

1950

Personality Characteristics and Socio-Economic Status of Delinquents and Non-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, Personality Characteristics and Socio-Economic Status of Delinquents and Non-Delinquents, 40 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 570 (1949-1950)

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.

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF DELINQUENTS AND NON-DELINQUENTS¹

Elio D. Monachesi

The author of the following article has been Professor of Sociology in the University of Minnesota since 1945. He spent the year 1933-1934 in Italy on a fellowship awarded by the Social Science Research Council to enable him to study Penology and Criminology as they had developed there since Lombroso. In 1939 he published *The Rehabilitation of Children* with Edith M. H. Baylor.—EDITOR.

In a paper, published early in 1948², data were presented indicating the degree to which the *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*,³ differentiated between female and male delinquents and non-delinquents. As Capwell had found in an earlier study⁴ the MMIP consistently differentiated between female delinquents and non-delinquents.

The MMIP contains twelve scales and a question (“?”)⁵ score consisting of the number of items left unanswered. Two scales, the L and F, measure the validity of the entire record. The L scale is intended to detect the degree to which the subject falsified his answers by choosing responses which tend to place him in a socially approved position. High scores on this scale cast doubt on the value of other scale scores. The F scale measures the degree to which the subject was careless and/or incapable of understanding the meaning of the items. High F scores invalidate all other scale scores. The K scale, essentially a correction, is supposed to sharpen the discriminatory power of five clinical scales.⁶ The remaining nine scales measure the semblance in response of subjects to persons clinically diagnosed as afflicted with emotional and personality disorders suggested by the following scale titles: hypochondriasis, (Hs); depression, (D); hysteria, (Hy); psychopathic deviate, (Pd);

¹ This study was made possible by financial aid from the research funds of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota. Thanks are due to Eleanor M. Barnett, Paul M. Berry, Dorothy D. Hayes, Ruth L. E. Johnson, Edward J. Kosciolk, Mercida M. Krips, Mary D. Meko, Grace L. Solether, and Olaf H. Swenson, who aided in collecting and analyzing the data presented in this paper. The author is grateful to Donald G. Paterson, Professor of Psychology in the University of Minnesota, for many helpful criticisms and suggestions.

² Monachesi, Elio D., “Some personality characteristics of delinquents and non-delinquents.” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 38:487-500. Jan.-Feb., 1948.

³ By Hathaway, Starke E., and McKinley, J. Charnley. Published by The Psychological Corporation, New York, New York.

⁴ Capwell, Dora E., “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.

⁵ Abbreviations of titles of the scales will be used in the remainder of the paper.

⁶ The K scale is discussed at some length in a later section of the paper.

masculinity—femininity, (Mf); paranoia, (Pa); psychasthenia, (Pt); schizophrenia, (Sc); hypomania (Ma).⁷

The differences in average scores made by female delinquents and non-delinquents on the several scales of the MMIP suggested that female delinquents were more like persons diagnosed as afflicted with a variety of emotional and personality difficulties in their responses to the items of the MMIP than were female non-delinquents. The results produced by these two studies seemed to make possible the formulation of a tentative conclusion that the responses made to the items of the MMIP by female delinquents and non-delinquents reflected, or were symptomatic of emotional and personality characteristics which differentiated these two categories of females. Comparable results, however, were not produced by the MMIP for male delinquents and non-delinquents. Not only did the MMIP fail to differentiate consistently between male delinquents and non-delinquents but on some scales (Hs, Mf, Pt, Sc, and Ma) non-delinquents actually achieved higher average scores than delinquents.

The variations in the MMIP's differentiating capacity when utilized in the study of male and female delinquents and non-delinquents are found in Table I. In this table are presented critical ratios of the differences in average scores made by female and male delinquents and non-delinquents included in our first study. Noteworthy are the critical ratios of the differences in average scores made by females in that with only two exceptions they are of a magnitude which suggests that the obtained differences in average scores made by delinquents and non-delinquents are not likely to occur by chance. Furthermore, the differences in average scores achieved by the female groups are uniformly in one direction. Such, however, is not the case for males. Not only are the differences in mean scores made by delinquents and non-delinquents inconsistent but moreover

⁷ See the following for a discussion of the construction and standardization of the scales: Hathaway, Starke R., and McKinley, J. Charney, "A multiphasic personality schedule (Minnesota): I. Construction of the schedule." *Journal of Psychology*, 10:249-254, 1940. "A multiphasic personality schedule (Minnesota): II. A differential study of hypochondriasis." *Journal of Psychology*, 10:255-268, 1940. "A multiphasic personality schedule (Minnesota): III. The measurement of symptomatic depression." *Journal of Psychology*, 14:73-84, 1942. McKinley, J. Charney and Hathaway, Starke R., "A multiphasic personality schedule (Minnesota): IV. Psychasthenia." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 26:614-624, 1942. "The Minnesota personality inventory: V. Hysteria, hypomania and psychopathic deviate." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 28:153-174, 1944. Hathaway, Starke R., and McKinley, J. Charney, *Manual for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943. Meehl, Paul E., and Hathaway, Starke R., "The K factor as a suppressor variable in the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 30:525-564, 1946.

they are not as significant as those characteristic of the female groups.

TABLE I

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE IN MEAN STANDARD SCORES MADE BY DELINQUENT AND NON-DELINQUENT FEMALES AND MALES ON THE MINNESOTA MULTIPHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Scales	Critical Ratios (8)	
	Female	Male
“g”	—(9)	—(9)
L	—(9)	2.57
F	4.19	.89
Hs	3.49	—2.25
D	2.16	2.47
Hy	3.55	2.19
Pd	10.55	2.84
Mf	2.81	—4.43
Pa	6.73	1.19
Pt	5.18	—2.85
Sc	4.96	—1.72
Ma	2.82	—2.13

Effects of the K Correction

The variations in the MMIP's ability to differentiate significantly and consistently between male and female delinquents and non-delinquents are only slightly modified when corrections are made on five of the scales of the MMIP. Since the study was completed, the authors of the MMIP have developed a correction designated as the K factor applicable to the Hs, Pd, Pt, Sc, and Ma scales. The discriminatory power of the clinical variables measured by these scales is sharpened when the raw scores made on these scales are treated by the K factor. The factor itself is not supposed to have clinical significance but rather in its action tends to raise the validity of the five clinical scales. The authors of the MMIP suggest that K behaves in the role of a suppressor variable and “if it is to be given any concrete, non-statistical meaning, it might be classed as a variable of ‘attitude toward personality test items,’ although the attitude probably is more generalized than that.”¹⁰ The size of a person's K score probably varies in accordance with the state of his feelings and the influences that impinge on him at the moment that he responds to the MMIP. “His particular motivation with respect to his desire to make a good or a bad record

⁸ Critical ratios preceded by a minus (—) sign indicate scales on which non-delinquents made higher average score.

⁹ The difference between mean standard scores was so small as to make unnecessary the calculation of the critical ratio.

¹⁰ Hathaway, Starke R., and McKinley, J. Charnley, *Supplementary Manual for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. The Psychological Corporation, New York, 1946. p. 1.

at the time will affect his K score. Persons who are motivated toward getting 'good' scores (defensiveness) will tend toward higher scores on K, and those desiring 'poor' scores (plus-getting) will obtain lower values. It should not be considered necessarily that these variations are made consciously. Often the attitude develops from motivational sources not recognized by the testee."¹¹ Available evidence indicates that when scores made on the five scales affected by K are corrected the percentage of clinically diagnosed persons detected who score above the 90th percentile of normal persons is increased from 5 to 20.¹²

The changes produced in the data by the introduction of the K correction are indicated in Table II. As will be noted the differences in average scores made by female delinquents and non-delinquents remain consistent and statistically significant although the size of the critical ratio is slightly lowered for all scales except the Ma scale. In the case of the males the K corrections tend to bring the differences in average scores on the Hs and Sc scales more in keeping with expectations while nullifying the significance of the differences in average scores on

TABLE II

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCE IN UNCORRECTED AND K CORRECTED MEAN SCORES MADE BY DELINQUENT AND NON-DELINQUENT FEMALES AND MALES ON THE MINNESOTA MULTIPHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Scales	Critical Ratios (13)			
	Female		Male	
	Uncorrected	K Corrected	Uncorrected	K Corrected
Hs	3.49	2.28	-.25(13)	1.40
Pd	10.55	9.61	2.84	3.98
Pt	5.18	3.12	-2.85	-1.26
Sc	4.96	3.85	-1.72	.20
Ma	2.82	3.33	-2.13	-1.58
K	-2.12		2.48	

the Pt and Ma scales. Also of note is the change produced in the Pd scale. The K correction pushes the significance of the difference in average scores made by male delinquents and non-delinquents on the Pd scale to the one percent level. It would

¹¹ Hathaway, Starke B., and McKinley, J. Charnley, *op. cit.* p. 1.

¹² For a comprehensive discussion of the K factor see: Meehl, Paul E., and Hathaway, Starke B., "The K factor as a suppressor variable in the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 30:525-564. Oct., 1946.

¹³ Critical ratios preceded by a minus (-) sign indicate scales on which non-delinquents made higher average scores.

seem that the Pd scale includes items capable of soliciting responses from male delinquents and non-delinquents which reflect differences in personality configurations.

Although the changes brought about by the corrections introduced by K are of significance, the MMIP persists, however, in demonstrating variations in its ability to discriminate consistently and significantly between male delinquents and non-delinquents while retaining its ability to produce significant and uniform differences between female delinquents with the exception of the K scale wherein the trend is reversed. To what may such variations in the MMIP's differentiating capacity be ascribed? In the earlier paper¹⁴ it was suggested that such variations could arise out of (1) the characteristics of the samples of delinquents and non-delinquents studied or (2) be related to the conventional roles assigned by our culture to females and males. In the remainder of this paper data will be presented that test the validity of the first explanation and that indirectly bear on the plausibility of the second explanation.

The results presented in the first paper dealt with scores made on the MMIP by groups of female and male delinquents and non-delinquents tested early in 1946. Two factors operated in determining the choice of those to be tested: (1) the individual's availability; (2) the individual's socio-economic status. The first factor limited the testing to individuals who had membership in some established group, thus rendering possible the testing of a large number at one time. Such comparatively large groups of delinquents were found in the Hennepin and Ramsey Counties, Minnesota, Home Schools. Non-delinquents belonged to such groups as: Girl Reserves, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Hi-Y clubs, settlement house recreational clubs and high school classes. When it appeared that the delinquent groups were not large enough to permit the planned analyses, a group of delinquents on probation was tested. The delinquents studied, therefore, are heterogeneous to the extent that some were confined in the Home Schools and others were on probation. One hundred and twenty-eight delinquents and 175 non-delinquents were tested; however, 71 persons achieved a standard score of 70 or more on either the L or F scales thus rendering their test results questionable. The elimination of such persons from further consideration confined the analyses to the following numbers of persons: 48 delinquent girls; 79 non-delinquent girls; 49 delinquent boys; and 56 non-delinquent boys.¹⁵

¹⁴ Monachesi, Elio D., *op. cit.* pp. 496-499.

¹⁵ For group membership and other characteristics of delinquents and non-delinquents see: Monachesi, Elio D., *op. cit.* pp. 492-496.

The choice of non-delinquent groups was determined by the socio-economic status of their members. Every effort was made to make non-delinquents and delinquents comparable in socio-economic status and in order to assure such comparability the non-delinquent groups were drawn from the same neighborhoods in which the delinquents lived or had lived. In spite of this, it was found that non-delinquents were more apt to come from homes with higher socio-economic status, as measured by the father's occupational classification, than did delinquents. However, the fact that the non-delinquents lived in neighborhoods located in areas of high delinquency suggested that the MMIP's failure to discriminate between male delinquents and non-delinquents in a consistent and significant fashion may have been due to the inclusion in the non-delinquent group of a number of pre-delinquents and/or unapprehended delinquents. It is not unlikely that persons were compared who stood side by side on a behavior continuum, differentiated only by the fact of apprehension and adjudication. If this were true then the MMIP's failure to discriminate between the two male groups in a consistently significant way is to be expected since many of the members of the groups compared may be alike in emotional and personality characteristics. The differentiating features of areas of high delinquency, so ably described and analyzed by Clifford Shaw and his associates, would make such an hypothesis tenable.

Characteristics of the Groups

Data to test the validity of this hypothesis would be available if it were possible to compare young males occupying widely separated segments of the behavior and adjustment continuum—groups of young males living in residential areas free from or unburdened with pressures conducive to delinquency. The choice of such a group of non-delinquents living in areas of low delinquency was again determined by the need to get as many persons tested at one time as our resources would permit. It was, therefore, thought desirable to find a secondary school which attracted students coming from the upper middle and professional occupational groups. Such a school was found in Minneapolis. The school is located in one of the better residential sections of the city and is denominational in character. Its student body is recruited, for the most part, from Minneapolis and St. Paul, and the fact that tuition of \$150.00 per year is charged tends to exclude youths who belong to the lower income classes. An examination of the addresses of students who at-

tended the school when the testing was done indicated that they belonged to the upper income classes and lived in the better residential areas of their community. This was further substantiated by an analysis of the occupational status of the fathers of the students. Slightly over 71 percent (71.6) of the fathers belonged to the professional, semi-professional, business, managerial, and skilled occupational groups, whereas only 23.7 percent of the first group of non-delinquents and only 16.5 percent of the delinquents had fathers who fell into such occupational groups. Data on the occupational status of the fathers of the members of the three groups are found in Table III.

TABLE III
OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF FATHERS OF DELINQUENT FEMALES AND MALES, NON-DELINQUENT FEMALES AND MALES, X ACADEMY FEMALES AND MALES¹⁶

Type of Occupation	Non-Delinquent Females & Males		Delinquent Females & Males		Academy Females & Males	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professional	3	2.2	0	0.0	70	19.7
Semi-professional and retail business	7	5.2	3	3.1	66	18.5
Clerical, skilled trades and retail business	22	16.3	13	13.4	119	33.4
Farmers	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	3.1
Semi-skilled occupations, minor clerical positions..	34	25.2	28	28.9	70	19.7
Slightly skilled trades and other occupations requir- ing little training or ability	54	40.0	11	11.3	2	0.6
Day laborers of all classes.	8	5.9	39	40.2	0	0.0
Father dead and/or occupa- tion unknown.....	7	5.2	3	3.1	18	5.0

Since the school chosen was denominational and would tend to cater to children whose parents were apt to be guided by religious dictates, it may be argued that test results would be considerably different from those obtained from a random sample of the entire non-delinquent population. Such may be the case, in fact it would be surprising if it were not; however, it should be remembered that a random sample of the non-delinquent population was not the objective, what was desired were test results for a group of non-delinquents occupying an entirely different segment of the behavior continuum than did

¹⁶ The Minnesota Scale was used in classifying occupation. See: Nikolaisen, Katherine, *The Minnesota Occupational Scale*. 1948 Revision, Institute of Child Welfare, University of Minnesota, 8 mimeographed pages. For the original scale see: Goodenough, F. and Anderson, J. E., *Experimental Child Study*, Century Co., New York, 1931.

the first sample of non-delinquents. Questions may also be raised regarding the suitability for our purposes of children attending a denominational school. Some may assume that such children would make above average scores on scales designed to reflect emotional and personality adjustment states. There exists evidence, however, which suggests that such persons tend to be emotionally stable.¹⁷ There is little reason to believe that in utilizing such persons in a study of this kind groups of emotionally unstable persons are being compared.

The MMIP was administered to the students of X Academy on November 27, 1947. All students in attendance on that day were tested, a total of 439 persons—160 boys and 279 girls. Eighty-three students made standard scores of 70 and above on either the F or L scales, making necessary their elimination from further consideration. The number of persons used in the study was 123 boys, or 76.9 percent of the number tested and 233 girls or 83.5 percent of those tested.

The Academy females had a median age of 16.03 years and a mean age of 15.99 years. The median age and mean age of the Academy males were 16.89 years and 16.17 years respectively. The delinquents and non-delinquents with whom the Academy group was compared had the following age characteristics: The male delinquent group had a median age of 15.45 years and a mean age of 15.31 years. The median age and mean age of the male non-delinquents were 15.85 years and 15.70 years. The female delinquent group had a median age of 16.28 years and a mean age of 16.27 years. The female non-delinquent group was characterized by a median age of 16.42 years and a mean age of 16.37 years.¹⁸

The mean scores made by the girls of the Academy as well as the mean scores achieved by the other groups of females on the several scales of the MMIP appear in Table IV. The same data for the male groups are presented in Table V. A scrutiny of these data presented in these tables suggests that the MMIP persists in differentiating between female delinquents and non-delinquents in a consistent fashion. Furthermore, it seems to make little difference whether the non-delinquents chosen for comparison with the delinquents came from low or high socio-economic levels. There are, to be sure, two exceptions in the

¹⁷ For a recent study see: Johnson, Ruth L. E., *The Relation of Religious Attitudes and Selected Personality Characteristics*. M.A. Thesis, University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, 1948.

¹⁸ Although IQ data were available for most of the individuals studied the fact that such data were collected for the Academy group with tests different from those utilized in testing the other groups rendered these data not comparable.

direction of mean score, the L and K scores. However, the uniformity in higher mean scores for delinquent females on all

TABLE IV

MEAN STANDARD SCORES, CORRECTED (K) SCORES, AND DIFFERENCES IN MEAN SCORES MADE BY ACADEMY FEMALE GROUP, A DELINQUENT FEMALE GROUP AND A NON-DELINQUENT FEMALE GROUP ON THE MINNESOTA MULTIPHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Scales	Mean Scores			Difference in Mean Scores		
	Academy Females	Non-Delinquent Females	Delinquent Females	Academy Females and Non-Delinquent Females	Academy Females and Delinquent Females ¹⁹	Non-Delinquent Females and Delinquent Females ¹⁹
f	50.75	50.35	50.39	.40	.36	.04
L	55.65	54.40	54.38	1.25	-1.27	-.02
F	55.45	56.04	60.73	.59	5.28	4.69
Hs	50.85	49.91	53.85	.94	3.00	3.94
D	49.30	49.02	54.06	.28	4.76	5.04
Hy	53.40	51.55	55.00	1.85	1.60	3.45
Pd	58.44	57.57	76.88	.87	18.44	19.31
Mf	53.62	50.80	55.53	2.82	1.91	4.73
Pa	52.86	55.35	66.46	2.49	13.60	11.11
Pt	56.11	55.10	59.27	1.01	3.16	4.17
Sc	56.09	57.69	64.69	1.60	8.60	7.00
Ma	56.43	55.54	61.35	.89	4.92	5.81
K	56.15	54.02	50.94	2.13	-5.21	-3.08

TABLE V

MEAN STANDARD SCORES, CORRECTED (K) SCORES, AND DIFFERENCES IN MEAN SCORES MADE BY X ACADEMY MALE GROUP, A DELINQUENT MALE GROUP, AND A NON-DELINQUENT MALE GROUP ON THE MINNESOTA MULTIPHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Scales	Mean Scores			Difference in Mean Scores		
	Academy Males	Non-Delinquent Males	Delinquent Males	Academy Males and Non-Delinquent Males	Academy Males and Delinquent Males ¹⁹	Non-Delinquent Males and Delinquent Males ²⁰
f	50.87	50.17	50.09	.70	-.78	-.08
L	55.02	53.57	55.97	1.45	.95	2.40
F	58.23	59.65	59.75	1.42	1.52	.10
Hs	53.56	53.30	56.18	.26	2.62	2.88
D	51.24	51.70	56.68	.46	5.44	4.98
Hy	53.60	53.21	56.79	.39	3.19	3.58
Pd	59.41	60.54	68.21	1.13	8.80	7.67
Mf	53.80	53.75	53.01	.05	-.79	-.74
Pa	53.03	55.81	58.01	2.78	4.98	2.20
Pt	57.30	58.93	56.48	1.63	-.82	-2.45
Sc	59.70	62.32	62.81	2.62	3.11	.49
Ma	58.76	61.07	57.70	2.31	-1.06	-3.37
K	53.35	51.17	55.26	2.18	1.91	4.09

¹⁹ Differences preceded by a minus (-) sign are in an unexpected direction in that delinquents made lower mean scores than non-delinquents.

²⁰ Differences preceded by a minus (-) sign are in an unexpected direction in that delinquents made lower mean scores than non-delinquents.

other scales in the MMIP suggests that the responses made to the items of the MMIP by female delinquents reflect emotional characteristics which serve to differentiate them from non-delinquents. The evidence presented here, in addition to that collected by Capwell, tends to lead to the conclusion that female delinquents and non-delinquents differ in emotional and personality characteristics regardless of differences in socio-economic status.

The MMIP, however, persists in its inability to differentiate in a consistent fashion between delinquent and non-delinquent males. As will be noted, on some scales, notably the "F", Mf, Pt, and Ma scales, non-delinquent males achieved higher mean scores than delinquent males. It is apparent that no significant modifications are produced when delinquent boys are compared with non-delinquent boys belonging to higher socio-economic levels. It would seem, therefore, that delinquent and non-delinquent males are not too much unlike in their responses to most of the scales of the MMIP.

The significance that may be attached to differences in mean scores for the two female groups and two male groups is indicated by the critical ratios presented in Table VI. Academy females are significantly differentiated from delinquent females on seven scales of the MMIP—that is, the F score, the D, Pd, Pa, Pt, Sc, and Ma scales. On the other hand, in the earlier study non-delinquent females differed significantly from delinquent females on ten of the scales.²¹ Both groups of non-delinquent females achieve significantly higher mean scores on the K scale than do delinquents indicating that non-delinquents tended to be more defensive or evasive (consciously or unconsciously) in their responses. At first glance, data on K tend to fit into the suggestions made by Meehl and Hathaway²² that elevated K scores seem to be related to high socio-economic status. College, pre-college and college-educated persons belonging to higher socio-economic classes on the average make higher scores on K than do less educated persons. Such a relationship is, however, reversed by the data collected on males. Both groups of non-delinquent males make lower mean scores on K than do delinquents, and in fact in one instance the difference in such mean scores is significant. Obviously, factors other than socio-economic status are operating to produce differences in K scores of the male groups.

²¹ Critical ratio of two or more.

²² Meehl, Paul E. and Hathaway, Starke B., *op. cit.* pp. 559-560.

Discussion

Despite the fact that when female delinquents are compared with a sample of female non-delinquents of high socio-economic status (Academy group) three of the clinical scales of the MMIP lose their discriminatory capacity, the evidence in general persists in demonstrating that female delinquents differ significantly from female non-delinquents in personality characteristics as measured by the MMIP. In short, it would appear that if responses made to the items of the MMIP do reflect emotional and personality characteristics, female delinquents and non-delinquents possess significantly different personality configurations. Whether these personality differences are merely temporary and related to the traumatic experiences created by the process of detection, apprehension and adjudication of delinquency or whether they are basic and find expression in delinquency in the female cannot be determined at the moment. As is well known, delinquency and crime are male prerogatives and erring females are apt to receive different treatment and to arouse different emotions than do male offenders. To what degree the emotional disturbances and personality maladjustment reflected in the scores made by female delinquents on the

TABLE VI

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE IN MEAN STANDARD AND CORRECTED
(K) SCORES MADE BY X ACADEMY FEMALES AND MALES, NON-
DELINQUENT FEMALES AND MALES AND DELINQUENT
FEMALES AND MALES ON
THE MINNESOTA MULTIPHASIC PERSONALITY INVENTORY

Scales	Critical Ratios ²³					
	Females			Males		
	Academy Females and Non- Delinquent Females	Academy Females and Delinquent Females	Non- Delinquent Females and Delinquent Females	Academy Males and Non- Delinquent Males	Academy Males and Delinquent Males	Non- Delinquent Males and Delinquent Males
f	.35	.25	.05	.77	-.30	-.09
L	2.41	-1.88	-.03	3.10	1.15	2.57
F	.93	4.32	4.19	1.53	1.70	.89
Hs	.95	1.90	2.28	.16	1.43	1.40
D	.15	2.14	2.16	.29	3.12	2.47
Hy	1.86	1.15	3.55	.28	2.37	2.19
Pd	.64	10.63	9.61	.75	5.32	3.98
Mf	2.31	1.40	2.81	.03	-.53	-.43
Pa	2.10	9.26	6.73	1.81	3.28	1.19
Pt	.92	2.95	3.12	1.09	-.47	-1.26
Sc	1.37	5.36	3.85	1.31	1.51	.20
Ma	.65	3.30	3.33	1.40	-.56	-1.58
K	1.88	-4.38	-2.12	1.51	1.32	2.48

²³ Critical ratios preceded by a minus (—) sign indicates scales on which non-delinquents made higher average scores.

MMIP are produced by differences in attitude and treatment accorded them by society must be known before it can be said that the personality maladjustment as measured by the MMIP is basic to the delinquency of the female. In any case, data presented by Capwell and the author tend to support the conclusion that female delinquents are unlike female non-delinquents in personality characteristics.

Data collected for males indicate again that the MMIP is unable to differentiate between male delinquents and non-delinquents as effectively as it does between female delinquents and non-delinquents. Only four scales, D, Hy, Pd, and Pa produced differences in mean scores made by the Academy males and delinquent males which may not be due to chance. Such significant differences in mean scores were made by the first non-delinquent group and the delinquent group on five scales—the L, D, Hy, Pd, and K. It would seem, therefore, that male delinquents in contrast to female delinquents, are afflicted, in general, with a lesser degree of personality maladjustment, indicating again that on many of the clinical variables measured by the MMIP male delinquents are not unlike male non-delinquents and that delinquency is not as often the manifestation of personality maladjustment in males as seems to be true of females. However, in spite of the MMIP's inability to produce as strikingly uniform and significant differences between male delinquents and non-delinquents as it does for females, it is able to reproduce some of the same significant differences when two different groups of non-delinquent males are compared with delinquent males. Such consistencies are noted for the D, Hy, and Pd scales. The repetition of such significant differences tends to suggest that male delinquents are more apt to be afflicted with depression, hysteria, and psychopathy than are non-delinquent males.

The differences in mean scores made by the Academy male group, the non-delinquent male group and delinquent male group as well as the critical ratios of these differences lend no support to the assumption that the members of the Academy male group are to be found in a "better" segment of the adjustment and behavior continuum than the members of the non-delinquent male group. The Academy males are significantly differentiated from the other non-delinquent male group on the L scale. The differences in mean scores achieved by these two groups on the other scales are not significant. The evidence suggests that the Academy males are in general no less maladjusted than non-delinquent males who reside in high delinquency areas. Fur-

ther, the data presented seem to indicate that the MMIP's failure to differentiate significantly and uniformly between male delinquents and non-delinquents in the first study could not be produced by the inclusion within the non-delinquent group of a number of pre-delinquent and/or unapprehended delinquents. Such conclusion is tenable only if it can be assumed that the Academy group would include none or at most only a very few such individuals. The evidence collected seems therefore, to indicate that the several scales of the MMIP, with the exception of the D, Hy and Pd, do not consistently and significantly differentiate male delinquents and non-delinquents as they do female delinquents and non-delinquents. It seems reasonable to conclude that female delinquents on the average, are characterized by a greater variety of personality disturbances than are male delinquents.

Of note are the differences found on the Pd scale. The most significant differences in mean scores made by both male and female delinquents and non-delinquents are on this scale indicating that delinquents are often apt to be persons unable, because of lacks in themselves or in their environment, to become fully socialized. These are the persons who are emotionally shallow, unable to profit from experience, lacking in self-criticism and sympathy, unmindful of the rights and feelings of others, incapable of appreciating the consequences of their anti-social behavior—in short, lacking in their personality structure the essential ingredients of an attribute which is usually referred to as "conscience."²⁴ In view of the limited response made by such persons to therapy the data presented above makes it imperative to gain knowledge of how and under what conditions psychopathy develops in order that basic and more realistic programs for the prevention and treatment of delinquency may be created.

Finally it may be said that up to this point the MMIP has proven to be a valuable tool in the study of the personality characteristics of delinquents by the fact that its use suggests the existence of significant differences in the personality structure of delinquents and non-delinquents. The results produced by several scales of the MMIP indicate that delinquents are more alike in their response to the items of the MMIP to clinically diagnosed abnormals than are non-delinquents. These empirical data tend to support the hypothesis that delinquency is an expression of or symptomatic of fundamental personality

²⁴ For an able discussion of psychopathy see: Gough, Harrison, "A sociological theory of psychopathy." *American Journal of Sociology*, 53:359-366. March, 1948.

maladjustment if it can be assumed that responses made to the MMIP reflect such maladjustment. It must, however, be remembered that these data can be said to support such an hypothesis only if it is found that the differences between delinquents and non-delinquents delineated by the several scales of the MMIP are not created by the traumatic experiences which accompany for some the process of being apprehended and being adjudicated delinquent. If it can be demonstrated that differences are produced by such a process, then it is necessary to look elsewhere for factors that find expression in delinquency. In any case, regardless of what future empirical research will show, the MMIP has been found to differentiate adequately adjudicated delinquents and non-delinquents on several of its scales. This has not been true of most questionnaires and tests hitherto employed in the study of delinquents and non-delinquents.