

1948

Some Personality Characteristics of Delinquents

Elio D. Monachesi

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

Elio D. Monachesi, Some Personality Characteristics of Delinquents, 38 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 487 (1947-1948)

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.

SOME PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF DELINQUENTS AND NON-DELINQUENTS

Elio D. Monachesi

This study was made possible by financial aid from the research funds of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota. The work was accomplished by the author, Professor of Sociology in the University, with the collaboration of Edith A. Bohince, Viola M. Brandon, Robert Dacy, Katherine Eustis, Gordon Jaeck, Vincent P. Reis and Matilda Wallblom—all graduate students in the University of Minnesota—who assisted in collecting and analyzing the data reported here.—EDITOR.

The search for a test or tests that would yield data differentiating delinquents and non-delinquents in a significant way has continuously beckoned to students of delinquency and crime. The literature in this field contains many reports devoted to an exposition of what seems at first glance to be significant differences in the psychological and social characteristics of law observers and law breakers. In general, however, it may be said that a closer examination of the published studies as well as further research along the lines suggested by such studies will demonstrate that most of the differences found to exist between criminals and non-criminals lack the significance indispensable to the derivation of sound generalizations. It is true that research has produced a plethora of correlates of delinquency and criminality but as yet most of it has attained indifferent success in demonstrating that delinquents are significantly different from non-delinquents in their social and psychological attributes. Furthermore, the literature suggests that little consistency has been achieved in the delineation of a specific factor or a configuration of factors which would make the prediction of delinquency more than a guess. It is, therefore, with some surprise and skepticism that one learns of an instrument which seems to differentiate significantly between delinquents and non-delinquents.

Description

The instrument to be described is the *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*.¹ The inventory consists of twelve scales designed to measure or to reveal the similarity in response to the items of the test of an individual tested and of a sample of persons clinically diagnosed as suffering from several cate-

¹ By Starke R. Hathaway and J. Charnley McKinley. Published by The Psychological Corporation, New York, New York.

gories of emotional disturbances. The test is available in either a card form, in which the 550 statements which comprise the test are printed on separate cards and the subject is instructed to sort the cards into three cells labelled *True*, *False* and *Cannot Say*, in as far as the statements apply to him; or in a booklet form produced so as to make it possible to use the inventory in the testing of large groups of persons. The booklet form of the inventory contains 566 statements (sixteen of the statements are duplicated in order to facilitate scoring) and the individual is provided with an answer sheet upon which he indicates his responses to the items which make up the inventory.

Three of the twelve scales are validating in character. The first of these is the *Question score* (?) which is computed by counting the number of items to which the testee has not responded. The second validating score is the *Lie score* (L). This is designed to reveal whether the person tested falsified his responses by choosing those which were most apt to place him in a socially approved category. The third is called the *Validity score* (F) and a high score on this scale indicates that the testee was either careless in choosing his responses or may have lacked an understanding of the statements contained in the inventory. The remaining nine scales measure the degree to which the subject is like in response to individuals who have been clinically diagnosed as suffering from disabling psychological abnormalities by the neuropsychiatric staff of the University of Minnesota Hospitals. One of the scales indicates the similarity in response of those tested to persons afflicted with hypochondriasis (the Hs scale). Another scale indicates the similarity in response to the test of persons tested and persons diagnosed as suffering from depression (the D scale). High D or Hs scores indicate that there is a close resemblance in the responses of those tested and of those patients who are afflicted with either depression or hypochondriasis. In addition, the hysteria scale (Hy) measures the degree to which those tested are like persons marked by symptoms of conversion-type hysteria. In the inventory also will be found a psychopathic deviate scale (Pd) and scores on this scale reveal how much those tested are similar to persons who show symptoms which have placed them in the psychopathic deviate category of psychological disabilities. Another scale measures the testee's proclivity for interests which are usually associated with masculinity and femininity (the Mf scale). The paranoia scale (Pa), again measures the degree to which subjects are similar to a group of psychiatric patients diag-

nosed as afflicted with paranoia, paranoid state or paranoid schizophrenia. Another, the psychasthenia scale (Pt), reveals how similar is the testee to patients plagued by phobias and compulsive behavior. The inventory also includes a scale to measure similarity of subjects to patients afflicted with the symptoms of schizophrenia. This is called the schizophrenia scale (Sc). Finally, the inventory contains a hypomania scale (Ma).² It reveals the degree to which persons tested are like in their responses to persons who are characterized by an "over-productivity in thought and action."³

Female Delinquents and Non-delinquents

The discriminatory capacity of the *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory* when applied to the study of delinquents and non-delinquents was demonstrated in a study made by Dora F. Capwell.⁴ The study dealt with 101 delinquent and 85 non-delinquent girls. The delinquent girls studied were the consecutive admissions to the Minnesota State School for Girls beginning in September 1941. The non-delinquent girls attended the consolidated public school at Sauk Center, Minnesota. In the selection of non-delinquent girls Capwell included only those in the school grades which would match the grade placement of girls entering the State School. The two groups selected for study were roughly equated for rural-urban background. The non-delinquents fell within an age range of from 12 years to 18 years with a median age of 15 years, whereas the age range of delinquent girls was from 13 years to 19 years with a 16 year

² The abbreviations of the scales enumerated above will be used in the rest of the paper.

³ For a discussion of how these scales were constructed and how they were standardized see: Hathaway, S. R., and McKinley, J. C., "A Multiphasic Personality Schedule (Minnesota): I. Construction of the Schedule." *The Journal of Psychology*, 10:249-254, 1940. "A Multiphasic Personality Schedule (Minnesota): II. A Differential Study of Hypochondriasis." *The Journal of Psychology*, 10:255-268, 1940. "A Multiphasic Personality Schedule (Minnesota): III. The Measurement of Symptomatic Depression." *The Journal of Psychology*, 14:73-84, 1942. McKinley, J. C. and Hathaway, S. R., "A Multiphasic Personality Schedule (Minnesota): IV. Psychasthenia." *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 26:614-624, 1942. "The Minnesota Personality Inventory: V. Hysteria, Hypomania and Psychopathic Deviate." *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 28:153-174, 1944. "The Identification and Measurement of the Psychoneuroses in Medical Practice," *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 122:261-267, 1943. Hathaway, S. R., and McKinley, J. C., *Manual for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943.

⁴ Capwell, Dora F., "Personality Patterns of Adolescent Girls: I. Girls Who Show Improvement in IQ." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 29:212-228. June, 1945. "Personality Patterns of Adolescent Girls: II. Delinquents and Non-Delinquents." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 29:289-297. August, 1945.

median age. Further, the median school grade placement for both groups was the ninth grade. Therefore, the delinquent group was characterized by the greater amount of school retardation.

The girls in the two samples were subjected to an extensive testing program in which the following testing instruments were employed: the Kuhlman Test of Mental Development, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Washburne Social Adjustment Inventory, the Pressey Interest-Attitude Test, the Terman-Miles Test of Masculinity-Femininity, the Vineland Social Maturity Scale, and the Stanford Achievement Test. Each group of subjects was tested twice with the Kuhlmann, the Minnesota Multiphasic, the Washburne and the Pressey tests. The delinquents were retested from six to 15 months after the initial tests and the non-delinquents were tested from four to 13 months after the first series of tests had been administered.

Capwell reported that the non-delinquents achieved a mean IQ of 101.88 on the first test while the delinquents achieved a mean IQ of 87.40 on the same test, a difference whose significance is substantiated by a critical ratio of 5.70. The difference in intelligence of delinquents and non-delinquents was reaffirmed on re-examination. On the second test the non-delinquents achieved an average IQ of 111.76 while the delinquents made an average IQ of 95.65. The significance of this difference was revealed by a critical ratio of 5.46. Of greater importance for our discussion is the fact that Capwell obtained some marked differences in the personality patterns of delinquent and non-delinquent girls as indicated by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. These differences are presented in Table I. A scrutiny of the data presented in this table will show that most of the scales contained in the Multiphasic Inventory differentiate delinquents from non-delinquents in a satisfactory fashion. With the exception of the L and the Hy scales on the first test and the Hy scale on the second test it would seem that the delinquent girls examined are more similar in their responses to patients employed in the standardization of the Inventory than are the non-delinquent girls. The striking manner in which the Multiphasic Inventory differentiates between these two groups of girls is further demonstrated by the data presented in Table II. In this table will be found data

TABLE I.

The Significance of Difference in Raw Scores Achieved by 99 Delinquent Girls and 85 Non-Delinquent Girls on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.⁵

Scale	Difference between Delinquents and Non-Delinquents	
	First Test D/ σ D	Second Test D/ σ D
f	2.93	4.25
L	1.75	3.30
F	7.21	5.95
Hs	3.11	3.12
D	4.59	2.92
Hy	2.74	.60
Pd	16.00	14.00
Pa	12.00	8.03
Pt	6.64	7.36
Sc	7.10	8.55
Ma	8.00	7.95

⁵ Capwell, Dora F., *op cit.* Table 2, p. 290.

which indicate the significance of the difference in raw scores obtained by matched groups of delinquents and non-delinquents on the first examination as well as the percentage of delinquents who reached or exceeded the 75th percentile of the scores made on each scale by non-delinquents. These data pertain to 52 delinquents and 52 non-delinquents matched within two IQ points. As will be noted, the Multiphasic Inventory persists in its capacity to differentiate between delinquents and non-delinquents in a significant fashion on all scales but the Hs scale. Further, these data show that the differences in scores attained by delinquents and non-delinquents on the Multiphasic Inventory are not related to differences in the intelligence of the two groups. Finally, the results presented in Capwell's report suggest that the Multiphasic Inventory was most successful in clearly differentiating between delinquents and non-delinquents. The Washburne test produced significant differences but it was found that it tended to lose its ability to differentiate between the two groups in a completely reliable fashion—as shown by a critical ratio of 2.70—when the groups were matched in IQ. The differentiating capacity of the Vineland test disappeared when the two groups were matched in IQ. It was also found that the Pressey test and the Terman-Miles test failed to reveal significant differences between delinquents and non-delinquents even when the two groups were unmatched in IQ.

The results reported by Capwell were of sufficient importance to warrant attempts to ascertain whether the Multiphasic Inventory would continue to differentiate between delinquent and

non-delinquent girls. Further, it seemed desirable to discover whether the Inventory would differentiate between delinquent and non-delinquent males.

Early in 1946 the Inventory was administered to 55 delinquent girls, 90 non-delinquent girls, 73 delinquent boys and 85 non-delinquent boys. Individuals were selected for testing with regard to their availability and to their comparability in socio-economic status.

TABLE II.

The Significance of Difference in Raw Scores and the Percentage of Overlap in Raw Scores Achieved by 52 Delinquents and 52 Non-Delinquents on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.⁶

Scale	D/ σ D	Percentage of Delinquents who Reached or Exceeded the 75th Percentile of Non-Delinquents
Hs	1.95	—
D	3.91	55
Pd	10.34	93
Pa	8.43	84
Pt	4.86	57
Sc	4.06	57
Ma	5.22	63

⁶ Capwell, Dora F., *op. cit.* Table 5, p. 293.

As a consequence of the first of these considerations the testing was confined to individuals who had membership in some established group in order to make possible the administration of the Inventory to a large number of persons. Such established groups of delinquents were found in the Hennepin County and Ramsey County, Minnesota, Home Schools. The non-delinquents selected had membership in such groups as Girl Reserves, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Hi-Y clubs, settlement house recreational clubs, and high school classes. It was found, however, that the delinquent populations of the Home Schools were not large enough to insure the collection of data sufficient for the analyses planned, and it became necessary to test a number of delinquents on probation. The delinquents employed in this study are heterogeneous to the extent that some were confined in one of the Home Schools and others were on probation when they were tested.

The 128 delinquents tested belong to the following groups: 33 delinquent girls were on probation to the Ramsey County Probation Office; 22 were confined in the Hennepin County Home School; 13 delinquent boys were under the supervision of one probation officer of the Hennepin County Probation

Office; 29 were confined in the Hennepin County Home School; 22 additional delinquent boys were in the Ramsey County Home School; 9 were on probation and under the supervision of a Ramsey County Probation Officer. The 175 non-delinquents tested belonged to the following groups: 48 Girl Reserves; 12 Girl Scouts; 30 girls attended two high school classes; 33 Boy Scouts; 15 boys had membership in a settlement house recreational club; 15 boys belonged to a Hi-Y group; 22 boys attended two high school classes.

After the tests had been scored it was found that 71 persons had achieved T scores (standard scores) of 70 or above on either the L or F scales. Scores of this magnitude were achieved by 24 delinquent boys, 29 non-delinquent boys, seven delinquent girls and 11 non-delinquent girls. It is interesting to note that 22.8 per cent of the non-delinquents and 24.2 per cent of the delinquents achieved such scores although in both instances females tended to obtain more reliable scores than males. Since standard scores of 70 or above on either the L or F scales tend to throw doubt upon the significance of scores made upon the other scales in the Inventory it was decided to eliminate persons who achieved such scores from further consideration. The elimination of such persons reduced the numbers of individuals compared to 48 delinquent girls, 79 non-delinquent girls, 49 delinquent boys and 56 non-delinquent boys.

As indicated above an effort was made to test delinquents and non-delinquents who were generally comparable in socio-economic status. To insure some degree of comparability in this regard the non-delinquents selected for study had membership in groups which functioned exclusively in neighborhoods in which delinquents lived or had lived. These neighborhoods were for the most part inhabited by persons in the lower income classes. However, in spite of efforts made to make groups comparable in socio-economic status the data gathered on the occupational status of the fathers of delinquents and non-delinquents indicate that non-delinquents tended to have membership in higher income classes. Thus 23.6 per cent of the fathers of non-delinquents pursued occupations in the professional, semi-professional, managerial, clerical, skilled trades and retail business categories while only 16.3 per cent of the fathers of delinquents were classified in such occupational categories.⁷ Twenty-five per cent of fathers of non-delinquents fell into the semi-skilled,

⁷ The Minnesota Occupational Scale was used in the classification of occupations. For a discussion of the Scale see: Goodenough, F., and Anderson, John E., *Experimental Child Study*, Century Co., New York, 1931. pp. 234-238; 501-512.

minor clerical and minor business occupational classifications, whereas 29 per cent of the fathers of delinquents were so classified. About 46 per cent (45.6) of fathers of non-delinquents were classified as following slightly skilled trades or as day laborers, while 51.2 per cent of fathers of delinquents occupied such occupational classifications.

Additional characteristics of delinquents and non-delinquents tested are as follows: The median age of the male delinquent group was 15.45 years and the median age of the male non-delinquent group was 15.85 years. The female delinquent group had a median age of 16.28 years and the median age of female non-delinquent group was 16.42 years. As Capwell and others have already found, the delinquents were on the whole characterized by lower IQ's than the non-delinquents. The male delinquents achieved a mean IQ of 103.47 and a median IQ of 101.25 while the male non-delinquents had a mean IQ of 107.59 and a median IQ of 108.50. A similar trend in IQ was found for the females. The female delinquents achieved a mean IQ of 101.70 and a median IQ of 102.50 while the non-delinquent females had a mean IQ of 108.06 and a median IQ of 108.08.⁸

When the scores achieved on the Multiphasic Personality Inventory by the various groups tested were compared it was found that the differences between delinquent and non-delinquent females closely resembled those reported in the Capwell study. It was found, however, that delinquent males were not as sharply differentiated from non-delinquent males as would have been supposed. The mean scores achieved and the differences in mean scores on the several scales of the Inventory by the groups tested are presented in Table III. An examination of the data presented in this Table will show that the Inventory consistently differentiated in one direction between female delinquents and non-delinquents with the exception of the I. scale. When, however, the data on males are scrutinized it will be seen that no consistent differentiation between delinquents and non-delinquents is achieved. In fact, higher mean scores for non-delinquents were obtained on the "?", Hs, Mf, Pt, Sc and Ma scales than for delinquents. It would seem, therefore, that the male non-delinquents were more similar in their response to certain of the items in the inventory to patients clinically diagnosed as afflicted with various emotional disturbances than were the delinquents tested.

⁸ The means and medians are based on 44 delinquent and 79 non-delinquent females; 43 delinquent and 53 non-delinquent males. IQ data for other cases included in this study were unavailable.

TABLE III.

Mean Standard Scores and Difference in Mean Standard Scores Achieved by Female and Male Delinquents and Non-Delinquents on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

Scales	Females			Males		
	Delinquent Mean Score	Non-Delinquent Mean Score	Difference in Mean Scores ¹	Delinquent Mean Score	Non-Delinquent Mean Score	Difference in Mean Scores ¹
¶	50.39	50.35	0.04	50.09	50.17	-0.08
L	54.38	54.40	-0.02	55.97	53.57	2.40
F	60.73	56.04	4.69	59.75	59.65	0.10
Hs	52.50	47.44	5.06	53.72	54.11	-0.39
D	54.06	49.02	5.04	56.68	51.70	4.98
Hy	55.00	51.55	3.45	56.79	53.21	3.58
Pd	77.81	56.49	21.32	67.29	60.98	6.31
Mf	55.53	50.80	4.73	53.01	53.75	-0.74
Pa	66.46	55.35	11.11	58.01	55.81	2.20
Pt	56.57	48.58	7.99	52.40	57.68	-5.28
Sc	61.35	52.56	8.79	55.36	58.84	-3.48
Ma	60.42	55.54	4.88	55.87	60.18	-4.31

¹ Differences preceded by a minus (-) sign are in an unexpected direction in that they indicate that non-delinquents on the whole scored higher than delinquents.

The significance of the differences in mean standard scores will be found in the data presented in Table IV. This Table contains critical ratios that indicate how much significance may be attached to the differences obtained in the mean standard scores for delinquents and non-delinquents. The fact should be noted that the critical ratios relating to females confirm the findings reported by Capwell. It is true that for most of the scales contained in the inventory the critical ratios calculated in the present study are not as high as those reported by Capwell, yet they are of sufficient magnitude to warrant concluding that the Inventory continues to differentiate satisfactorily between delinquent and non-delinquent females.

The critical ratios in Table IV bear witness to the Inventory's inability to differentiate between male delinquents and non-delinquents in a consistent fashion. The magnitude of these ratios also suggests that the differences in average scores on the several scales achieved by male delinquents and non-delinquents are not as significant as those found for female delinquents and non-delinquents if it is remembered that critical ratios of 2.00 or more mean that a given difference would occur in random sampling one time in 20 trials. It will thus be seen that differences in average scores on six of the Inventory's scales ("?", F, Hs, Mf, Pa, Sc) achieved by male delinquents and non-delinquents resulted in critical ratios which fall below the five per cent level of significance. It will also be seen that none of

TABLE IV.

Significance of the Difference of Mean Standard Scores of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

Scales	Critical Ratios ¹	
	Female	Male
? ² ²
L ²	2.57
F	4.19	.89
Hs	3.49	— .25
D	2.16	2.47
Hy	3.55	2.19
Pd	10.55	2.84
Mf	2.81	— .43
Pa	6.73	1.19
Pt	5.18	—2.85
Sc	4.96	—1.72
Ma	2.82	—2.13

¹ Critical ratios preceded by a minus (—) sign indicate the scales in which non-delinquents achieved a higher average score.

² The difference between mean standard scores was so small as to make it unnecessary to calculate the critical ratios.

the critical ratios calculated for male differences in average scores have a numerical value of 3.00 or more. A critical ratio of a numerical value of 3.00 or more means that a difference in average score of a given size in random sampling would be due to chance in approximately three times in 1000 trials.

It is an interesting fact, too, that on some scales the non-delinquent males achieved significantly higher average scores than delinquent males. This is true in the case of the Hs, the Mf, the Pt, the Sc and the Ma scales. Leaving aside the differences on the Hs and Mf scales which are chance differences, it would seem that male non-delinquents are more similar in their response to the items which are contained in the Pt, Sc and Ma scales to patients clinically diagnosed as afflicted with psychological disturbances classified as psychasthenia, schizophrenia and hypomania than are male delinquents. These results stand in contrast to those obtained for females. It would seem on the basis of Capwell's study and this study that female delinquents are psychologically and emotionally more akin to persons who have been clinically diagnosed as suffering from the psychological disabilities reflected in the scores made on the several scales contained in the Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

Discussion

Several explanations may be offered to account for the variations in the Inventory's capacity to differentiate between

female and male delinquents and non-delinquents. The first of these involves a consideration of some of the characteristics of the samples employed in making comparisons. As indicated above, attempts were made to equate the delinquents and non-delinquents in socio-economic status. Although these attempts were not too successful in bringing about the desired results the fact that they were made may have resulted in the inclusion in the non-delinquent groups of individuals who are pre-delinquents or unapprehended delinquents. In short, we may be comparing individuals who stand side by side on a behavior continuum and the dividing line that exists between them is merely one which is drawn by the fact of apprehension and adjudication. That this may have happened is suggested by the fact that a large portion of the non-delinquent were members of such groups as Boy Scouts, Hi-Y and Settlement Boys Clubs—groups which have as one of their avowed purposes the prevention or modification of behavior problems in boys. It is not unlikely, therefore, that some of the boys in the non-delinquent group were afflicted with personality difficulties just as serious as those found amongst delinquents. It may also be true that their membership in so-called "character building" groups was the result of manifest or latent behavior difficulties. These circumstances may account for the similarity of some of the responses to the Multiphasic Inventory of male delinquents and non-delinquents, and if the non-delinquents had been selected from another segment of the behavior continuum the results of the test might have been different. It would seem desirable therefore to test other groups of non-delinquents in order to measure the discriminatory capacity of the Inventory under various conditions.

The explanation just offered to account for variations in the Inventory's differentiating ability has plausibility if it is confined to males. When, however, it is applied to females its plausibility at first glance becomes questionable. It will be remembered that the major portion of the female non-delinquents belonged to groups which resemble in avowed purposes those to which the non-delinquent males belonged. However, there is reason to believe that even though such female and male groups resemble one another in purposes and in general organization the resemblance in other respects is superficial. Such female and male groups cater to an entirely different clientele and the members of such female groups are on the whole individuals who do not deviate to any considerable degree from the normal. In fact, it may be that the members of such female groups tend toward the

“better” end of the behavior continuum. If what has been said is actually characteristic of such female groupings then the significant differences between female delinquents and non-delinquents revealed by the Multiphasic Inventory are accounted for by the fact that samples of distinctly different segments of the population have been compared. It follows therefore that the next step in research in this field would be to compare delinquent females with a sample of non-delinquent females who do not have membership in groups such as those included in this study.

Another possible explanation that may account for the variations in the Inventory's capacity to differentiate between female and male delinquents and non-delinquents stems from the respective conventional social roles assigned to the sexes by our culture. In contrast to males, females are more restricted in what they are permitted to do and when females deviate in their behavior from the expectations of society they run the risk of bringing down upon them the odium and condemnation of so-called respectable people to a greater extent than do errant males. In fact, our culture permits males to engage in various activities both in childhood as well as in adulthood which may be regarded as lying in a twilight zone between the respectable and the scandalous without incurring social disapproval. The conventional roles assigned to males by our culture include amongst them those that are manifested in behavior that skirts the edges of that which is both moral and lawful. Some of them are roles which the male may play so as to acquire characteristics which are associated with an entity variously and vaguely defined as “manliness”, “he-manishness”, “masculinity”, etc. Furthermore, ecological and case studies made of male delinquents by Shaw and others suggest that much of the activity characteristic of delinquency areas is not only approved but is also traditional for gangs of young males who are reared in such areas. To engage in delinquent acts in those areas is the way in which growing boys acquire status in the play groups to which they belong. These studies as well as those concerned with the respective roles assigned to the sexes by our culture suggest that a portion of the delinquency associated with the male sex is behavior which is induced by the social environment rather than springing from the emotional pattern of the individual delinquent. The more circumscribed behavioral horizons of females prescribed by our culture would seem to render most of female delinquency and criminality primarily a function of the females' inability, because of personality defects, to play the conventional

roles imposed upon them by society. In other words, the data presented above suggest that delinquency in females is more often the expression of personal inadequacies rather than a manifestation of cultural imperatives.

In accounting for differences in male and female delinquents and non-delinquents through the immediately preceding discussion another pertinent question is raised which eventually must be answered. The question in mind is created by the possibility that the close resemblance in response to the Inventory of delinquent girls and clinically diagnosed patients may be due to the traumatic experiences attendant upon the processes that lead to being adjudicated delinquent. The social disapproval that is brought to bear upon the erring female who is apprehended may be the factor which plays an important part in producing those emotional disturbances which are supposedly reflected in the responses made to the items in the Multiphasic Inventory. It is not unlikely that in testing female delinquents who have been subjected to the processes of discovery, apprehension and adjudication we may be testing individuals who, because of the odium with which society regards the deviant female, are rendered emotionally disturbed. If such were found to be true then the explanation to account for differences based upon the prevailing standards in our culture for judging female and male conduct would lose its plausibility when confined to attempts to account for differences which are associated with the commission of the delinquent act. On the other hand, these same factors of social disapproval may be decisive in producing those emotional patterns which are revealed by the Inventory after the female has been adjudicated delinquent. In short, the differences found in the response of delinquent males and females to the Inventory may be due to differentials in the attitudes of society toward deviant males and females.

Whatever the final explanation may be, attempts to account for the differences found in the responses made to the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory have given rise to a number of hypotheses which mark out areas to which future research in this field should be devoted. The instrument employed in this work seems to have sufficient discriminatory capacity to warrant its repeated use in the study of delinquents and non-delinquents. Such work would create a body of data which would make possible further testing of the instrument's discriminatory possibilities and in addition provide much needed empirical data for substantiating or nullifying much which is now regarded as determinative in crime causation. Furthermore, research of the

kind suggested by the utilization of the inventory would add an important prognostic tool to those employed by persons primarily concerned with the prevention of delinquency. If the Inventory were found adaptable to the task of segregating those children in the general population who are likely to become behavior problems or delinquents because of their emotional or personality patterns it would add immeasurably to the adequacy of a program designed to prevent behavioral maladjustments and delinquency. There is also another field of endeavor which could be materially aided by the employment of the Multiphasic Inventory in conjunction with other data, namely, in the work connected with the evaluation of treatment accorded to behavior problem children and delinquents. How adequate is the treatment prescribed by social agencies for children referred to them for aid is a question which does or should confront any agency that desires to do intelligent and satisfactory work for the clients it accepted for treatment. Any test or instrument which could be used to determine what changes have taken place in the life of the individual subjected to a plan of treatment would make it possible to test the adequacy of such a treatment plan. Evaluative work of the kind proposed would eventually create a body of knowledge which could be used to determine the most desirable treatment prescriptions for those clients accepted by an agency as well as furnishing a stimulus to efforts directed at the formulation of novel plans for those clients who possess characteristics similar to those persons with whom the agency in question has found it impossible to deal in a satisfactory manner. The evaluation of the various treatment programs of the several social agencies created to care for maladjusted children would result in providing the most intelligent and the most adequate care for the various types of maladjustments that blight the lives of those who must seek the aid of such agencies.