to be an army captain. Fifteen, or 37.5%, of the delinquents,

as compared to six, or 15%, of the non-delinquents wanted to be railroad engineers.

A review of Table IV shows a preponderance of non-delinquents who desired to be lawyers and doctors, as compared to the delinquent group, and a preponderance of delinquents who desired to be bricklayers, though only five of the delinquents indicated a preference for that occupation. The last method of approach to the occupational interests of the two groups of juveniles introduces some new kinds of work not mentioned by any of the boys when they were left to write down the desired occupations without any suggestion. However, the degree of differences in occupational interests between the two groups of boys remains fairly constant through both throughout. It would be noticed that the non-delinquent boys indicated a wider range of occupational interest and were more inclined to name the learned professions and types of work requiring educational training in the formal sense than was the case with the delinquent boys. For example, the non-delinquents enumerated without suggestion in the test form, doctor, musician, cartoonist, contractor, architect, scout master, teacher, missionary, reporter, scientist (or chemistry), business manager, banker, and druggist, none of which was mentioned by delinquents. Several types of work were mentioned by the delinquents that were not included by any of the non-delinquents, though almost all of these, with the exception of civil engineering and army officer, are occupations which do not require a high degree of formal education.

To the question "If you were accused falsely to whom would you first go for help?" sixteen, or 40%, of the delinquents answered "to my mother," five said "the juvenile commissioner," while only three said "Dad (or Father)." Two said "Sister," two "my chum," one answered "my brother," and one replied "the gang." In the case, however, of the non-delinquents, fourteen said "Dad (or Father)," thirteen "Mother," two "my parents," four said the "Boy Scout Master," while several others gave the names of men in the community who were organization leaders or business men, etc. The most outstanding and significant fact in the replies to this question is the wide difference in the proportion of each group who mentioned the Father as one to whom the boy would go for help in the event he was falsely accused. It is noteworthy also, that a very large proportion of the delinquent boys would go to their mothers, and also that not a single one of them mentioned a person outside of their family except the five who designated the juvenile commissioner, the two who would

go to a chum, and the one who would appeal to the gang. Whereas, on the other hand, the non-delinquents included the Scout Master and various leaders of other social organizations and business men of the community.

Table V compares the reactions of the two groups of juveniles toward certain types of conduct with the idea of trying to discover some differences in the emotional judgments of these two groups of boys, if any such differences exist. In the first question a number of types of men are depicted, one who steals, who lies, etc. The boys were asked to indicate by numbering which of these "are the meanest." The second question is similar to the first except that the characteristics apply to boys instead of men. In the third question the juveniles were requested to indicate by numbering the characteristics, from a list of suggested ones, which make boys likeable. In the fourth question the boys were asked to indicate in the same way the characteristics possessed by the girls which they liked best.

Twenty-eight, or 70%, of the delinquents included whipping one's children among the most despicable practices of a mean man, and twenty of these placed that practice first in a list of three meanest things that a man can do, on the basis of the characteristics suggested in our form. On the other hand, fifteen of the non-delinquents indicated whipping one's children, and only four of these gave it first place. Abusing one's wife came second in the number of times it was enumerated by the delinquents, and also in the proportion of times that it was given first place, though it was mentioned by more of the non-delinquents than of the delinquents. Twenty-four delinquents as compared to twenty-two non-delinquents indicated that one who steals is among the worst of men. However, ten of the non-delinquents as compared to four delinquents ranked stealing first among three practices enumerated. Seventeen non-delinquents included "won't work" among the characteristics of a mean man and an equal number indicated "gets drunk." Nine of the non-delinquents gave "won't work" first place as compared to only four who placed getting drunk first. The contrast between the two groups at this point is interesting. Only eight of the delinquents included "won't work" as among the worst characteristics of the mean man, and not one of them gave it first place. Six of the delinquents included getting drunk, and two of these indicated that it was the worst characteristic of any of those in the whole list.

The second question in this group does not show such outstanding dissimilarities, but is nevertheless interesting. Twenty-one of the

TABLE V

TABLE V ATTEMPTS TO REVEAL THE COMPARATIVE ATTITUDES OF THE INDIVIDUALS IN THE JUVENILE GROUP TOWARD CERTAIN TYPES OF CONDUCT WITH THE IDEA OF TRYING TO DISCOVER SOME DIFFERENCES IN THE EMOTIONAL JUDGMENTS IN THE TWO GROUPS IF ANY SUCH DIFFERENCES EXIST.

(The apparent discrepancies are due to the fact that some boys indicated three words and others only two)

The Meanest Man Is One Who:	Delinquents		Non-delinquents		Boys I Like Best	Delinquents		Non-delinquents	
	Times	First	Times	First		Times	First	Times	First
Whips his children	28	20	15	4	Truthful	36	14	24	10
Abuses his wife	25	12	29	9	Kind	31	13	26	12
Steals	24	4	22	10	Honest	33	11	30	6
Lies	15		13	2	Obedient	10		22	2
Won't work	8		17	9	Courteous	5		18	6
Gets drunk	6	2	17	4	Courageous	2	1	17	3
Won't pay his debts	8		8		Shrewd	3		1	
Fights	5		3						
TOTAL	119	38	124	38	TOTAL	120	39	148	39
The Meanest Boy Is One Who:					Girls I Like Best Are:				
Won't obey his mother	31	22	31	20	Kind	34	25	29	13
Hits from behind	24	13	25	10	Full of fun	20	6	33	18
Lies	21	3	15		Modest	8	5	31	2
Steals	7	1	4		Like to dance	1	1	4	3
Smokes	7		14	7	Timid	1	1	10	
Bragg	9	2	7		Fond of flirting			4	1
Fights	4		3		Bashful			6	
Tells secrets	4		1		Meek			6	
Won't go to school	3		3						
Won't go to church	4		9						
Is not kind to girls	2		9	2					
TOTAL	116	37	121	39	TOTAL	65	38	123	37

delinquent boys included lying as among the meanest characteristics of a boy, three of them gave it first place, as compared to fifteen of the non-delinquents who included lying and not one of this group thought it the worst quality. The attitudes of these two groups are reversed in proportions on the question of smoking. Fourteen non-delinquents thought smoking among the meanest things that a boy could do, seven of these indicated that it was the meanest trait among those suggested in the form. Seven delinquents, on the other hand, included it among the worst three practices of a boy though none of them thought it sufficiently bad to merit first place. Nine non-delinquents thought that a boy who wouldn't go to church bad enough to include among the three worst types of boy. An equal number of this group had the same opinion about boys who were not kind to

girls. Only four of the delinquents, however, included as among the three meanest boys one who does not go to church, while only two of this group thought that a boy who was not kind to girls was sufficiently bad to include among the three worst kinds of boys suggested by the questions. The table indicates sufficiently the differences in the responses to the other parts of this test.

Table VI compares the reactions of the two groups of juveniles with the idea of depicting certain differences in ethical, religious, and social judgments. In each group of questions, the child was asked to indicate the statement which was "most true." The outcomes are, at some points, somewhat surprising in view of the emphasis which a rather large proportion of the delinquents have placed upon religion in some other parts of the test.

Four delinquents believed that "all religion is superstition" though apparently none of the non-delinquents thought so. Seventeen, or 42.5%, of the delinquents thought there was some good in all religions as compared to twenty-three, or 57.2%, of the non-delinquents. It is interesting also, that a considerably larger proportion of the delinquents than non-delinquents believed Christianity to be the only good religion. Not less interesting is the larger proportion of non-delinquents who believed that "no religious denomination is perfect," and the exceptionally large proportion of delinquents who thought that "one religious denomination is as good as another." There is certainly some inconsistency in the replies of the delinquent group. Perhaps the proper generalization is that the judgments of the delinquents seemed more irregular and uncertain as regards religion.

While five of the delinquents believed that a large fortune is an indication of dishonesty, twenty-two delinquents as against seven non-delinquents thought a large fortune indicated an owner who had been good and consequently blessed of God. Twenty-seven non-delinquents, or 67.5% of this group thought that the most true statement in this series of three was "some honest and some dishonest men have large fortunes," while only twelve delinquents indicated this as the most true statement. If they show nothing else, the answers here indicate how thoroughly the unfortunates have been grounded in respectable economic-religious dogma. Though their pure theology seemed uncertain, it developed certainty, when combined with economic-theology.

The replies of the delinquents to the next series are equally interesting. In spite of the fact that a comparatively small proportion of the delinquents thought refusing to work a particularly mean thing, 72.5% of this same group believed that any man that was well and

TABLE VI

TABLE VI COMPARES THE REACTIONS OF TWO GROUPS OF JUVENILES TO A SERIES OF STATEMENTS INVOLVING ETHICAL, RELIGIOUS, AND SOCIAL JUDGMENTS

	Delinquents		Non-delinquents	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
I.				
1. All religion is superstition	4	10	—	—
2. There is some good in all religions.....	17	42.5	23	57.2
3. Christianity is the only good religion.....	19	47.5	12	30
II.				
1. Every religious denomination has some good in it	12	30	16	40
2. No religious denomination is perfect....	6	15	11	27.5
3. One religious denomination is as good as another	22	55.5	8	20
III.				
1. A large fortune is an indication of dishonesty	5	12.5	1	2.5
2. A large fortune indicates that the owner has been good and God has blessed him....	22	55.5	7	17.5
3. Some honest and some dishonest men have large fortunes	12	30	27	67.5
IV.				
1. Any man who is well can always find work to do if he wants to work.....	29	72.5	20	50
2. Some men are well and want to work but can find nothing to do	2	5	13	32.5
3. It is never a man's own fault if he does not find work	9	22.5	2	5
V.				
1. Kindness is the best thing in the world....	32	80	29	72.5
2. Power is the best thing in the world....	1	2.5	—	—
3. Self-confidence is the best thing in the world	7	17.5	10	2.5
VI.				
1. Every criminal should be punished severely	26	65	12	30
2. Some criminals should not be punished for they are not to blame.....	10	25	22	55
3. Criminals should never be punished severely	4	10	1	2.5
VII.				
1. We should help others because it makes us happy	12	30	17	42.5
2. We should help others because it pleases God	16	40	16	40
3. We should help others so that they will help us	11	27.5	6	15

wanted to work could find something to do. Furthermore, only two out of forty delinquents designated as most true, the statement, "some men want to work and are well but can find nothing to do." Again, the stupid orthodoxy of the unfortunate on economic-ethical problems! Thirteen of the non-delinquents, however, thought this the most true statement.

The reactions of the two groups to the next series of statements are not surprising in view of all that has gone before. "Kindness" takes predominance again in both groups of boys but is emphasized by a slightly larger proportion of the delinquents than of the non-delinquents. A considerable number in both groups emphasized self-confidence, though a slightly larger percentage of the non-delinquents indicated the statement in which self-confidence was employed as the most true in this group of statements. The almost perfect indifference of the individuals in both groups to the statement employing "power" was outstanding.

The next series concerning the treatment of criminals shows the non-delinquents very much more lenient toward criminals than the juvenile delinquents themselves. Twenty-six of the delinquent boys thought the statement "Every criminal should be punished severely" the most true of all three of the statements in this group; while only twelve non-delinquents thought so. On the other hand, twenty-two non-delinquents as against ten delinquents believed that some criminals should not be punished. The reactions to the last three statements are less interesting than the others. However, there appears to be some significance in these. A larger proportion of the non-delinquents than delinquents thought we should help others because it makes us happy and a larger percentage of the delinquents than non-delinquents thought we should help others "so they will help us."

The consistency and superiority of the judgments of the non-delinquents as compared to the delinquents revealed in the reactions to this part of the test are so clear as to need no comment. Just how much the responses of the delinquents were influenced by their court experiences and how much of it is due to their environmental background it is impossible to say without a more complete and careful examination of each case. It is doubtful, however, if the court experiences could account for all of these differences. We know that the backgrounds in these two groups differ rather widely on the average. We know also that the child's experiences in the home and elsewhere are largely responsible for his point of view on social and ethical questions. The natural conclusion to be drawn from the dif-

ferences in the reactions of these two groups to this sort of test is that it is simply an outcome of two different sets of circumstances in which, in the case of the delinquent group, the juvenile court experience constituted a small part and was the natural, perhaps inevitable consequent of all that had gone before, society being what it is. The point which this examination emphasizes is simply this: here are two groups of boys with two different sets of viewpoints on the average, one of the groups is a problem group, the other, so far, is not. This is the important thing which this whole examination tends to clarify in spite of so many factors in the situation which are not amenable to interpretation, and will not be without much further study and investigation.

It is not contended that this study does more than indicate that there exist distinct differences in the social and ethical judgments of the two groups. Whether these differences do or are capable of throwing any light on the problem of delinquency remains to be demonstrated. It seems clear, however, that delinquents behave differently in their responses to stimuli involving these types of problems. Where such differences are consistently found to exist between two groups of human beings, it is not unlikely that sufficient study may reveal relationships between these differences and the other differences in behavior which present a particular problem to be solved.