



LEHIGH
UNIVERSITY

Library &
Technology
Services

The Preserve: Lehigh Library Digital Collections

The Effects Of Incarceration On The Intelligence, Achievement And Personality Characteristics Of Adjudicated Male Delinquents.

Citation

PECK, THOMAS EDWARD. *The Effects Of Incarceration On The Intelligence, Achievement And Personality Characteristics Of Adjudicated Male Delinquents*. 1977, <https://preserve.lehigh.edu/lehigh-scholarship/graduate-publications-theses-dissertations/theses-dissertations/effects-82>.

Find more at <https://preserve.lehigh.edu/>

This document is brought to you for free and open access by Lehigh Preserve. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of Lehigh Preserve. For more information, please contact preserve@lehigh.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-20,721

PECK, Thomas Edward, 1932-
THE EFFECTS OF INCARCERATION ON THE
INTELLIGENCE, ACHIEVEMENT AND PERSONALITY
CHARACTERISTICS OF ADJUDICATED MALE
DELINQUENTS.

Lehigh University, Ed.D., 1977
Psychology, general

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

THE EFFECTS OF INCARCERATION ON THE
INTELLIGENCE, ACHIEVEMENT AND PERSONALITY
CHARACTERISTICS OF ADJUDICATED MALE DELINQUENTS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
Lehigh University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Thomas Edward Peck
December, 1976

Approved and recommended for acceptance as a dissertation
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education.

19 January, 1977
(date)

Raymond Bell
Professor in Charge

Accepted 19 January, 1977
(date)

Special committee directing the
doctoral work of
Mr. Thomas Edward Peck

Raymond Bell
Chairman

Alfred J. Castaldi
James R. McArthur

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation and Gratitude are extended

to

Dr. Raymond Bell
Assistant Professor of Education
who provided guidance and direction

and

Dr. Margaret C. Grandovic
Associate Professor of Education
who gave me the opportunity

and

Mrs. Arlene Peck
whose patience and understanding
made my graduate studies possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	
The Delinquency Dilemma	4
The Rights of Juvenile Delinquents.	6
The Problem	9
Hypotheses.	10
Importance of the Study	13
II. THE PROBLEM OF DELINQUENCY IN THE NATION AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA	
The National Commitment	14
Delinquency in Pennsylvania	18
Delinquency in Dauphin County	24
III. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
Historical Background	28
Failure in the Delinquency System	31
Predicting Delinquency.	35
Delinquency Treatment Models.	37
Delinquency and Intelligence Quotient	49
Delinquency and Scholastic Achievement	54
IV. SAMPLE AND PROCEDURES	
The Population and Sample Group	59
The Procedure	61
1. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale	61
2. Wide Range Achievement Test	63
3. Projective Personality Measurements	66
Statistical Analysis.	68
V. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	
Method of Statistical Analysis.	70
Analysis of the Hypotheses.	71
Discussion of the Data.	77
1. Intelligence.	77
2. Achievement	79
3. Personality Characteristics	80

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary.	81
Conclusions.	82
Implications for Future Research	88
Testing Delimitations.	89

APPENDIXES

A. Increases in Serious Crimes--Juvenile and Adult.	15
B. Operational Definition of Terms	92
C. Individual Test Scores.	95
Table I-A Wechsler Full Scale I.Q.	95
Table II-A Wechsler Verbal I.Q..	96
Table III-A Wechsler Performance I.Q..	97
Table IV-A Wechsler Verbal and Performance Subtests.	98
Table V Pre & Post Wechsler Subtest Scaled Score Differences	102
Table VI-A Wide Range Achievement Test Scores.	103
Table VII-A Bender-Gestalt Test Scores	104

BIBLIOGRAPHY	105
------------------------	-----

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

Thomas E. Peck

Lehigh University

1976

The Effects of Incarceration on the Intelligence,
Achievement and Personality Characteristics of
Adjudicated Male Delinquents

Thirty male delinquents between 16 and 18 years of age who had been placed in a county prison and tried before the juvenile courts and subsequently placed in a maximum security institution for at least six months, were evaluated to determine the effects, if any, on the intelligence, achievement and personality characteristics.

The results were analyzed using the correlated "t" technique for related means. The level of significance was at the .05 level. Three major hypotheses stated that there would be no significant difference on the intelligence, achievement levels or personality characteristics as a result of imprisonment and court involvement. The post testing revealed significant results in all three areas which enabled the investigator to reject the three main hypotheses. All thirty subjects improved in the full scale intelligence as measured by the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Test. The range was two points to twenty-five points. Sub

hypotheses dealing with the verbal and performance scores and all the individual subtests revealed significant differences beyond the .05 level.

The sample's achievement, as measured by scores on the Wide Range Achievement Test, also improved in all three areas with the range from six months in reading to over one year in arithmetic. All three areas are significant beyond the .05 level and therefore the hypothesis was rejected. The personality characteristics were diagnosed using the Bender-Gestalt protocol which are independent of organic involvement and indicate emotional factors. The hypothesis was rejected as significant improvement was noted in at least one area.

The results of the investigation conclude that the pre test scores completed in a county prison can be depressed by an abrupt change in environment, acute anxieties and uncertainties regarding the future and were not influenced by any meaningful training or rehabilitation program.

It is concluded that the impact of judicial proceeding on the test functioning of juvenile offenders, as measured in this study relating to areas of intelligence quotient, academic achievement, and personality characteristics is a realistic and compelling one. Results indicate a need for more appropriate testing in terms of the time element for conditions during test administration are usually critical. In this study, where the results of testing is reported to be an aid to proper placement in suitable programs, an awareness of the outcome of this study is both necessary and meaningful. The study reveals the need

for a more accurate method of testing confined delinquents and generates the need for additional research into the effects of long-range institutional placements on the measured intelligence, academic achievement and personality characteristics of delinquents.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The problems of juvenile delinquency have increased as our society becomes more complex. National, state, and local governments have recognized the problems and the need for new approaches to treatment and rehabilitation methods. One area of major concern is the delinquent who is apprehended and placed in a secure facility such as a county prison until his appearance before the juvenile court. Many times these delinquents are administered a battery of tests which are used to select the proper treatment program in an appropriate institution. This investigation will explore the effects of incarceration on selected standardized tests of Intelligence, Achievement, and Personality Characteristics as it relates to delinquents who are apprehended and temporarily held in prison and, as a result of a court trial, are confined to the Camp Hill Correctional School which is a state operated maximum security institution.

The first chapter will explore the extent of the delinquency problem, define the rights of confined delinquents, and explain the treatment as defined by state and court philosophies.

The Delinquency Dilemma

One of the most alarming facts about crime in America is the soaring rate of delinquency among the nation's youth

and the apparent lack of effective rehabilitation and treatment methods. Between 1960 and 1973 the number of juveniles arrested for all types of criminal offenses increased by 144 per cent.¹ For "serious crimes" the increase was 116 per cent.² The "serious crime" category does not mean petty thievery or vandalism but crimes such as manslaughter, forcible rape, armed robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, auto theft, and larceny of money and valuable property. In this same period, violent crimes committed by delinquents increased faster than the same crimes committed by adults.³ The total number of juveniles arrested in 1973 for all criminal offenses reported was 1,717,366.⁴ This is more than one fourth of the total for all age groups. Delinquents under 18 accounted for 11 per cent of all arrests for killings, 34 per cent of those for armed or strong-armed robberies, 20 per cent of those for rape, 17 per cent of those for aggravated assault, 54 per cent of those for burglaries, 56 per cent of those for auto theft, and 48 per cent of those for larceny.⁵

Many citizens who fled from crime in the city are finding that crime has followed them to the suburbs and small towns.⁶ FBI statistics for the first half of 1974 clearly demonstrate this

¹Kelley, Clarence, Director. Federal Bureau of Investigation, U. S. Department of Justice. Uniform Crime Report. Washington, D. C. March 31, 1975.

²Ibid.

³Ibid.

⁴Kelley, Clarence, Director. FBI. March 29, 1974.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

trend. They show the following rates of juvenile crime increase according to community size.⁷ Cities over 1 million in population had a six per cent rise in all crimes. Cities over one hundred thousand to one million population experienced a 12 to 15 per cent increase. Cities under twenty-five thousand, a 25 per cent increase and suburbs and rural areas, a 19 to 21 per cent increase. This increase in juvenile crime has placed a heavy burden on many community agencies which deal with the delinquency problem. The police, family agencies, schools, probation and court authorities, all are attempting to "solve" an ever increasing complex problem. The final responsibility rests with the court system which appears to be restricted by an ever increasing caseload and a lack of adequate rehabilitation programs.

The Rights of Juvenile Delinquents

The complex court procedures, agency regulations, and confinement methods make it difficult to enforce the individual rights of juveniles. The Congress enacted Public Law 93-415 in September of 1974 to guarantee juveniles the same rights as adults who would commit the same type of crime. Included in the Law were the "Due Process" procedures and individual rights relating to legal counsel, confinement and treatment methods.

The landmark case argued before the Supreme Court involved the Gault Decision of 1967. Gerald Gault was a fifteen year old male who was imprisoned without his parent's knowledge. After

⁷Ibid.

locating their son in a detention center, the parents were able to learn the specific charges causing his confinement. The hearing was held and no one was sworn in as a witness, no transcript was taken, and no records prepared. This case ruled against the juvenile laws of Arizona because, contrary to the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, the juvenile was taken from the custody of his parents and committed to a state institution without parental knowledge. This action gives the juvenile court unlimited discretion which enables them to violate the following basic rights:⁸

1. Notice of the charges.
2. Right to counsel.
3. Right to confrontation and cross examination.
4. Right to confrontation and self-incrimination.
5. Right to a transcript of proceedings.
6. Right to appellate review.

The Gault Decision of 1967 held that the children must be told of the charges against them. They must be given a chance to confront their accusers, and allowed to consult an attorney.⁹ The most extreme action available to the juvenile court involves incarceration of youths into government operated maximum security institutions. The services utilized by the court in making this decision to incarcerate youths should provide a vigorous test for the court's objective of individualized treatment.¹⁰

⁸Putzel, Henry. Cases Adjudged in the Supreme Court. United States Reports, Vol. 387, October, 1966, pp 1-81.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰U. S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Juvenile Confinement Institutions and Correctional Systems, Hearing, 92nd Congress, 1st Sess. May 3, 1971, (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1972).

The phrase "individualized treatment" actually connotes a whole theory of juvenile delinquency as well as theory of rehabilitation of delinquents. For example, the state of Tennessee's Juvenile Court Law states that a youth can be declared delinquent upon the court finding the youth in need of treatment and rehabilitation.¹¹

Delinquency is treated as a problem of a youth's adjustment and not as a problem arising out of the youth's social position and the social conditions which influence youth in the society. Hence, the social conditions contributing to delinquency are overlooked while youths are subjected to treatment as a result of the effects of these social conditions.¹²

The adherence of most juvenile courts to the psychological model of delinquency causation has slanted court programs in the direction of the individual treatment concept. The psychological model is patterned after the Fruedian concepts of the early Twentieth Century.¹³ These concepts attempted to explain neurotic behavior on the basis of social pressure blocking the expression of an individual's biological impulses. These impulses had to be expressed or released if the individual was to make a satisfactory adjustment.¹⁴ Almost completely disregarded has been the broader question of social reform. If the courts are to understand the total delinquency problem and alter the individual treatment

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

concept to include social reform, basic changes in the definition of delinquency and causation will need to be accepted by the courts.¹⁵

The actions of the juvenile court often appear to be in conflict with the court's own stated philosophy when youths under their jurisdiction are viewed from a political control perspective rather than an individualized treatment perspective. The political control perspective means controlling and attempting to alter behavior judged in violation of the system of laws developed by a community and enforced by the judicial system.¹⁶ Let it be emphasized that what is at issue is not a particular court, but the system which renders juvenile justice and treatment is being questioned.

The ineffectiveness of the "treatment" offered by institutions is reflected by Sargarent who reports a 75 per cent recidivism rate for delinquents in Massachusetts.¹⁷ Dr. Richard Korn, et al, testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Confinement Institutions and Correctional Systems gives extensive and expert testimony as to the adverse effects on delinquents who have been entrapped in the total court institutional cycle of so-called rehabilitation programs.¹⁸

The Problem

This study will be exploratory in nature. It will determine

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

if any differences exist between scores of intelligence, achievement and personality characteristics of juvenile delinquents taken at the time of prison confinement and the scores on tests which measure intelligence, achievement, and personality characteristics after adjudication and at least six months confinement in a maximum security institution. It is suggested that if such differences exist they can be ascertained by differential responses, across time, on appropriate validated instruments. "Across time" refers to the interval between apprehension and the completion of a minimum of six months detention in a maximum security institution. This investigation will attempt to determine if any differences exist between test scores at the time of apprehension and a period of confinement and to suggest the possible causes for change, if in fact they do exist.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses will be investigated to determine if a difference exists between test scores at the time of apprehension and after six months confinement in a maximum security institution.

H₁ - There will be no significant change in the Intelligence Quotient as measured by the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

H₂ - There will be no significant change in the Achievement Grade Level as measured by the Wide Range Achievement Test at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least

six months placement in a maximum security institution.

H_3 - There will be no significant change on Personality Characteristics as measured by the Bender-Gestalt Test at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

H_1 will be tested utilizing the Full Scale IQ of the Wechsler Test. Since the test will provide additional information regarding ability to deal with verbal concepts and problem solving, as well as a number of perceptual motor tasks (there may be differential effects on the various sub-levels of the Wechsler) additional hypotheses can be tested for purposes of more specific information, which can effect placement. These additional hypotheses are:

H_{1A} - There will be no significant change on the Verbal IQ at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

H_{1B} - There will be no significant change on the Performance IQ at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution. Since there were subtests of Performance used in this study, the following hypothesis was also tested:

H_{1A1} - There will be no significant change at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution in the areas of the Wechsler subtests such as Object Assembly, Picture Arrangement, Block Design, Picture Completion, Digit Symbol, Vocabulary, Digit Span, Similarities, Arithmetic, Comprehension and Information.

H_1 will be rejected if the differences in at least one test results from pre to post are significant to the .05 level. The sub Hypothesis will provide additional information, and tests of significance will also be performed.

H_2 will be tested utilizing the Wide Range Achievement Test. The test covers performance in the areas of Reading, Arithmetic, and Spelling. A significant change in performance in any of the three areas (differential test results at pre versus post time) will be judged significant at the .05 level and be sufficient grounds to reject the hypothesis. However, again in view of the usefulness of additional data, the following sub Hypothesis will also be tested:

H_{2A} - There will be no significant change on Reading performance as a consequence of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

H_{2B} - There will be no significant change on Arithmetic performance as a consequence of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

H_{2C} - There will be no significant change in Spelling performance as a consequence of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

As in H_1 , should any significant difference between pre- and post-test at the .05 level occur in at least one of the three areas, this will be considered sufficient grounds to reject Hypothesis₂.

H_3 will be tested using the Bender-Gestalt Test in the areas of Increase in Size, Confused Order, Large Drawings, Expansion

and Constriction. Should there be significant pre-post changes in at least one of the above areas, H_3 will be rejected. For purposes of this study, H_3 will be considered thusly:

H_3 - There will be no significant change on Personality Characteristics at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

Importance of the Study

The investigator of this research paper evaluated many delinquents who were confined to a county prison while awaiting court action. The confinement and treatment of juveniles are changing because all known methods have not successfully lowered the recidivism rate. The institutions are overcrowded and many delinquents are inappropriately placed without consideration for their basic needs. Experience indicated that many could not function at their true potential because of disabling states of anxiety and other personality maladjustments. Conversations with court authorities, probation officers, and other interested parties, indicated an awareness of the problem but no factual knowledge was available. A review of the literature revealed no similar studies.

Chapter II

THE PROBLEM OF DELINQUENCY IN THE NATION AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

This chapter will present background information to gain perspective in relation to the scope and seriousness of the delinquency problem. The chapter will discuss the national commitment in terms of federal laws and finances authorized by Congress. The Pennsylvania Juvenile Act and juveniles processed by the courts will also be reported. The delinquency problem in Dauphin County will be explored in relation to the numbers of juveniles, cost, and types of violations involving delinquents.

The National Commitment

Speaking before the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in May of 1972, Senator Birch Bayh, the chairman, stated that the alarming increase in juvenile crimes is a problem of crisis proportions. For nearly every type of crime, the increase is greater for youths than adults. The Federal Bureau of Investigation's figures for the years 1960 to 1973 reveal the following percentage increases for violent, property and other crimes:¹

¹Kelley, Clarence, Director. Uniform Crime Report, 1973.

PERCENTAGE INCREASE OF VIOLENT CRIMES

Juvenile and Adult 1960-1973

	<u>Juveniles under 18</u>	<u>Adults over 18</u>
<u>Violent Crimes:</u>		
Murder	201%	85%
Rape	132%	95%
Robbery	299%	125%
Assault	206%	101%
 <u>Property Crimes:</u>		
Burglary	104%	59%
Larceny	124%	129%
Auto Theft	51%	80%
 <u>Other Crimes:</u>		
Forgery	105%	27%
Fraud	205%	81%
Receiving Stolen Property	529%	387%
Prostitution	285%	62%
Narcotic Laws	4,673%	774%
Drunken Driving	401%	188%

Crime in the United States as measured by the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Crime Index during 1974 increased 17 per cent. Violent crimes, as a group, increased 11 per cent. Robbery increased 14 per cent, while forcible rape and aggravated assault rose 9 per cent. Murder was up 5 per cent. The property crimes of burglary, larceny-theft and motor vehicle theft increased 17 per cent as a group. Larceny-theft rose 20 per cent, burglary 17 per cent and motor vehicle theft 4 per cent. Cities with 100,000 or more inhabitants reported an average increase of 13 per cent in the volume of Crime Index offenses. Crime was up 20

per cent in the suburban areas and 21 per cent in the rural areas.²

Geographically, the Southern states reported a 21 per cent rise in the volume of Crime Index offenses. Crime in the North Central States was up 17 per cent, in the Northeastern States 15 per cent and in the Western States 13 per cent.³

The total number of youngsters involved have caused officials on all levels to reassess the seriousness of the problem and recruit the national government in an effort to reverse a national trend. Senator Bayh stated that the juvenile justice system is a failure and the ineffectiveness of the federal delinquency effort has been described in detail by many expert witnesses before the Senate Subcommittee. The federal effort is a conglomeration of diverse, uncoordinated federal programs which are supposed to be dealing with juvenile delinquency. Senator Bayh now concludes that these programs are ineffective and nothing short of restructuring the national effort will produce the desperately needed national leadership in the fight against delinquency.

In response to the testimony of expert witnesses from across the United States, the demands of state and local government agencies, and the needs of the juveniles themselves, the "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974" was passed by Congress on September 7, 1974. This Act provides for a new national Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention within the Executive Office of the President with the authority to supervise, coordinate, and evaluate all federally assisted delinquency programs. The main thrust

²Kelley, FBI, 1974

³Ibid.

of the federal commitment centers around the following:⁴

- (1) to develop national standards and guidelines for the juvenile courts and juvenile detention and correction facilities;
- (2) to implement the provisions of recent Supreme Court decisions to provide the rights of juveniles and provide other basic protections for juveniles under federal jurisdiction;
- (3) to create real alternatives to the traditional juvenile correction process by developing innovative approaches and alternatives to the present methods of dealing with delinquency.

To accomplish the provisions of the new Federal Law, 350 million dollars have been authorized for the next three years (1975-1977) to develop and implement delinquency prevention, diversion, and rehabilitation programs.⁵ The heart of this revitalized federal fight on delinquency will be the provision of funds to develop innovative approaches and alternatives to the present method of dealing with delinquency.

To implement the intent of the Law, existing state and local agencies are challenged to develop new programs. Also included are any public or private agency, institution, or individual, who can seek funds to carry out the purposes of the Law. The federal government has taken steps to provide the national direction and finances to the states and agencies who must administer the programs. In the event that any state fails to submit a plan, or submits a plan which does not meet federal guidelines, the money

⁴U. S. Congress. Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Hearing, 93rd Congress, 1st Sess. May 15, 1972 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1973).

⁵Ibid.

allotted to the state shall be available for public or private agencies for special emphasis, prevention and treatment programs as defined by the federal laws. The new federal law is broad and appears all inclusive in relation to the needs for new and alternative programs for the delinquent. The federal government has committed itself, but the task of implementing the law rests with each individual state and its supporting agencies. The intent of the law is clear but no concrete programs or alternatives have been developed because the federal government has not appropriated any monies to carry out the newly passed Public Law 93-415.

Delinquency in Pennsylvania

In December of 1972 the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania enacted the "Juvenile Act" relating to the care, guidance, control, trial, placement and commitment of the delinquent and deprived children. The Juvenile Act is commonly referred to as Act 333 and repealed absolutely all previous county and state juvenile laws.

The Act is comprehensive in scope. Of special importance for this research investigation is Section 14 which defines places of detention:

Section 14. Place of Detention

- (a) A child alleged to be delinquent may be detained only in:
- (1) A licensed foster home or a home approved by the court;
 - (2) a facility operated by a licensed child welfare agency or one approved by the court;
 - (3) a detention home, camp, center or other

facility for delinquent children which is under the direction or supervision of the court or other public authority or private agency, and is approved by the Department of Public Welfare, or

- (4) any other suitable place or facility, designated or operated by the court and approved by the Department of Public Welfare. Under no circumstances shall a child be detained, placed or committed in any facility with adults, or where he or she is apt to be abused by other children unless there is no appropriate facility available, in which case the child shall be kept separate and apart from such adults at all times and shall be detained, placed, or committed under such circumstances for not more than five days.

- (b) The official in charge of a jail or other facility for the detention of adult offenders or persons charged with crime shall inform the court immediately if a person who is or appears to be under the age of eighteen years is received at the facility and shall bring him before the court upon request or deliver him to a detention or shelter or care facility designated by the court.
- (c) If a case is transferred for criminal prosecution the child may be transferred to the appropriate officer or detention facility in accordance with the law governing the detention of persons charged with crime. The court in making the transfer may order continued detention as a juvenile pending trial if the child is unable to provide bail.

Section 14 states that delinquents can be placed in approved facilities only operated by the Department of Public Welfare. The procedures followed by the juvenile courts of Dauphin County are in conflict with the intent of Act 333. There is no approved detention center and some juveniles are held in adult prisons. Juvenile delinquents must be certified as adults if they are to be maintained in a secure facility. Once the juvenile has been sentenced by the courts, the judges across the Commonwealth face a lack of realistic alternatives. Many "hard-core" recidivists cannot be maintained

unless placed in a secure facility which houses only adult prisoners.⁶

Robert P. Vogel, Assistant Attorney General for the state of Pennsylvania, states in a letter to Senator Scott of Pennsylvania that one of the major problems in the field of juvenile justice in Pennsylvania today is the apparent fragmentation of responsibility for confinement and treatment. The responsibility for dealing with the various aspects of juvenile delinquency within the state is divided among a host of agencies. There are 157 locally-based juvenile police units, 67 county-based juvenile courts and probation units, 12 privately operated delinquency institutions, and 9 state operated youth development centers. At times there is little, if any, communication between the various agencies. One result is that too many children are arrested and placed in institutions when they could be handled by various community agencies, or alternative programs.⁷

The latest figures regarding juveniles processed by the Pennsylvania Juvenile Courts in 1973 were 41,377. This is an increase of over two thousand from the previous year. Of the total number processed in 1973, there were 2,323 placed in private or public institutions.⁸ The juvenile court system in Pennsylvania suffers from a lack of alternatives. The first alternative is

⁶ Act 333. General Assembly of Pennsylvania, December, 1972.

⁷ Boylan, James. Department of Justice. Juvenile Court Dispositions. Bureau of Criminal Justice, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1973.

⁸ Ibid.

probation [which, because of probation officers' case loads, offers little delinquent/probation contact] or placement in an institution.⁹

A recent court survey in the State of Pennsylvania's youth development centers reported by the Assistant Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the United States Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency indicated that at least fifty per cent of the youngsters incarcerated in Pennsylvania did not warrant such action if appropriate alternatives existed in their home communities.¹⁰ The Pennsylvania Senate Committee on Problems of Youth recommended a "probation subsidy" that would encourage county courts to keep juvenile offenders out of jails and detention homes. These funds then would be used to develop comprehensive community probation programs.

The State has recently announced a decision to close the Camp Hill Correctional Institution facility to juveniles under age 18. The Juvenile Judges' Commission have shown some concern for the juvenile court system in Harrisburg and other Pennsylvania cities because services in halfway houses, residential treatment centers, and detention centers on a large scale basis are not presently available.¹¹

The Pennsylvania Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics

⁹U. S. Congress, p 791.

¹⁰Boylan, Juvenile Court Dispositions.

¹¹Lipsitt, Judge William. The Evening News, (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania), May 14, 1975, p 12.

reveal that Philadelphia County handles 37.5% of the juveniles processed throughout the Commonwealth. Allegheny County followed with 20.8%, Montgomery County ranked third with 3.3%, Bucks County fourth with 2.5% and Westmoreland fifth with 2.2%. Dauphin County processed less than 2% of the statewide total.¹²

Of the total number of juveniles processed officially throughout the State, Allegheny County ranked first in custody transferrals with 35.7% (1,647). Philadelphia County followed with 19.2% (908) and Dauphin County ranked third with 4.3% (205). Cumberland County had 3.1% (147) of the State total ranked fourth while Northampton County ranked fifth with 2.7% (126).¹³

The Pennsylvania Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics reveal the following selected characteristics for delinquents involved with the courts:

Sex:

Male	81.1%	33,547
Female	18.9%	7,830

Race:

White	62%	25,781
Nonwhite	38%	15,395

Reason for Court Referral (offense):

Burglary	14.8%	6,105
Larceny	8.5%	3,513
Disorderly Conduct	7.8%	3,247
Assault	7.1%	2,930
Robbery	4.9%	2,026

Mean age of all juveniles = 14.9
 Median age of all juveniles = 15.7

Of the total number of juveniles processed unofficially, 14.0% (2,457) were referred for disorderly conduct. Burglary

¹²Juvenile Court Disposition.

¹³Ibid.

accounted for 10.4% (1,824) followed by larceny, 9.1% (1,595); assault, excluding aggravated, 6.4% (1,119); and drug law violation, 5.7% (995).

When comparing the number of children handled unofficially with the total number of referrals for these offenses, it is noted that 75.6% of the children referred to Juvenile Court for disorderly conduct were handled unofficially. Of the total referrals for drug law violation, narcotics, 52.2% were handled unofficially, followed by 45.4% of those referred for larceny, except shoplifting; 38.3% of the referrals for assaults, except aggravated; and 29.5% of those referred for burglary.¹⁴

Legal transfer of custody in 4,740 cases were as follows: burglary accounted for 16.4% (776); followed by auto theft, 5.9% (280); robbery, excluding purse snatching, 5.5% (263); larceny, excluding shoplifting, 5.5% (261); and 5.1% (243) for assault, except aggravated.¹⁵

Selected characteristics revealed that males represented more than 81.1% (33,547) of the entire juvenile court population. However, depending upon the reason for referral, a great deal of variance is indicated for each type of offense. For example, males account for 86.8% of the juveniles processed for offenses applicable to juveniles and adults. Males comprised only 56.5% of the juveniles processed for offenses applicable to juveniles only.¹⁶

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid.

Delinquency in Dauphin County

Dauphin County surrounds Harrisburg, the capital city of Pennsylvania. Southern Dauphin County is mostly manufacturing areas with mill towns and large industrial complexes. To the east is the Hershey area composed of large farming areas with enclaves of wealthy upper-middle class suburbs. The northern section of the county is separated from the southern section by a mountain range and is composed mainly of small communities, rolling farmland and rural school districts.

The City of Harrisburg is mostly lower-middle class whites and blacks of ever-shifting population patterns. Also found are small retreating pockets of a once thriving Jewish community. Surrounding Harrisburg are the black and white middle and upper classes who have retreated to the suburbs. This diversity of population which includes all classes of wealth and race yield a broad sample of delinquents from which a sample will be obtained as the basis for this investigation.

Delinquency is a serious problem in Dauphin County. The Probation Department, the Dauphin County Courts, Dauphin County Child Care, Dauphin County Mental Health and Retardation Center, Family and Children's Services, and the Harrisburg School System each are spending a vast amount of tax dollars to prevent and rehabilitate the delinquent youth. The Juvenile Court System disbursed \$112,970.40 on salaries for probation workers, clerical help, and office expenses in 1974.¹⁷ The price to the taxpayer for

¹⁷Lingle, Oscar. Dauphin County Annual Controller's

sending juveniles to approved private or state supported detention centers and forestry camps is \$931,649.13.¹⁸ This does not include the \$142,360.06 spent to send adjudicated delinquents to correctional or penal institutions. The total expenditure of \$1,186,979.59 does not include the support services of the many community agencies or the local school systems.¹⁹

Juvenile crime in Dauphin County has kept pace with the national trend. In 1973, 340 juveniles were declared delinquent at 43 juvenile court sessions.²⁰ Of the 464 declared delinquent in 1974, 349 came from the City of Harrisburg with 115 from the remainder of the county. The 14 to 17 year age group had the largest increase and number of delinquents. The total number of complaints increased by 310 to 1,684 in 1974.

Serious crimes by juveniles increased in all areas as witnessed by the following chart:²¹

	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>Percentage Increase</u>
Assault	19	37	94
Burglary	147	242	64
Robbery	24	89	37
Armed Robbery	3	10	33
Theft	39	165	42
Rape	2	3	50

The number of juveniles placed in detention centers, forestry camps, and correction centers also showed a marked increase. In 1973, 58 delinquents were placed in institutions by the Court.

Report. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1974.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

This increased to 117 in 1974.²² The ages range from 12 to 17 with the majority being in the 14 to 17 age group. The financial cost to place juveniles in training schools and forestry camps increased in 1973 from \$403,694.54 to \$931,649.13 in 1974.²³ This increase is over 100 per cent and does not include the \$142,360.06 spent to confine juveniles in correction centers and penal institutions.²⁴ The total cost to the taxpayers of Dauphin County to confine juveniles in 1974 was in excess of one million dollars, excluding probation department salaries and costs. The average juvenile inmate committed to the Camp Hill facility from Dauphin County has appeared before the juvenile court 4.58 times, has been committed to institutions 1.68 times, and committed 9.6 crimes.²⁵

Dauphin County, which currently has approximately 40 juveniles confined at Camp Hill, have experienced a 75 per cent recidivism rate from early parolees and others who have served their time in institutions.²⁶ This high rate of recidivism is reflected in the increase of serious crimes in Harrisburg. Serious crimes increased from 4,511 in 1973 to 7,210 in 1974.²⁷ This 36.5 per cent increase in serious crimes and high recidivism rate appears to indicate that the rehabilitation and treatment of "hard core" delinquents is ineffective at the present time.

Research into the effectiveness of placing juveniles in maximum security institutions is limited and additional research will provide information in relation to the reliability of test

²²Ibid. ²³Ibid. ²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid. ²⁶Ibid. ²⁷Ibid.

scores at the time of apprehension and the effect, if any, on test performance after a period of confinement.

Chapter III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature included the total spectrum of delinquency problems with special emphasis towards specific research investigations in relation to incarcerated delinquents. Beginning with the historical background in the late Nineteenth Century, the review of the literature will include early treatment and rehabilitation methods, current treatment models including the controversial Massachusetts Plan of community alternatives. Also included will be specific research studies which provide background and supportive data in predicting delinquency and the effects on intelligence, academic achievement and personality characteristics of delinquents who have been incarcerated for varying lengths of time for treatment and rehabilitation.

Historical Background

The introduction to reform measures in correctional programs in the latter part of the Nineteenth Century was largely the result of the desire for humane treatment.¹ The offender was no longer regarded as an "evil" person who freely engaged in criminal activities; rather he was viewed as having been "socially

¹Robinson, James. "The Effectiveness of Correctional Programs." California Legislative Ways and Means Committee, Committee on Criminal Justice, 1969.

determined" to take deviant roles and now in need of "treatment" or rehabilitation into a socially adequate individual.² Assessment of the relative effectiveness of various correctional programs is difficult because measures of performance had not been established. Very often the attempt to measure the behavior of the systems clients is confounded by the reporting procedures of the system. The results of such research yield insights about the personnel of the system but tell us little about the clients.³

The correctional practice of treatment and punishment generally coexist and cannot appropriately be viewed as mutually exclusive. Correctional activities (treatments) are undertaken in settings established as places of punishment. Restriction of freedom is a punishment, no matter whether it is imposed by physical confinement (jail or prison) or by surveillance of movement in the community (probation or parole). Punitive conditions are viewed as necessary for the administration of treatment, and the treatments are believed to account for whatever favorable results occur. The real choice in correction, then, is not between treatment on one hand and punishment on the other, but between one treatment-punishment alternative and another. Analysis of findings in a review of the major California corrections programs that permit relatively rigorous evaluation strongly suggests the following

²Ibid.

³Robinson, J. and P. Takag. "Case Decisions in a State Parole System." California Department of Corrections. Research Division, Report Number 31, 1968.

conclusion: there is no evidence to support any programs claim of superior rehabilitative efficacy.⁴

Havel reports that California offenders on parole did just as well when they were given minimum parole supervision as when similar offenders were given normal parole.⁵ She offers three alternative solutions to the hypothesis that all treatments give the same results:

- (1) that the methods of comparing offenders sent to different treatments are so crude that they fail adequately to take account of real differences in the types of offenders given different treatments;
- (2) that while overall results are the same, the treatments are each having successes and failures with different types of offenders so that the results balance out to look the same. For example, if treatment "A" gives very good results for offenders with characteristics "xyz" but bad ones for offenders "abc", while on the other hand, "B" gives moderate results for both "xyz" and "abc" the overall rate of success for each treatment could be the same;
- (3) that at present treatments are more or less equally irrelevant. Those who are good risks succeed whatever one does to them, and those who are bad risks fail whatever is done.

Havel concludes that the earliest training schools which confined their treatment to custody and control cannot effectively be evaluated against today's standards. The present treatment models have developed in the past ten years and concentrate on the causes and cures for delinquency and recidivism.

⁴Robinson, James. "It's Time to Stop Counting." Special Report to California Legislative Ways and Means Committee, Select Committee on Criminal Justice, 1969, pp 270-271.

⁵Havel, Joan. "The High Base Expectancy Study." SIPI, 4 Research Division, Department of Corrections, Calif. 1961, p 166.

Failure of the Delinquency System

The federal government established a policy to combat delinquency through the establishment of the Youth Development and Delinquency Assistance Administration of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The national strategy is an effort to implement needed services and divert youth from encounters with the juvenile justice system.⁶ The Federal Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development offered recommendations for content and language treatment programs administered by state and local agencies.⁷

Many prominent national authorities in the field of juvenile delinquency have expressed concern over the failure of our present court and institutional system. In the Kent Case which defined and tightened the rules and conditions under which juvenile hearings can be transferred to another court for criminal prosecution, the Court states, "...There is no place in our system of law for reaching a result of such tremendous consequences without ceremony, without hearing, without effective assistance of counsel, without a statement of reasons." The decisions made in the Gault Court Decision is clearly based on the requirements of the due process clause as applied to juvenile court proceedings.

Bazelon states that the criminal justice system is a dismal

⁶U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Law Enforcement Assistance Agency, 3rd Annual Report. Washington, D.C. 1971.

⁷U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. Legislative Guide. Washington, D. C., 1972.

failure because the rehabilitation methods have not effectively reduced the recidivism rate and the development of alternative methods of social control will be one of the great challenges for the future.⁸ Silberberg and Silberberg suggest that the prison system is ineffective and in many instances counter productive because many delinquents become negative in their attitudes toward society.⁹ Most authorities agree with the Silberbergs in relation to the ineffectiveness of prisons, and some authorities have even classified prisons as schools for criminals. Dr. Jerome Miller states that prison is an ineffective solution to rehabilitation and that the Camp Hill Correctional Institution in Pennsylvania is a national scandal and a human sewer for juveniles.¹⁰ It appears that Miller has over reacted in his comments when one considers the burden placed on rehabilitation programs which are under staffed and under funded because of crowded conditions. Miller's statements regarding Camp Hill appear to be his personal opinion because he offers no data to support the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness in relation to rehabilitation programs at this facility. His comments should also be understood in the frame of reference in which they were made. The quote was printed in the newspaper at the time Camp Hill was undergoing a basic change in confinement

⁸Bazelon, David. "Beyond Control of the Juvenile Court." Juvenile Court Journal. Vol. 21, 1974, pp 45-50.

⁹Silberberg, N. E. and M. C. "School Achievement and Delinquency." Review of Educational Research. Vol. 41, Feb. 1971, pp 17-33.

¹⁰Miller, Dr. Jerome. Patriot-News, (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania) Col. 1, Vol. 26, No. 51, September 7, 1975.

policy and Dr. Miller was under constant criticism from judges, probation officials and community leaders for his release of many hard-core delinquents.

In defense of Dr. Miller's policies in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, the criticisms about alternative treatment programs appear politically motivated without consideration for his attempts to humanize services for delinquents. Miller was hampered by financial and personnel constraints. The institutions failed to carry out his policies and the staff members refused to cooperate because of threatened loss of job security. Many staff appointments were of political nature while other positions were locked in by Civil Service Laws.

Tannenbaum, Cloward and Ohlin, and more recently, Glueck and Procnier, recognized the fact that placement in an institution has a reverse effect and usually pushes the individual into defiance and deviance towards society.¹¹ Jordan estimates that only five per cent of all juveniles need to be isolated from society.¹² Jordan does not define which five per cent should be isolated but previous research suggests those convicted of murder, violent crimes and sex offenses are the most logical delinquents for isolation. Kirkpatrick theorizes that institutions need internal changes and extensive

¹¹Tannenbaum, Frank. Crime and the Community. Ginn & Co. New York, 1938. Cloward, Richard and Lloyd Ohlin. Delinquency and Opportunity. The Free Press, New York, 1960. Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Juvenile Delinquents Grow Up. New York Commonwealth Fund, 1960. Procnier, Richard. U. S. News & World Report. Vol. LXXVII, December 16, 1974.

¹²Jordan, Vernon. "The System that Propogates Crime." Crime and Delinquency. Vol. 10, No. 3, July, 1974.

tinkering to adequately meet the desired functions.¹³ These theories may be well founded but large maximum security institutions cannot change without re-educating the staff by changing basic philosophies. This was experienced in the Massachusetts Plan when the prison staff was not included in decision making and change in confinement policy. If the basic philosophy of the internal functioning of maximum security institutions is affected by policy change, such change should include the concerns and support of those in charge of internal prison operations.

Gibbons argues that, at best, most institutions offer a benign effect and, therefore, it is not usually wise to recommend placement in such institutions.¹⁴ Lerman theorizes that juveniles are subject to stricter laws than adults, and to more severe penalties for non-criminal acts than are many adults who commit felonies.¹⁵ Krueger's thesis stresses that many institutions are based on archaic ideas of punishment and provide little more than custodial care. They not only fail in obtaining socially desirable behavior, they are also training youth to be criminals.¹⁶ Vogel states that the juvenile justice system is in disarray and evidence

¹³Kirkpatrick, John. Delinquent Behavior. Prentice Hall, Inc. 1970.

¹⁴Gibbons, T. G. N. and R. Ahrenfeldt. Cultural Factors in Delinquency. J. B. Lippencott Co., 1970.

¹⁵Lerman, Paul. "Child Convicts." Transaction. Vol. 8, July/August, 1971, pp 35-44.

¹⁶Krueger, Robert G. "Let's Make Use of Learning Theory." Child Study Center Bulletin, Vol. 3, No. 3, 1967, pp 59-63

indicates the system is inhumane and ineffective at all levels.¹⁷ Vogel, an Assistant Attorney General for the State of Pennsylvania, refers to the complete fragmentation of responsibility in handling juveniles. Pennsylvania is now in the process of releasing juveniles from institutions but lacks a workable system of community alternatives.

Predicting Delinquency

Many attempts have been made to devise delinquency measures to identify in early childhood those children who might become juvenile delinquents in later years. Herzog's investigation into predictive measures conclude that no known test is highly predictive in relation to juvenile delinquency.¹⁸ She further concludes that certain measures can identify groups of children from whom the majority of future delinquency are likely to come. In doing so, these measures highlight conditions that are damaging to all children. The results also conclude that these measures are not capable of identifying the individual "predelinquent" within the more vulnerable groups.

Follman and Dickinson attempted to determine the relationship between delinquency prediction scales and personality inventories. The instruments evaluated were the Kvaraceus Delinquency

¹⁷U. S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Juvenile Delinquency Hearing, 93rd Congress, (Washington Government Printing Office, 1973).

¹⁸Herzog, Elizabeth. "Identifying Potential Delinquents." U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Services. Children's Bureau Facts and Facets No. 5. Washington, D. C. Reprint, 1965.

Proneness Scale, Nye Delinquency Scale, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the Edwards Personal Preference Scale. The results indicate that both delinquency prediction scales generally correlate low with most of the inventory scales. They conclude that there is no significant relationship between predicting delinquency and personality measures.¹⁹

The Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Scale was investigated by Benning and Thurston who found no difference in children who are delinquency prone and those who were not delinquency prone.²⁰ The main asset of the Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Scale is to predict personal and social adjustment and not delinquency.²¹ Another paper and pencil delinquency predictor is the Nye Delinquency Scale which is supported by no empirical evidence.²² Hathaway and McKinley attempted to predict delinquency by using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory but found no code classification dramatically predicted delinquency.²³

Healy in his early studies of delinquency states that it

¹⁹Follman, John and James Dickinson. "Delinquency Prediction Scales and Personality Inventories." Child Study Journal. Vol. 2, No. 2, 1971.

²⁰Benning, James J. and John R. Thurston. "Prediction of Delinquents Adjustment and Academic Achievement Over a Five Year Period with the Kvaraceus Delinquent Proneness Scale." The Journal of Education Research. Vol. 65, No. 8, April, 1972.

²¹Ibid.

²²Nye, F. I. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York, 1958.

²³Hathaway, S. R. and J. C. McKinley. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. New York, The Psychological Corp. 1951.

is impossible to find a general theory of delinquency after investigating the sociological, biological and psychological background.²⁴ Robison's studies reveal, and most authorities agree, that at present you cannot accurately measure, index or predict delinquency because of the uncontrollable variables.²⁵ There is no unity of measurement because of community, courts, and agencies reporting have no common denominators.²⁶ [This investigator concludes that the predicting of delinquency will not be possible until testing instruments are refined which can rule out uncontrollable variables or account for factors contributing to delinquency. These factors could include family conditions, economic needs or peer pressure.]

Delinquency Treatment Models

Many models have been developed to divert and prevent delinquent youths from appearing before the courts. Lamert, of the National Institute of Mental Health, reported an effort to develop a series of models to divert children from the juvenile justice system so that their problems, which would be dealt with in the context of delinquency, could be defined and handled by other means.²⁷ It was asserted that too many children are unnecessarily

²⁴Healy, William. The Individual Delinquent. Brown Little and Company, 1971.

²⁵Robison, Sophia. Can Delinquency Be Measured. Brown Little and Company, 1971.

²⁶Ibid.

²⁷Lamert, K. M. Instead of Court: Diversion in Juvenile Justice. Crime and Delinquency Issues: A Monograph Series, 1971, p 102.

referred to juvenile courts, the harm done by these contacts far outweighs any benefits gained and the results often increase the problem of delinquency.²⁸ Lamert's assertion that too many delinquents are referred to the courts is unclear. The courts could mean a variety of programs controlled by the courts without actual court involvement.

The radical correctional reforms started in 1969 in Massachusetts by Dr. Jerome Miller, Commissioner of Youth Services, have focused national attention on a treatment policy without the traditional reform school. Miller implies that the courts are being punitive and accuses them of operating schools for crime in the form of institutions. Dr. Miller's goal was to create a therapeutic community within existing institutional facilities. This model of treatment would require a democratic relationship between staff and youth in small units. This treatment model challenged basic features of the traditional training school system. Change could not be expected until the differences in philosophy, goals, and staff and youth roles, and the processes of decision making could be dramatized, justified and enforced.²⁹ The therapeutic community model of restructuring lines of authority, new responsibility, and retraining of old staff members caused much internal dissention. This caused Miller to employ outside agency help and purchasing of services. Many of the old training schools were closed as the treatment concept was transferred to residential, group and

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ohlin, et al, Harvard Educational Review, February, 1974.

foster homes in the community. The results of Miller's experiment are inconclusive. Advocates of his theories contend that the recidivism rate had decreased but accurate statistics are unavailable.³⁰ Bakal reports that the Massachusetts experiment of closing juvenile training facilities was nothing more than poor houses for neglected children tending to increase the alienation and crystallize the criminal self-concept.³¹ Miller's policies have generated controversy from many state authorities in Pennsylvania such as judges, probation officers, and organized community groups. In theory, his removal of delinquents from maximum security institutions is acceptable, but removal was completed before community alternative plans were completed. Many community projects were over funded and understaffed and community pressures mounted because treatment centers were placed in middle-class neighborhoods. The juvenile courts appear to have lost some degree of effectiveness because of non-existence of final alternatives and hard-core delinquents know the ultimate punishment is a community alternative or minimum security setting. Miller's program does have merit but no proven success in Pennsylvania due to the fact of its newness. It would appear that Miller chose the wrong sample for his alternative program. He would probably experience more success with those delinquents classified as marginal or first time offenders.

Speaking before the Pennsylvania Juvenile Justice Day on

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Bakal, Y. Tzhak. "Strategies for Restructuring the State Department of Youth Services." Office of Youth Development, Washington, D. C. June, 1973.

August 5, 1975, Commissioner of the Department of Youth Services for Massachusetts, Commissioner Joseph Leavy declared that secure detention in even the best staffed institution is likely to cause severe distress to children who commonly see this removal from the community to a locked institution as an unalterable proof of their worthlessness. Because it is often a damaging and always a stigmatizing experience, the use of secure detention should be limited severely. He offered alternatives to the existing confinement methods. He advocates children's shelters for short-term confinement for those who cannot return home. Foster homes which cost a lesser amount are also advocated. Family day care centers will be employed to care for those children whose parents must work. Leavy also discusses other alternatives which include twenty-four hour intake services, intensive supervision, group homes, volunteer counselors and a youth service bureau. Leavy claims that since Massachusetts has closed all their institutions for delinquents, the state has developed over two hundred alternative treatment programs. Leavy's two hundred alternatives include group homes, foster home placements and community oriented treatment centers in existence before the institutions were closed with few new original methods for juvenile rehabilitation.³²

Dr. Robert Coates, who has evaluated the Massachusetts program, declares that one per cent need a secure facility, twenty-three per cent respond to group care, forty-nine per cent can be

³²Leavy, Joseph. "Those Mystery Alternatives." Harvard Law School, Speaking before Pennsylvania Juvenile Justice Day Conference, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, August 5, 1975.

placed in foster homes, and fifty-six per cent can be maintained in nonresidential programs. He went on to explain that the percentages reflect children who are treated by more than one type of program. Coates further states that the recidivism rate for the state is equal to the rate before the Massachusetts experiment but large differences are visible in the seven regions of the state. The lower rate of recidivism is evident when the child is treated close to home and the program is adequate. Coates feels the most important observation of his incomplete study is the fact delinquents who are helped before appearing in juvenile court are less likely to become a recidivist.³³ Dr. Lloyd Ohlin declared that the present system is totally inadequate and the delinquent cannot be "plugged" into the present system of rehabilitation and alternative programs are needed.³⁴ This statement is supported by many researchers, but Ohlin also fails to report the effectiveness of the alternative programs he supports. In his speech Ohlin claimed over 200 new alternative programs but a closer analysis reveals few totally new approaches to the treatment problem. Recently the State of Massachusetts has taken a revised approach to delinquency and opened several institutions for hard-core delinquents. This leads one to believe the program may not be as successful as first reported.

The Center for Criminal Justice of the Harvard Law School

³³Coates, Robert. "Only the Facts, Please." Harvard Law School, Justice Day Conference, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, August 5, 1975.

³⁴Ohlin, Dr. Lloyd. "Only the Facts, Please." August, 1975.

which was commissioned to evaluate the first five years of the Massachusetts Plan, declare the program a success. Although definitive data on outcomes is not yet available, the Center's tentative conclusion is that the reforms in Massachusetts have been successful. In summary, their major findings to date are:³⁵

- (1) All the training schools have been closed, and most have been converted to other uses. There is no intention to re-open any of them at this time. In their place, the Department of Youth Services has successfully developed a network of over 140 community residential programs, 80 non-residential programs, and 200 foster homes. The Department also continues to operate one forestry camp and three of its detention centers.
- (2) There was an initial shortage of secure therapeutic facilities, but this problem has apparently been overcome. At present, five per cent of the total active caseload of DYS, including those on parole, are in secure settings.
- (3) Based on limited samples, recidivism for boys has been reduced from 49 per cent under the old system to 24 per cent. The recidivism rate for girls shows a very slight increase.
- (4) Although there was a high runaway rate when the training schools were first closed, preliminary analysis suggests that boys in community programs run away at approximately the same rate as boys who were in the training schools (about 35 per cent).
- (5) Data from structured youth interviews strongly suggests that the new community programs are far more humane and treatment-oriented than their predecessors and are more conducive to effective youth socialization.
- (6) City-wide arrest rates for juveniles in the city of Boston have declined since 1972. Further research is presently being conducted to determine the extent to which this decline may be attributed to state correctional reforms.

³⁵Ohlin, et al. Harvard Law School Review. June, 1975.

- (7) There has been a marked decrease in the number of youth bound over to adult court since the institutions were closed (from 143 in 1973 to 96 in 1974), despite the fact that some judges initially significantly increased bindovers. The vast majority of bindovers were eventually returned to DYS. Many court personnel remain hostile to DYS, however.
- (8) There is little doubt that the rapid move to de-institutionalization caused considerable administrative chaos in terms of contracting procedures, payment of new bills, rate-setting, quality control, staffing patterns, and organizational lines of authority. According to the evaluators, most of these problems have been resolved as affairs normalized under the present DYS administration.

Recent developments in Massachusetts include the dismissal of the Commissioner of Youth Services and the re-opening of several institutions for hard-core delinquents. It is not known if the Miller Plan of community alternatives is a success or a failure until a long-range evaluation can be completed.

Grob and VanDoran described a very personal attempt to work with teenage delinquent boys at the Chaddock Boys School, Quincy, Illinois. These two men spent three mornings per week for three weeks clearing a swamp with alternating groups of ten residents of a cottage.³⁶ Grob and VanDoran were successful in helping the boys make a better personal adjustment, but the project was not for the hard-core delinquent and a higher than average success rate could be expected. Magrady proposed that a course in juvenile delinquency should be taught in every teacher education program in order to help prepare teachers to recognize and work with potential delinquents in

³⁶Grob, H. E. Jr. and E. F. VanDoran. "Aggressive Group Work with Teenage Delinquent Boys: Chaddock Boys School, Quincy, Illinois." Children. 16:103-108, May, 1969.

their classrooms.³⁷ With the increase of delinquency in all schools, the proposal should gain acceptance. Tyler described experiences at the Douglas County Youth Center in Omaha, Nebraska. Workers at the center face the problem of working with neglected and borderline youth. Anecdotes were told of events in which normal children were inadvertently assigned to the center and experienced very destructive influences from contact with hard-core delinquents, resulting in corruption of the normals into delinquents. These anecdotes suggest that hard-core delinquents should be carefully separated from other youth to protect the latter.³⁸ Tyler's experiences are probably valid but lack any statistical data to verify his conclusions. He fails to identify the characteristics of either the hard-core group of delinquents or the so-called borderline cases. The most obvious concern to this investigator is how normal children were "inadvertently" assigned to a center for hard-core delinquents. It appears inadequate evaluations and placement criteria contributed to a problem which should not exist if adequate screening and placement procedures are carried out. Tyler's observation is supported by many institutional authorities and school personnel. The child who is unsure of himself lacks direction and responds to peer pressures, is easily influenced by dominant peers. The solution at the county

³⁷Magrady, R. A. "Delinquency Prevention: A Suggested Course for Teacher Education." Illinois Education. April, 1967, p 57.

³⁸Tyler, C. E. "Teaching Youth in Trouble: Douglas County Center." Childhood Education. Vol. 44, May, 1968; pp 546-548.

level is appropriate separation when confined. The period immediately following confinement is critical for many delinquents who cannot tolerate physical and sexual abuse. The most critical cases appear to be the first offender confined with hard-core delinquents.

Levine writes of the Weeks School in Vergennes, Vermont; a state correctional institution that aids dropouts, kickouts, and failures that are court-committed. Personal touches are used to encourage youth to succeed. Boys and girls live in separate cottages, have outdoor classes with no grades or tests. Discipline and control are based upon extension and revocation of privileges rather than on punishment or the threat of punishment. The number of students varies between 120 and 200 with 98 staff members and a per pupil cost of \$3,365.00.³⁹ It is of interest to note about this pupil cost. A recent survey by the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections reveals that it costs an average of \$11,657.00 per year to house a juvenile in a state institution. Four states report an average cost of over \$19,000.00. The average cost in community treatment programs is \$5,501.00.

Pierson, et al, reports that the High School Personality Questionnaire is sensitive enough to measure personality changes in hostile and aggressive delinquents of secondary school age. The four main factors analyzed were submissive vs. dominance, super ego strength, tender vs. tough mindedness, and self sentiment. The treatment lasted seven to eight months and consisted of structured

³⁹Levine, R. H. "Martha's World." American Education. Vol. 4, April, 1968, pp 22-23.

group living, psychotherapy, and academic and vocational training. Pierson infers that the High School Personality Questionnaire can measure changes of adjustment and the supporters of the psychoanalytic school may be ineffective in their treatment goals.⁴⁰ Cohen and Filipczak reported on a two-year project with 41 teenage delinquent boys. Most were school dropouts and unresponsive to the regular program at the National Training School for Boys in Washington, D. C. Operant conditioning was used in a contingency management system. This technical terminology means simply that rewards were given to the boys for particular activities and behaviors which were announced as a schedule of rewards.⁴¹ Experience suggests that operant conditioning or behavior modification programs based on rewards work best with younger or delinquents with borderline intelligence. Delinquents who are classified as "hard-core" appear to respond to peer pressures in controlled group counselling sessions. This approach is called (guided group interaction) and is the basic treatment method at the Loysville Youth Development Center in Pennsylvania. Some socially disturbed youths who are also delinquents will respond to conditioning techniques which lengthen the time a reward is withheld to strengthen poor impulse control. This method has been used to improve academic performance with limited success in Project II, a federally financed

⁴⁰Pierson, George R., Raymond B. Cattell and John Pierce. "A Demonstration by the HSPQ of the Nature of the Personality Changes produced by Institutionalization of Delinquents." Journal of Social Psychology. Vol. 70, No. 2, 1966, pp 229-239.

⁴¹Cohen, H. L. and J. Filipczak. A New Learning Environment: A Case for Learning. 1971, p 214.

program for disturbed youths under the auspices of the Harrisburg School System.

The Highfield's experience indicates that delinquents placed in small cottage settings has a lower recidivism rate and made a better personality adjustment.⁴² Weeks states that part of the program's success is the low ratio of black to white delinquents. At the time of the study, approximately 20 per cent were black. If the number of blacks were increased in proportion to the whites, the acceptance and integration of the races might be different. This acceptance and integration is fundamental to the Highfield's program. The delinquents live, work and play together in a unit which houses only a few boys. The main form of treatment is individual counselling and guided group interaction sessions which is a method of exploring and solving one's personal problems by group interaction. The research design attempted to answer several basic questions. Do delinquents participating in short-term treatment programs show a higher or lower recidivism rate than boys participating in other treatment models? Do delinquents in short-term treatment programs change their attitudes, values and opinions? The results of the study indicate that the treatment is effective based on the recidivism rate. When compared to another institution offering long-term confinement, Highfield had 63 per cent of the delinquents experiencing no further difficulties with the law. The long-term institution had only 47 per cent who were not involved

⁴²Weeks, H. A. Youthful Offenders at Highfields. University of Michigan Press, 1958.

with the law.⁴³ The study concludes that the Highfields short-term treatment program rehabilitates a higher proportion than institutions with long-term confinement and showed a lower recidivism rate at one third of the cost.⁴⁴

A community treatment project was initiated by the California Youth Authority in 1960 in an effort to divert youths from placement in institutions.⁴⁵ In 1961 as a result of the above consideration, an intensive treatment-control program in the community as a substitute for traditional types of institutional programs was initiated. The major goal of the project was to evaluate the effectiveness of a period of intensive treatment in the community with a period of incarceration for similar groups of habitual delinquents. The delinquents were divided into meaningful groups of like offenders for control purposes, effective treatment methods, and precision of effective research. This enabled the researchers to develop the Interpersonal Maturity Level Classification for Juveniles. Four groups were established based on offenses committed and personality characteristics. A battery of tests were used on a pre-and post-test basis. The major test instruments used were the California Psychological Inventory and the Jesness Inventory. The researchers attempted to measure the comparative effectiveness of the community treatment model and traditional methods of incarceration. The results indicate that the experimental model participants scores are significantly higher in the parole criteria and test score changes. This indicates that

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

some positive effect has taken place in favor of the experimental program. The results of the program support the feasibility of substituting intensive community programs and the Youth Authority is planning a series of such programs in the state.⁴⁶ Experience proves that juveniles placed in maximum security institutions have a high recidivism rate. The same type of delinquents placed in community treatment centers do not show a drastic decrease in recidivism. All the treatment models reviewed do nothing to treat the cause of the juvenile's original problem which appears to be the social conditions and lack of parental control and concern within the community.

Delinquency and Intelligence Quotient (I.Q.)

Shulman presents evidence that a low IQ is coming to be viewed as one of a series of attributes that characterize children which society has selected for formal adjudication as delinquents through the differential operation of the machinery of juvenile justice.⁴⁷ He further states that the delinquents are non-representative of the whole child population, but the selectivity of the delinquent group increases proportionately with the degree of authority applied. There is a disproportionate number from lower socio-economic groups; black and foreign born. He also concludes that the delinquents dealt with unofficially appear to represent a group of high socio-economic status than those officially

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Shulman, Harry. Juvenile Delinquency in American Society. Harper & Row, 1961.

arraigned or committed to juvenile training schools.⁴⁸ Shulman's observation in relation to unofficially handling high socio-economic delinquents is supported by this investigator's experiences. Some delinquents who have wealthy parents can be placed in private schools, but the major factor appears to be the degree of control exercised when faced with a threatening sentence in an institution or loss of status in the community. It should also be noted that many poor delinquents do not have parents to care, nor do they know how to take advantage of the law. The observations of the low IQ characterizing delinquents does not reveal that the same IQ from non-delinquents in the same minority groups is possible. This concept is supported by McConochie.

McConochie's research disputes the conclusions of Shulman in relation to the effect of delinquency on intelligence. McConochie evaluated 126 male delinquents using the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC). He concluded that intelligence scores are not indicative of delinquency.⁴⁹ Factor analysis indicated that the WISC subtests measure the same mental skills in delinquents as in non-delinquents.⁵⁰ Haskins and Friel report that 1,666 juvenile inmates committed to institutions showed that thirteen per cent of the males and seventeen per cent of the females were

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹McConochie, William A. "Juvenile Delinquents: Relationships between WISC Scores, Offenses, Race, Chronological Age and Residence." Correctional Psychology. Vol. 4, No. 3, November, 1970. pp 103-110.

⁵⁰Ibid.

retarded compared to three per cent incidence in the general population. More mentally retarded than non-mentally retarded inmates were from minority groups, had poor school attendance and academic records, and came from impoverished families.⁵¹ Merrill has traced relationships between type of crime and intelligence. She found that intelligence positively correlated with forgery, lack of parental control and malicious mischief, and negatively with sex offenses and truancy.⁵² The more intelligent delinquent would probably fit the sociopathic personality profile and would be a manipulator of events and people which could account for the deceptive type of deviant behavior. The relationship between intelligence and recidivism have been studied by criminologists but the results are inconclusive at this time.⁵³

Glueck investigated the intelligence of 500 delinquents and 500 non-delinquents in relation to the verbal, performance and subtest performance of the Wechsler-Bellevue Scale. The fact that the delinquents and non-delinquents were matched as a total intelligence quotient (allowing not more than a ten point difference), concern is shown to determine what differences there are, if any, in the components of their intelligence as revealed in the verbal and performance aspects of the Wechsler Scale. On the whole, the delinquents average less in verbal intelligence than do the

⁵¹Haskins, Jimmy and Charles Friel. Project Cameo. Sam Houston University. No. 5, December, 1973.

⁵²Merrill, Maude. Problems of Child Delinquency. Houghton Mifflin. Boston, 1947.

⁵³Ibid.

non-delinquents, but the two groups resemble each other closely in performance intelligence. A comparison of the delinquents and non-delinquents in their attainment on the vocabulary test and the five subtests of the Wechsler verbal battery reveals that the delinquents show less aptitude in Vocabulary, Information and Comprehension but that they resemble the non-delinquents in their scores on Similarities, Arithmetic Reasoning, and Memory Span for Digits.⁵⁴ Wechsler's observations of lower scores on the Information, Vocabulary and Comprehension subtests would also apply to non-delinquents from minority groups. It appears that this test profile resembles the culturally deprived groups and is not only a delinquency characteristic.

The Vocabulary subtest, although a good indicator of general intelligence, is particularly affected by the amount of actual schooling. The Information subtests, although likewise a very good indicator of intellectual capacity, is also considerably effected by educational opportunities and the cultural atmosphere of the home. Success in the Comprehension Test, on the other hand, depends upon possession of practical information and the ability to evaluate past experience; and in this test, poor verbalizers tend to make lower scores. The resemblance between the delinquents and non-delinquents on the scores they attain in the performance aspect of the Wechsler Scale, a comparison of their accomplishment on the subtests of this battery show that the delinquents have less aptitude than the non-delinquents on the Digit Symbol Test, but a little

⁵⁴Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. pp 206-207.

more on the Block Design and Object Assembly Test. The two groups resemble each other in their accomplishment on the Picture Completion and the Picture Arrangement Tests. In assaying the difference in these aspects of performance intelligence, we must keep in mind that the Digit Symbol Test, on which the delinquents average less than the non-delinquents, involves concentration and persistency of effort, and is therefore a test in which impulsive, emotionally liable persons would not perform as well as those who are more stable. The slight superiority of the delinquents over the non-delinquents in the Block Design and Object Assembly Tests, although in the latter test the difference between the two groups merely approaches the level of statistical significance may reflect a greater skill in motor capacity.⁵⁵

It appears the delinquent, on the whole, is somewhat superior in many intellectual tasks in which the approach to meaning is by direct physical relationships (Block Design and probably Object Assembly Tests). The delinquents apparently do not accumulate a large repertoire of symbols or of symbolized content. Their generalizations are closely, even though not directly, geared to concrete realities. Both as a group and as individuals, the delinquents are more variable than the non-delinquents in their accomplishment on the Verbal subtests, but do not manifest any greater variability on the Performance subtests.⁵⁶

Wechsler's analysis of the intelligence test subtests includes a sociopathic profile (adolescent delinquents). He reports

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Ibid.

that delinquents score higher on the Performance scale as compared on the Verbal part of the scale. Wechsler also observed that adolescent sociopaths could suffer from high anxieties as reflected by the Arithmetic and Digit Span subtests.⁵⁷

Delinquency and Scholastic Achievement

Gormly and Nittoli investigated the reading skills of boys institutionalized for illegal behavior. He found that they are frequently in dire need of remedial academic programs. Twenty boys, who were committed to a state institution as delinquents, participated in a short-term reading program which provided structured self-instruction, high interest reading material, and reduced chances of experiencing failure. After completing an average of twenty-four 50 minute sessions, significant improvement was found. Students responded favorably to the program, and discipline problems were minimal.⁵⁸ This project reports significant improvement in reading scores after 24 self-instruction sessions. The improvement was probably caused by other factors than improved reading abilities. The fact that delinquents spent time to read caused increased proficiency in their functioning level. This finding joins that of Carroll and Nittoli who found that improvement in math skills in institutionalized delinquents was unrelated to IQ. These findings support the interpretation that IQ scores of institutionalized

⁵⁷Wechsler, David. The Measurement and Appraisal of Adult Intelligence. Williams and Wilkins, Co., 1965.

⁵⁸Gormly, J. and M. J. Nittoli. "Rapid Improvement of Reading Skills in Juvenile Delinquents." Journal of Experimental Education. Vol. 40, No. 2, 1971.

delinquents should not be taken as an indicant of relative capacity to learn.⁵⁹ Within the ranges of these studies, IQ scores are closely associated with scores from standard tests of academic achievement, and as such, IQ appears to be another indicant of academic achievement, not academic capacity.

Jastak reports that delinquents score definite patterns in relation to reading, spelling, and arithmetic. Those individuals suffering severe personality disorders usually score poorly in arithmetic and best in reading.⁶⁰ Bland's study investigated the levels of achievement in both reading and computation as they were associated with selected independent variables - age, offense, and grade completion in school. Inmates were selected from all classes of age, type of custody and type of offense. Group I included 597 subjects who had not reached fourth grade. Group II included 1,219 subjects who reached fourth but not eighth grade. Data were collected by means of a 40 item questionnaire and a series of achievement tests. No significant relationship was shown between level of achievement in reading and offense, for either group. Misdemeanants did not have consistently lower levels of achievement in reading than did felons. For Group II there was a high degree of significance between age and achievement in reading. Achievement in classifications data failed to support the assumption that numerical ability was higher than verbal ability. Significant relationships

⁵⁹Ibid.

⁶⁰Jastak, Joseph. Wide Range Achievement Test. C. L. Story Company. Wilmington, Delaware, 1946.

between grade completion and level of achievement in reading and computation was shown.⁶¹

Silberberg and Silberberg reviewed research on the topic of school achievement and delinquency. They found that only one fifth of delinquents who received training in a correctional institution succeeded in translating the training into a legitimate occupation in the outside world. Vocational training as it is usually conducted often fails to provide training that is relevant enough to the world of work to provide entry.⁶² Silberberg's observation in relation to vocational training is valid for most occupations. Although the Camp Hill Institution has a complete vocational shop, most inmates do not become proficient in a skilled trade. The limited number of spaces available and the short amount of time spent in the institution are two contributing factors. Some who do receive training in the skilled trades cannot find a job on the outside. Others who could find work, do not want the type of jobs available. It appears that most of the training done in institutions are low-skill level jobs which are offered to keep the institution in operation. These skills would include dishwasher, cook, laundry or building maintenance. Closson suggests changing some of the institutions of society that make delinquency inevitable. Among these are schools, the present approaches to preparation for jobs and job entry, the official system of social control, such as

⁶¹Bland, David Horton. "A Study of the Achievement Levels in Reading and Computation of Incarcerated Adult Males in North Carolina Prison System." North Carolina University. May, 1968.

⁶²Silberberg & Silberberg, "School Achievement and Delinquency."

police, courts, correctional institutions and the juvenile justice system.⁶³

Melvin Roman's research at the Psychiatric Clinic of the Manhattan Children's Court focuses on reaching delinquents through reading. Roman used twenty-one male subjects between 13 and 16 years of age who were at least two years below expectancy for their mental and chronological age.⁶⁴ The IQs as measured by the abbreviated Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children ranged from 65 to 95. The twenty-one subjects were divided into three groups equally:

1. To receive group remedial reading.
2. To receive tutorial group therapy.
3. To receive interview group therapy.

All three treatment groups were treated by the same therapist to help control the human variables. The test instruments used were the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children and Gray's Oral Reading Paragraphs which contains twelve paragraphs increasing in difficulty. These tests were used because they are routine testing instruments at the Children's Court Clinic. The procedure was to meet with the perspective groups for one and a half hours, one session a week for seven months. The results of the IQ pre- and post-testing reveal an improvement for all three groups with Group II showing the greatest improvement with an increase of 9.1 points. Groups I and III gained 8.3 and 4.4 points respectively.⁶⁵

⁶³Closson, F. I. "Delinquency: Its Prevention Rests Upon the Academic Community." *Clearing House*. 45;1971, pp 290-293.

⁶⁴Roman, Melvin. Reaching Delinquents Through Reading. Charles G. Thomas, Springfield, Illinois, 1957.

⁶⁵Ibid.

The pre-and post-test reading groups show Group II with the most improvement with a grade increase of 1.8. Group I gained 1.1 years and Group III .7 of a year. Roman's research concludes that group therapy (Group II) effected greater improvement in psychosocial adjustment than Groups I and III. Secondly, tutorial group therapy was found to be statistically significant.⁶⁶ Many research studies show a rapid improvement in reading scores regardless of the treatment used. Although the treatment method is given credit for the improvement, some studies do not report a control group and therefore, it is difficult to determine the effect, if any, of a lessening of environmental or emotional factors which could depress the true potential. It is possible to show achievement gains when the environment is controlled regardless of the treatment.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

Chapter IV

SAMPLE AND PROCEDURES

This chapter will discuss the location of the study, the delinquency population, and the sample which participated in the study. The procedures for selecting the sample, the test instruments, validity and reliability will also be explained. The final part of the chapter will explain the statistical procedures required to complete this research project.

The Population and Sample Group

The location for the study was Dauphin County, Pennsylvania. Dauphin County is comprised of three first-class townships, twenty-two second-class townships and sixteen boroughs.¹ The sample consists of those delinquents who have appeared before the Dauphin County Juvenile Courts and in addition have been placed in the Dauphin County Prison as a result of court action. The subjects for this study was selected from male delinquents over 16 years of age who were confined to the Dauphin County Prison. The subject selection was limited to 40 male delinquents who represented the delinquent population from Dauphin County confined at Camp Hill. Eight were eliminated because they were too young or had not served the required time. The number was reduced to 30 by randomly

¹Lingle, Dauphin County Controller's Report.

eliminating two subjects. No member of the selected sample refused to participate nor did the institution impose any restrictions on the test instruments used or the information gained from the personnel files. The delinquents were all confined during August, 1974 to May, 1975.

Although the sample was selected from the files of those appearing before the juvenile court from the entire county and sentenced to Camp Hill, 28 are from the City of Harrisburg which is an urban area with a high percentage of delinquents. The two remaining members of the sample are from the suburbs of Harrisburg. The remainder of the county had no members in the sample because there are no known delinquents from any age group confined at Camp Hill at this time. It has been noted by the investigator that the area north of Harrisburg which is divided by a mountain range, has few hard-core delinquents which have come to the attention of the juvenile court for sentencing. Twenty-five blacks, one black-Spanish, and four Caucasians comprise the total sample. Seventy-two per cent of the juveniles appearing before the Dauphin County Court are black. However, ninety per cent of the sample of this study are black. Many of the sample attended the city schools and could be identified as students in the ninth or tenth grade with a mean grade of 8.5. The average age was 17 years, 7 months. The criminal record of the sample includes 510 burglaries, 211 robberies, 190 car thefts, 2 rape convictions and 1 murder. The thirty members of the sample have been placed in institutions on 86 different occasions with one member confined to six different institutions. The court records reveal the sample was placed on probation 69 times

and as a group have appeared in court 125 times. The subjects had been confined between six and seventeen months and the average length of confinement was approximately ten months.

The Procedure

The sample consisted of 30 delinquent males who have appeared before the Dauphin County Juvenile Courts. At the time of apprehension each subject was given a battery of tests which included an individual intelligence test, achievement test, and a projective test. Each member of the sample was retested after adjudication and six months confinement in a maximum security institution to determine if any significant differences existed between the pre-and post-test scores. The test-retest differences on the intelligence scale show relatively little change with less than five points difference after an interval of several weeks or several years.²

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale

The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale is the most commonly used IQ test for adults over sixteen years of age. The test results yield scores in the two areas - verbal and performance intelligence. The verbal intelligence is the ability to deal with verbal concepts, abstract reasoning and the use of symbols; the performance intelligence involves the manipulating of objects and perceptual-motor tasks.³ Two areas of intelligence are then combined to yield a

²Wechsler, The Measurement & Appraisal of Adult Intelligence.

³Ibid.

Full Scale Intelligence score. The verbal and performance areas consist of five separate tests in each area described in detail as follows:

Verbal Subtests

- A. Information - The 30 questions, in ascending order of difficulty, samples a broad range of information usually acquired by an individual through experiences common to our society.
- B. Comprehension - This series of verbal questions is designed to measure the individual's efficiency in common sense problem solving.
- C. Arithmetic - This subtest consists of a variety of verbally administered arithmetic problems which the adult must solve without benefit of paper and pencil. One basic element of cognitive development is the ability to integrate and utilize the abstract concept of numbers and numerical operations.
- D. Similarities - Fine discrimination, categorization, and interrelationships of words, objects, ideas, processes, etc., form a basic element of intelligence. In this measure of verbal concept formation, the individual must perceive the similarity or commonness of the two objects or concepts as stated.
- E. Vocabulary - (In the case of the WAIS, definitions requested for a list of 40 words in ascending order of difficulty) can be thought of as an abbreviated history of language development in the individual person. The clinical interchange during this subtest is essentially a microcosm of the language process.

Performance Subtests

- A. Picture Completion - This subtest consists of 20 drawings, each of which has an important element missing. It is a measure of concentration, visual discrimination, and visual organization.
- B. Picture Arrangement - This subtest presents a series of picture cards which when properly arranged make a meaningful story. It is a

measure of visual concentration.

- C. Block Designs - In this subtest the adult is requested to duplicate with colored blocks, the designs presented on cards. The test is a visual-motor-perceptual task involving visual concentration; visual comprehension (decoding of the design); and visual discrimination.
- D. Object Assembly - This subtest consists of four "jigsaw" puzzles, in ascending order of difficulty. The test is primarily a visual-motor-perceptual task involving visual concentration; visual comprehension (visual decoding of part-to-whole relationships) and visual discrimination.
- E. Digit Symbol - This test requires the adult to fill in with pencil a written symbol which corresponds with a particular number. The task encompasses visual activity, motor activity, and a learning process.

A combination of the verbal and performance scores yield the Full Scale IQ. Comparisons will include Full Scale scores and verbal and performance subtest scores to determine any significant difference. The reliability coefficients reported for the WAIS are: verbal, .96; performance, .93; and full scale, .97. The validity coefficients are verbal, .86; performance, .96; and full scale, .85 when compared with the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test. Each individual subtest for the group will also be analyzed and compared by the same technique to determine if improvement or regression in specific areas of intelligence is significant. The reliability coefficients for the subtests range from .65 to .94.⁴

Wide Range Achievement Test

The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) is a basic tool for

⁴Wechsler, The Measurement & Appraisal of Adult Intelligence.

assessing the word recognition, written spelling and arithmetic computational skills, and is widely used on institutional intake procedures. The first edition consisted of one level of achievement ranging from kindergarten to college in each of the three subtests. This proved unsatisfactory and the 1946 revision divided the test into two levels.⁵

- Level I = Includes the ages 5-0 to 11-11.
- Level II = Extends from age 12 thru adulthood.

The test revision takes less time to administer and is easier for the examiner to score. The three tests give the examiner information in the following areas:

- A. Reading - recognizing and naming letters and pronouncing words.
- B. Spelling - copying marks resembling letters, writing the name, and writing words from dictation.
- C. Arithmetic - counting, reading number symbols, solving oral problems, and doing written computations.

The test folder contains all three subtests on one folder sheet. The spelling test and grade level for each test are contained on the first page. The same blank can be used for each level with the difference of words accounting for the degree of difficulty. The second and third pages contain the arithmetic test for each level. The problems are arranged by degree of difficulty. The student always starts with the easy problems and progresses until he reaches a ceiling age. The fourth page contains the reading test for both levels. It is possible to use the test blank twice if two different age groups are tested. The WRAT is primarily

⁵Jastak, Wide Range Achievement Test.

used to determine grade level functioning of individual students but other uses include:

- A. Assignment of students to instructional groups.
- B. Comparison with intelligence to determine underachievers.
- C. Establishment of school norms.
- D. Comparison to determine regression of students.
- E. Test analysis to help determine anxiety-ridden and socially and emotionally maladjusted students.
- F. Selection of students for specialized training.

The test also contains a personal data blank which serves to provide easy identification for future reference and research data. The grade level placement is included for each subtest making scoring easy and quick.

The WRAT yields individual grade achievement scores which can be used in the total diagnostic procedure. These scores can be used to compare and predict academic performance. The individual grade scores can also be converted to standard scores and percentiles which yield a further comparison.

The standard scores are equal to an IQ score for each subject. When compared with the IQ score, it can be determined if the subject is working at his potential. The percentile ranking is another form of comparison which compares the student in rank order with all other students in the standardization sample.

Reliability - The WRAT uses the split half measure with odd and even scores arranged in exact order of difficulty. The order of difficulty was determined by an item analysis of over fourteen hundred records for Level I and thirteen hundred records

for Level II. The clinical reliability measure for all three subtests are impressive and range from .90 to .95 for each subtest with the average reliability being .93.

Validity - One method is cross-validation provided by a comparison of the three subtests on the WRAT scale. The correlations between the reading, spelling and arithmetic subtests range from .69 to .93. These correlations are significant and tend to confirm the clinical impression that learning the fundamentals has a common factor in all areas.⁶

Another method to determine the validity of the WRAT is to correlate the scores with another achievement test. The instrument was the New Stanford Achievement Test. The New Stanford and WRAT reading correlation is .81; spelling, .93; and arithmetic, .91.⁷

Projective Personality Measurements

The Bender-Gestalt Test seeks to assess a person's emotional or personality reactions as a basis for therapy, identification of a personality problem or correction of personality inadequacies rather than his capacities or skills.⁸ As with other methods, projective techniques can be used successfully to measure development or at any particular time to assess status.⁹ They may also be given before and after an introduced experimental condition in order to

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Carmichael, Leonard. Manual of Child Psychology. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York, 1965. p 23.

⁹Ibid.

measure its effects. They may be standardized or not.¹⁰ The subject is presented with various neutral stylized or indefinite materials upon which they can project their own feelings and attitudes and indicate by the character of response how they feel.¹¹ The main difference between the psychometric and projective measures are as follows:¹²

- A. Structuring - projective testing is not structured in the response expected.
- B. Test Results - no right or wrong answers. The examiner must interpret test results.
- C. Relation to Social Pressures - projective tests are independent of culture and social pressures.
- D. Validity and Reliability - need not be known.
- E. Best Performance vs. Typical Performance - not interested in best performance but typical or characteristic reactions or reactions to circumstances.

The Bender-Gestalt Test is a projective test which has been developed to determine deficiencies in the visual-motor development areas. Clinical experience has shown that emotional and personality maladjustments can be isolated which are separate from the visual-motor perceptions.

The pre-and post-testing will be analyzed for five clinical factors associated with personality maladjustments. The five factors are not considered functions of visual-motor perceptions and are related to emotional disturbances. The scoring will use the Koppitz and Clawson clinical model. This method allows for the

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

total incidence of emotional indicators in the Bender protocol. The testing protocols will be scored to determine the degree of emotional stability. The scoring allows for no more than one emotional indicator which suggests no major personality disorder. Three emotional indicators suggests some degree of emotional disturbance and five emotional indicators indicate a severe emotional problem.¹³

- A. Confused Order - This indicator appears to be related to a lack of planning ability, to an inability to organize and to mental confusion.
- B. Progressively Increasing Size - This indicator is supposedly related to low frustration tolerance and to explosiveness.
- C. Large Size of Drawings - An increase in the size of drawings has been associated with acting out behavior in children.
- D. Expansion - This indicator is associated with acting out behavior and impulsiveness.
- E. Constriction - This indicator is associated with withdrawal, shyness and depression.

The reliability of the Bender Test was accomplished by the test-retest method after a period of four months. The correlations were found statistically significant and ranged from .59 to .64 indicating the Bender can be used with some confidence in relation to developmental and emotional factors.

Statistical Analysis

Results of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Wide Range Achievement Test and the Bender-Gestalt Test were compared using

¹³Clawson, Aileen. The Bender-Visual Motor Gestalt Test. Western Psychological Services, 1961. Koppitz, Elizabeth. The Bender-Gestalt Test. Grune & Stratton, New York, 1965.

the correlated "t" procedure. Pre-testing was done when the juvenile was first confined to prison and before any court proceedings; post-testing - six months later while still confined in the Camp Hill facility. The "t" technique is useful whenever each subject can be used as his own control. This type of pairing provides a more sensitive test of significance, by pooling variance. The test, therefore, becomes less dependent on meeting assumptions of homogeneity of variance and maintains sufficient rigor in spite of possible fluctuations.¹⁴

¹⁴Wert, James, Charles O. Neidt, and J. Stanley Ahmann. Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research. Copy Right, 1954.

Chapter V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In this chapter an analysis of the data will be presented. The Full Scale, Verbal and Performance Intelligence Quotients of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale will be analyzed. Pre and post scores on each of the ten subtests of the Wechsler Scale will also be evaluated to determine any significant differences.

The Wide Range Achievement Test scores in Reading, Spelling and Arithmetic will also be evaluated to determine any significant differences between pre- and post-testing. The pre and post scores on the Bender-Gestalt Test will be evaluated to determine if any changes occurred in the personality characteristics during the period of confinement.

Method of Statistical Analysis

The data were analyzed using the "t" test for related means and each hypothesis was examined for any significant differences between pre- and post-testing. Significant difference was set at the .05 level. The correlated "t" test allows for rigorous control when using a sample with small numbers and is useful in one sample problems in drawing inferences from one sample means.¹

¹Tate, Merle. Statistics in Education and Psychology. The MacMillan Company, New York, 1965.

Hypothesis:

H₁ - There will be no significant change in the Full Scale Intelligence Quotient as measured by the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

Test of the Hypothesis - Table I indicates pre and post test measures on the Full Scale IQ as determined by the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale.

Table I

Means of Pre-and Post-Test Scores for the Full Scale IQs

	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>"t"</u>
Full Scale	84.13	93.77	10.40*

*Significant beyond .05 level

.05 "t" df 29 = 2.045

N = 30

The difference between pre- and post-testing is 9.64 IQ points. The "t" score is 10.40 for the Full Scale IQ. This difference is significant beyond the .05 level and therefore H₁ is rejected.

Hypothesis:

H_{1A} - There will be no significant change on the Verbal Intelligence Quotient as measured by the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

Test of the Hypothesis - Table II indicates pre and post test measures on the Verbal IQ as determined by the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale.

Table II

Means of Pre-and Post-Test Scores on the Verbal IQs

	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>"t"</u>
Verbal IQ	84.47	91.67	8.94*

*Significant beyond .05 level

.05 "t" df 29 = 2.045

N = 30

The difference between pre-and post-testing is 7.20 Verbal IQ points. The "t" score is 8.94 for the Verbal IQ. This difference is significant beyond the .05 level and therefore H_{1A} is rejected.

Hypothesis:

H_{1B} - There will be no significant change on the Performance Intelligence Quotient as measured by the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

Test of the Hypothesis - Table III indicates pre and post measures on the Performance IQ as determined by the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale.

Table III

Means of Pre-and Post-Test Scores on the Performance IQs

	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>"t"</u>
Performance IQ	85.40	97.27	7.18*

*Significant beyond the .05 level

.05 "t" df 29 = 2.045

N = 30

The difference between pre-and post-testing is 11.87 Performance IQ points. The "t" score is 7.18 for the Performance IQ. The difference is significant beyond the .05 level and therefore H_{1B} is rejected.

Hypothesis:

H_{1A1} - There will be no significant change in the areas of the Wechsler subtests such as Information, Comprehension, Arithmetic, Similarities, Digit Span, Vocabulary, Digit Symbol, Block Design, Picture Completion, Picture Arrangement and Object Assembly at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

Test of the Hypothesis - Table IV indicates pre-and post-test means of the subtest on the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale.

Table IV

	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>"t"</u>
Information	5.33	6.07	4.10*
Comprehension	5.77	7.63	4.39*
Arithmetic	6.50	7.40	2.67*
Similarities	8.17	10.20	5.55*
Digit Span	6.87	8.70	5.25*
Vocabulary	6.13	6.87	4.26*
Digit Symbol	7.63	9.67	5.91*
Picture Completion	7.23	9.63	5.86*
Block Design	7.67	8.97	3.62*
Picture Arrangement	7.47	9.47	4.82*
Object Assembly	8.07	9.50	3.12*

*Significant beyond the .05 level

.05 "t" df 29 = 2.045

N = 30

In every instance through the Wechsler Subtest scores, the post means are significantly different from the pre test means. Thus, Hypothesis H_{1A1} is rejected. The rejection of the Hypothesis H_{1A1} reinforces the decision to reject Hypothesis H₁.

Hypothesis:

H_2 , H_{2A} , H_{2B} , and H_{2C} - There will be no significant change on the Achievement scores measured by the Wide Range Achievement Test at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

Test of the Hypothesis - Table VI indicates the pre-post means in relation to Arithmetic, Reading and Spelling as determined by the Wide Range Achievement Test.

Table VI

Pre-Post Means of Sample in Arithmetic,
Reading and Spelling

	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>"t"</u>
Arithmetic	4.28	5.70	4.26*
Reading	4.27	4.96	4.09*
Spelling	5.19	6.39	2.82*

*Significant beyond .05 level

.05 "t" df 29 = 2.045

N = 30

Significant differences beyond the .05 level occur in all areas. Thus, H_2 , H_{2A} , H_{2B} , and H_{2C} can be rejected in view of the significant pre-post differences in the means through the three areas of academic achievement measured in this study.

Hypothesis:

H₃ - There will be no significant change on Personality Characteristics, as measured by the Bender-Gestalt Test, at the time of apprehension and after adjudication and at least six months placement in a maximum security institution.

Test of the Hypothesis - Table VII analyzes the pre-post means of the Bender-Gestalt scores as they apply to the subjects of this study. The areas reported are those involving Increase in Size, Confused Order, Large Drawings, Expansion and Constriction.

Table VII

Pre-Post Test Means of Sub-Areas of the Bender-Gestalt Test

	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>"t"</u>
Increased Size	1.80	1.60	0.72
Confused Order	3.40	2.40	3.53*
Large Drawings	1.73	1.45	1.28
Expansion	2.40	2.07	1.41
Constriction	1.13	1.73	2.76

*Significant beyond .05 level

.05 "t" df 29 = 2.045

N = 30

Hypothesis H₃ deals with changes in the Personality as measured by the Bender-Gestalt Test. The prime criterion in rejecting H₃ was a significant difference in at least one of the categories. This is evident in the test of Confused Order and therefore, H₃ is rejected.

Discussion of the Data

Intelligence

The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale's mean IQ is 100. This indicates an average IQ with a standard deviation of 15 points. The Full Scale mean IQ of the sample on the pre-test is 84.13 which places the IQ in the dull-normal range of intellectual functioning. This score is obtained by 16.1% of the general population. The post-test full scale IQ is 93.77 which is an increase of approximately 10 points and places the sample in the normal range of intellectual functioning along with 50% of the general population. The verbal and performance IQs show a 7.20 and 11.87 IQ points improvement on the post-testing. In pre- and post-tests the performance IQ was greater than the verbal IQ. These results were also experienced by Wechsler and the Gluecks.² The difference in the pre- and post-test scores is significant beyond the .05 level. The verbal IQ scores of the sample on the pre-test were 84.47 which is also in the dull-normal range. The post-test score on the verbal IQ is 91.67. This 7.20 increase places the IQ in the normal range. The pre-test performance IQ of 85.40 is in the dull-normal range. The post-test performance IQ of 97.27 shows the greatest increase and is also in the normal range of intellectual functioning. The full scale IQ reveals gains of 2 to 25 points with no member of the sample scoring lower on the post-test. This improvement allowed the group to score into the normal range of intellectual functioning. The subtests of the

²Wechsler, The Measurement and Appraisal of Adult Intelligence. Glueck & Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency.

verbal and performance IQs show improvement with a significant difference in all eleven subtests. The "t" scores range from 2.67 (arithmetic) to 5.86 (picture completion). Pre-test means range from 5.33 (information) to 8.17 (similarities). Post-test means range from 6.07 (information) to 10.20 (similarities). Differences between pre and post means range from 0.90 (arithmetic) to 2.03 (similarities).

The intelligence test results agree with those reported by the Gluecks in their analysis of delinquent's intellectual factors. They report lowest scores in information, comprehension and arithmetic subtests. It is their conclusion that delinquents suffer certain constituents of abstract intelligence, namely vocabulary, information and comprehension.³ They also theorize that the delinquent's performance intelligence is higher than the verbal intelligence. The high performance/low verbal combination is usually associated with an "acting out" personality pattern.⁴ The subtests also support previous research in relation to the low scores attained in the information subtests. Wechsler states that a low information score is common to both male and female sociopaths and could reflect in part education retardation or the tendency of many delinquents to disregard those aspects of available knowledge (reality) which do not lead to the satisfaction of their immediate needs.⁵ The Gluecks state that delinquency and mental retardation do not show a positive relationship which is evident from the

³Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Delinquents in the Making. Harper & Row Publishers, New York, 1952.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid.

normal mean IQ scores of the sample group. The subtest triad which usually reflects cultural deprivation is information, vocabulary and arithmetic. Low scores on these subtests may also reflect poor academic performance. The sample reflects this pattern on both the pre-and post-testing. This educational retardation may make it difficult for the sample to compete with a normal academic peer group.

The improvement in the object assembly and picture arrangement subtests suggest a lessening of the anxiety level which causes a temporary loss of goals, occasional awkwardness and unnecessary persistence.⁶

Achievement

The Wide Range Achievement Test reports scores based on years and months of academic achievement. The three areas of pre-testing reveal that the average achievement grade is approximately two to four grades below the average grade attained in school for the sample. The arithmetic grade reveals 1.42 grade improvement; the reading grade improved approximately 7 academic months; and the spelling grade improved 1.20 academic years. These results are surprising because spelling is higher than reading on both the pre-and post-test scores. The reading sight vocabulary test requires little reasoning with spelling requiring fundamental knowledge to complete the word correctly. The results support the previous studies by the Gluecks which suggest reading deficiencies could be the result of innate abilities, but could also include emotional upsets, bad study habits,

⁶ Wechsler, The Measurement & Appraisal of Adult Intelligence.

truancy, and resistance to schooling.⁷ The high spelling score, followed by arithmetic and reading, is seen in approximately fifteen per cent of clinical children. Discrepancies within the patterns are usually small although the differences between school achievement and native endowment may be great. Jastak considers this a mixed pattern and suggests a disorganized personality may be present.⁸ The results indicate significant difference beyond the .05 level in all areas, thus, H_2 can be rejected in view of the significant pre-post differences in the means of the three areas of academic achievement measured in this study.

Personality Characteristics

The Bender-Gestalt Test Protocols were scored on the basis of five emotional indicators which are separate from visual-perceptual signs. The prime criterion for rejecting H_3 was a significant difference in at least one category. The differences were significant beyond the .05 level in Confused Order and Constriction. In the areas of Increase in Size, Large Drawings, and Expansion the differences are not significant but the trend appears evident toward improved functioning or greater stability of the personality. The scores compliment those of Koppitz in her research with emotional children as to the type and number of emotional factors present.⁹

⁷Gluecks, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency.

⁸Jastak, Wide Range Achievement Test.

⁹Koppitz, The Bender-Gestalt Test.

Chapter VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this exploratory study was to determine if incarceration in a county prison followed by at least six months imprisonment had any effects on the intelligence, achievement and personality characteristics of juvenile offenders. The sample was selected from the male delinquents confined to Dauphin County Prison and after a court trial and sentencing, spent at least six months in the Camp Hill Correctional Institution which is designed for maximum security. The sample was between 16 and 18 years of age and selected at random from the delinquents who met the time and age requirements.

The test instruments used were the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Wide Range Achievement Test and the Bender-Gestalt Test. The testing was confined to three areas and three major hypotheses were tested. The first major hypothesis (H_1) stated that no significant difference would occur in the Full Scale IQ as measured by the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale using the "t" test for related means at the .05 level. In addition, sub-hypothesis (H_{1A} and H_{1B}) would perform the same function in relation to the verbal and performance levels of intelligence. The eleven subtests of the Wechsler Scale (H_{1A1}) were also tested at the .05 level of significance. The second major hypothesis (H_2) analyzed the academic achievement

in the areas of Reading (H_{2A}), Arithmetic (H_{2B}) and Spelling (H_{2C}) at the .05 level of significance. The third major hypothesis (H_3) analyzed five personality characteristics on the Bender-Gestalt Test using the same criteria as H_1 and H_2 . The three major hypotheses and sub-hypotheses on the Intelligence Test, Achievement Test and Bender Test were rejected as all showed significant differences beyond the .05 level of significance. The rejection of the hypotheses indicates that a measurable change occurred after a brief period in a county prison and six months incarceration in a maximum security institution.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to determine what impact, if any, judicial proceedings might have on the test performance on juvenile offenders. Impact was measured as differences in pre/post means of the 30 members of the sample in the areas of intelligence quotient, achievement and personality characteristics. The concern expressed by this investigator is that juvenile offenders experience an abrupt change in life-style as a consequence of apprehension. The juvenile offender who is tested at the time of apprehension will score differently at this point in time than he would under more favorable circumstances.

The impact of the climate during which a test is administered has always been of concern to psychologists. A charged atmosphere can easily be generated as a consequence of the arrest and prison confinement which can impact on performance in test situations and can subsequently depress scores. The use of these suspected

invalid outcomes to place offenders in institutions and programs indicate the serious consequences of the inappropriateness of testing at this point in the delinquent offenders life. The atmosphere in the county prison is characterized by the loss of personal freedom, tension of uncertainty in relation to the criminal violation, and physical threats from other prisoners.

The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale's Full Scale IQ mean score for the sample on the pre-test is 84.13. This places the sample in the dull-normal range of intellectual functioning. The post-test Full Scale IQ mean score is 93.77 which is in the normal range of intellectual functioning. Gains of 2 to 25 points were recorded by members of the sample; no member of the sample regressed. Based on the state of Pennsylvania standards of 80 or below IQ for class placement in Special Education, eleven scored in the educable mentally retarded range on the pre-testing. The post-testing revealed only two scoring in the retarded range. If placements were determined by the pre-testing IQs, the evidence indicates that some members of the sample could be placed in institutions which accept retarded, or denied admission to more appropriate institutions because they lacked the necessary intellect on the pre-test. The purpose of providing such pre-test data in this study is to present evidence of the specific differences and to suggest the fallacy of using scores which are the consequence of testing during or immediately following confinement, as realistic profiles of the offenders functioning. The test scores could be so inaccurate that the true potential is not realized and specific strengths could be easily overlooked. If the scores are used for placement purposes

or prevent accurate placement, the effect on the delinquent could cause unknown psychological and emotional damage.

The Wechsler subtests are all below the mean score of ten on the pre-testing and all but Similarities is below the true mean on the post-testing. The subtest pattern of scores corresponds with the results experienced by Glueck and Glueck.¹ The low Information score is reflected in both studies. The subtests do not reflect any organic or serious personality maladjustments, but do suggest the sociopathic personality profile described by Wechsler.²

The achievement scores indicate that as a group the sample members are chronic underachievers. They function approximately two to three grades below the highest grade completed. The greatest improvement was in the Arithmetic and Spelling areas. It should also be noted that the Arithmetic and Spelling scores will suffer most when prolonged and direct effort is required, however this is not possible during periods of acute stress and anxiety. Jastak theorizes that the S-A-R pattern of scoring is associated with a disorganized personality pattern. This disorganized pattern could be caused by language retardation or disorganization of the personality. Language retardation causes inferiority in reading, writing and spelling while a disorganized personality causes inferiority in arithmetic and in many concrete adjustments. The cause of the low academic scores in this study is probably caused by a combination of both factors which are chronic in nature. Most expressed a

¹ Glueck & Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency.

² Wechsler, The Measurement & Appraisal of Adult Intelligence.

desire to return to school but when placed in the general society it is doubtful they would achieve unless some form of control was present.

The Bender Test reveals an improved level of functioning in all areas with a significant difference in Confused Order and improvement in the other four areas. This improved performance suggests a more stable personality but is not to be interpreted as a normal personality. The results only suggest a less expansive and acting out test protocol. The personality factor which presents the most difficult scoring is the Constriction. Previous research (Byrd) indicates that it does present pathological implications for adults but is less effective for children.³ Koppitz' research indicates that some studies indicate that this is the only indicator that appeared in the control group more frequently than in emotional children. Some researchers have dropped the constriction indicator because it lacks diagnostic value. It was included in this study for reasons of confirmation of previous research and although a significant difference was found it was not used to reject the H₃ hypothesis. This investigator agrees with previous research suggesting that the constriction indicator can be used for research but its validity is questionable. The data clearly presents evidence that a change has occurred in all areas evaluated. The difference in the pre-and post-testing indicates that the scores are higher after a period of confinement in the institution. This improvement in scores cannot be attributed to any formal academic

³Byrd. E. "The Clinical Validity of the Bender Test with Children." Journal of Projective Techniques. Vol. 20, 1956.

program because no member of the sample was involved in a structured academic program which is the responsibility of the institution and/or the Intermediate Unit. This conclusion takes into consideration that a formal academic program is available for inmates at Camp Hill but none were in regular attendance. Reasons given included the fact that classes were full and enrollment could not be undertaken until the next semester. The county prison has no known academic program and no known teacher is assigned there. This could be caused by the fact that delinquents are processed through the prison in a matter of days. There are exceptions with one juvenile confined to the county prison for at least eight months before his transfer but was not given any academic opportunities. Some members of the sample stated that they would enter the General Education Development program when space was available. This appears to be one of the institution's best academic programs with many delinquents receiving the high school equivalent certificate. Thus, one should not be given the false impression that the scores increased because of the "academic treatment" factor.

Three factors which this investigator feels contributed to test score improvement are a feeling passed throughout the institution that it would help them to be released and everyone cooperated in an attempt to obtain their best scores. The second factor was the lower anxiety level when compared to the initial shock of confinement in the county prison. The third "intangible" factor which was seen and felt but could not be measured was control and conformity of the delinquents. Each was accustomed to his life-style after six

months and all knew how to "make it" in their present environment.

A personal interview was conducted with each member of the sample to determine their present situation from their status when first seen in the county prison. The interviews suggest a different set of problems. Fourteen of the sample expressed concern for physical harm from other delinquents. Three admitted they had some type of weapon (handmade knives) hidden in their cells. Two confirmed homosexuals were experiencing difficulties with other delinquents who claimed them as "wives". Although these concerns are serious in nature, the acute anxieties were not present and the members of the sample could cope with their problems. The greatest complaint was the fact that there was nothing to do and they spent all day in their cells. This reflects the fact that no member of the sample was in a formal academic treatment program. Based on the available facts into the effects of incarceration, the five following general conclusions are offered:

1. The three major hypotheses are rejected as a result of the significant differences in T1 and T2.
2. Delinquents placed or denied admittance to an institution based on T1 scores could be inappropriately incarcerated.
3. The difference between T1 and T2 cannot be explained by or credited to any known academic treatment program.
4. Delinquents confined to a maximum security institution have internalized controlled anxieties rather than the acute, overt anxieties exhibited in the original county jail placement.
5. The cause of the differences between T1 and T2 are inconclusive and additional research is indicated using a control group and extended periods of testing.

It is conceivable that the improvement in scores, as reported in this study, could be explained by the positive influence of the experience while incarcerated. This author does not believe this to be the case. Instead it is suggested that testing at the time of stress and uncertainty during initial detention and prior to the dispositional hearing resulted in the depression of the actual intelligence, achievement and personality characteristic scores which were more accurately measured at the time of the post-test.

Implications for Future Research:

The results of this exploratory investigation are inconclusive. Additional research and refined testing procedures could help explain the difference between T1 and T2.

It is suggested that future researchers investigate the possibility of devising a more appropriate test protocol which includes a personality questionnaire and a standardized projective test. Another critical variable that needs to be explored is the time element. Testing could be done, for example, every 60 days until the psychologist is assured the results are stable and repeatable. If this approach is used, two forms of the same test are recommended to minimize test recall. Additional research should also explore the effects after twelve or eighteen months of confinement. This time period was chosen because it usually corresponds with the sentence received.

A more meaningful study would investigate the sample who received little or no treatment with a control group in the institution which had been exposed to the academic treatment and

rehabilitation programs after the same length of confinement. Recent pressures from the state of Pennsylvania have closed the maximum security institutions to juvenile delinquents in favor of the community treatment programs advocated by Dr. Jerome Miller, Commissioner of Youth Services. These community treatment centers have received much criticism but give future researchers an opportunity for additional study. This could be accomplished in two ways. The original sample could be reevaluated after a period of readjustment in the community or another sample could be selected as they proceed from the county prison through the courts and into the residential treatment programs. The second alternative would shed additional information about the effects of T1 and T2 in relation to institution vs. community treatment on the intelligence, achievement and personality characteristics of confined delinquents.

Testing Delimitations

In any investigation involving groups of people, the results are easily influenced by uncontrollable variables. This investigation is no different and it is therefore necessary to examine and explain the difficulties encountered.

The pre-testing was completed at Dauphin County Prison with the post-testing at the Camp Hill Correctional Institution. It has been the investigator's experience that court and prison officials cannot be by-passed and should be informed as to the nature of the study, the time element, and intended use of the results.

The prison officials should be informed about the length of time needed to complete the study, space needed and exact time

you will be in their institution because prisons operate on a specific time schedule of activities. The actual testing can only be completed with the help of each prisoner because he is a volunteer and has the right to refuse. An explanation of purpose is usually sufficient to gain total cooperation. The testing protocol should be rigid because the information will quickly filter back through the prison regarding the type of testing and even the possibility of specific questions asked.

The intelligence and achievement testing instruments present no problems as they are standardized. The projective testing is more difficult to control because no standardized scores are available and the examiner must follow established procedures and use some degree of professional judgment in the scoring procedures.

The first ten reevaluations quickly changed this investigator's preconceived opinion about the effects of institutional placement. Experience suggested that all would score lower because of the effects of confinement. The exact opposite was true; all had scored higher and to eliminate any personal bias about the study, it was necessary to maintain exact standards. It was evident the inmates were scoring higher and no artificial help could be given. The pattern of scoring higher was evident throughout the study and this can be attributed to the inmates response because the same standards were maintained throughout. Additional information was gained about attitudes, prison life, future plans, and personal concerns but these are not the main thrust of the study.

The last area of concern for any examiner is getting the

data for the original study. This should be accomplished at the beginning of any interview because the inmates are so overwhelmed by their personal problems that they will quickly take over the interview and attempt to satisfy their own needs. Some become so emotional that it is impossible to secure your data. The key to success in institutional research is preplanning, straight talk and listening to the personal problems after your data is obtained.

APPENDIX A

Operational Definition of Terms

1. Adjudication. Official court hearing before the juvenile judge to hear or settle a juvenile offense.
2. Apprehension. For purposes of this study, apprehension means confinement in a county prison at the request of the courts.
3. Correctional Institution. Usually a state or private institution for the confinement or rehabilitation of juvenile offenders charged with or convicted of criminal offenses.*
4. Culture Deprivation. A lack of experience and knowledge to the complex whole called culture. Includes beliefs, morals, art, laws and customs and other habits or capabilities acquired by members of a society.**
5. Detention. Placement in custody for an alleged act of juvenile delinquency usually in separate facilities away from adults.*
6. Dull-normal Intelligence. Any individual with an IQ between 80-89 and not retarded.**
7. Hard-core Delinquent. Any child between 8 and 17 years of age who consistently violate the law and fails to respond to treatment and/or therapy.*
8. Juvenile - A person who has not attained their eighteenth birthday.*
9. Juvenile Delinquent. - A person who is in violation of a law committed by a juvenile which would be a crime if committed by an adult.*

10. Juvenile Rights. A juvenile charged with an act of juvenile delinquency has the same rights as those guaranteed by the Constitution to an adult.*
11. Mentally Retarded. Any child who scores below 80 on the standard intelligence test and does not suffer from chronic cultural deprivation.**
12. Neglected. Any child who lacks parent or guardian care, control or custody which deprives them of normal means to develop to their potential.*
13. Offenses Applicable to Juveniles and Adults. Offenses for which an adult may also be processed; such as burglary, larceny, and drunkenness, etc.*
14. Offenses Applicable to Juveniles Only. Offenses for which only the juvenile may be processed; such as, running away, truancy, and ungovernable behavior.*
15. Official. Is used to denote only those cases that appear for adjudication by a judge through the filing of petition. Where a juvenile has a detention hearing, subsequently an evidentiary hearing and then a final adjudication hearing, it is considered and counted as one case only.*
16. Organic Involvement. Any person suffering physical damage to the brain caused by birth or an accident.**
17. Public Institution. Institutions maintained by the state, or county or city for delinquent children.*
18. Recidivism. Any delinquent who is placed in an institution and returns to an institution because of inability to adjust to the standards imposed by society.*

19. Transfer of Legal Custody. The court divests the parents of their parental responsibilities toward the child and vests custody of the child to an individual, institution or agency.*
20. Treatment. Includes, but is not limited to, medical, educational, social, psychological and vocational services, corrective and preventive, guidance and training, and other rehabilitative services designed to protect the public.*
21. Unofficial. Is used for all juveniles processed without an adjudicatory hearing by a judge. This also includes those cases where a petition is filed with no evidentiary hearing taking place and the disposition of the juvenile is determined by the probation officers.*

*Pennsylvania Juvenile Courts Disposition Manual, 1972.

**Wechsler Intelligence Scale Classification.

TABLE I-A

WECHSLER FULL SCALE IQs			
<u>N =</u>	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Diff</u>
1	105	108	3
2	78	86	8
3	67	78	11
4	79	87	8
5	110	117	7
6	85	92	7
7	85	95	10
8	72	86	14
9	85	87	2
10	93	95	2
11	80	87	7
12	86	98	12
13	94	104	10
14	84	104	20
15	75	85	10
16	72	78	6
17	74	86	12
18	89	93	4
19	73	84	11
20	86	98	12
21	79	92	13
22	83	94	11
23	81	87	6
24	72	97	25
25	97	113	16
26	84	90	6
27	77	83	6
28	105	112	7
29	90	105	15
30	<u>84</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>8</u>
Average	84.13	93.77	9.64

TABLE II-A

WECHSLER VERBAL IQs			
<u>N =</u>	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Diff</u>
1	103	105	2
2	79	88	9
3	74	77	3
4	77	82	5
5	102	115	13
6	82	91	9
7	83	91	8
8	73	80	7
9	80	80	—
10	85	89	4
11	79	86	7
12	86	98	12
13	92	96	4
14	87	98	11
15	77	84	7
16	72	77	5
17	81	90	9
18	92	91	-1
19	76	87	11
20	85	96	11
21	81	92	11
22	84	93	9
23	82	87	5
24	83	100	17
25	94	107	13
26	88	94	6
27	80	78	-2
28	103	110	7
29	92	103	11
30	<u>81</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>4</u>
Average	84.47	91.67	7.20

TABLE III-A

WECHSLER PERFORMANCE IQs			
<u>N =</u>	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>	<u>Diff</u>
1	105	113	8
2	81	86	5
3	62	82	20
4	85	96	11
5	120	117	-3
6	92	94	2
7	90	102	12
8	74	96	22
9	94	98	4
10	104	104	—
11	83	90	7
12	87	98	11
13	98	113	15
14	83	113	30
15	77	84	7
16	75	82	7
17	69	83	14
18	87	96	9
19	73	82	9
20	70	100	30
21	79	94	15
22	86	98	12
23	83	89	6
24	60	94	34
25	102	119	17
26	79	89	10
27	77	92	15
28	107	103	-4
29	90	108	18
30	<u>90</u>	<u>103</u>	<u>13</u>
Average	85.40	97.27	11.87

TABLE IV-A

WECHSLER VERBAL SUBTESTS									
	Information			Comprehension			Arithmetic		
	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff
1	8	8	—	7	10	3	10	9	-1
2	4	5	1	5	7	2	5	6	1
3	4	4	-	5	4	-1	5	5	—
4	3	4	1	5	6	1	5	5	—
5	6	6	—	12	15	3	7	13	6
6	4	5	1	5	7	2	8	10	2
7	5	6	1	5	7	2	7	7	—
8	5	5	—	4	6	2	4	6	2
9	4	5	1	5	7	2	5	5	—
10	5	5	—	5	6	1	5	5	—
11	4	4	—	5	7	2	5	6	1
12	6	7	1	4	6	2	8	12	4
13	6	8	2	7	10	3	7	7	—
14	7	9	2	6	11	5	7	8	1
15	4	5	1	10	4	-6	4	4	—
16	4	5	1	5	6	1	5	5	—
17	4	4	—	2	9	7	7	7	—
18	6	5	-1	6	7	1	8	9	1
19	5	8	3	6	6	—	5	5	—
20	5	5	—	5	12	7	8	7	-1
21	5	6	1	5	6	1	8	8	—
22	5	6	1	6	7	1	7	8	1
23	5	5	—	6	7	1	5	5	—
24	5	5	—	6	11	5	6	8	2
25	7	10	3	5	7	2	8	15	7
26	7	8	1	6	7	1	7	7	—
27	4	6	2	3	4	1	6	5	1
28	11	11	—	9	11	2	8	8	—
29	6	7	1	9	11	2	9	10	1
30	6	5	-1	4	5	1	6	7	1
Av.	5.33	6.07	0.73	5.77	7.63	1.866	6.50	7.40	0.9

TABLE IV-A Continued

WECHSLER VERBAL SUBTESTS									
	Similarities			Digit Span			Vocabulary		
	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff
1	12	11	-1	16	15	1	7	9	2
2	7	8	1	7	10	3	5	6	1
3	3	7	4	6	6	—	5	5	—
4	8	9	1	4	7	3	6	6	—
5	12	13	1	11	13	2	9	10	1
6	9	9	—	7	11	4	6	6	—
7	8	9	1	7	9	2	5	7	2
8	7	9	2	2	6	4	5	5	—
9	8	7	-1	6	7	1	6	6	—
10	9	10	1	9	10	1	6	7	1
11	8	10	2	4	6	2	7	7	—
12	7	10	3	7	10	3	8	10	2
13	10	12	2	7	6	-1	9	8	-1
14	8	12	4	6	7	1	7	8	1
15	5	11	6	4	9	5	4	5	1
16	6	8	2	1	4	3	5	6	1
17	7	8	1	10	10	—	5	6	1
18	9	8	-1	11	10	-1	6	6	—
19	5	9	4	4	6	2	5	7	2
20	7	14	7	9	7	-2	5	6	1
21	6	11	5	7	9	2	4	6	2
22	9	10	1	6	11	5	5	5	—
23	8	10	2	7	9	2	5	5	—
24	11	13	2	6	11	5	6	9	3
25	9	12	3	12	12	—	8	8	—
26	11	12	1	4	6	2	7	8	1
27	9	9	—	7	6	-1	5	5	—
28	11	12	1	9	12	3	10	11	1
29	8	13	5	6	10	4	8	7	1
30	8	10	2	6	6	—	5	6	1
Av.	8.17	10.2	2.03	6.87	8.70	1.833	6.13	6.87	0.733

TABLE IV-A Continued

	Block Design			Object Assembly		
	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff
1	12	12	—	11	13	2
2	7	7	—	7	7	—
3	2	7	5	5	7	2
4	6	9	3	10	12	2
5	13	12	-1	12	12	—
6	9	9	—	8	7	-1
7	9	10	1	8	7	-1
8	5	9	4	5	8	3
9	9	9	—	9	8	-1
10	14	10	-4	12	12	—
11	6	7	1	9	6	-3
12	10	9	-1	8	9	1
13	12	13	1	6	12	6
14	7	12	5	7	10	3
15	6	7	1	5	5	—
16	6	7	1	7	9	2
17	6	7	1	4	8	4
18	6	8	2	12	14	2
19	4	5	1	7	7	—
20	6	8	2	12	11	-1
21	6	9	3	6	7	1
22	7	9	2	7	10	3
23	7	7	—	6	6	—
24	3	7	4	4	9	5
25	12	14	2	9	17	8
26	8	9	1	7	9	2
27	3	7	4	9	8	-1
28	12	11	-1	13	10	-3
29	9	9	—	6	11	5
30	8	10	2	11	11	—
Av.	7.67	8.97	1.30	8.07	9.50	1.43

TABLE IV-A Continued

WECHSLER PERFORMANCE SUBTESTS									
	Digit Symbol			Picture Compl.			Picture Arrange.		
	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff
1	10	11	1	11	14	3	9	9	—
2	5	9	4	7	8	1	8	7	-1
3	6	8	2	7	7	—	0	6	6
4	7	8	1	9	8	-1	5	9	4
5	13	13	—	13	10	-3	13	15	2
6	12	14	2	5	8	3	9	7	-2
7	9	10	1	8	11	3	7	9	2
8	7	12	5	6	8	2	6	9	3
9	10	15	5	5	6	1	11	10	-1
10	8	10	2	7	9	2	11	11	—
11	6	8	2	6	10	4	9	10	1
12	8	8	—	7	11	4	6	11	5
13	10	10	—	11	13	2	8	11	3
14	6	10	4	9	12	3	7	15	8
15	4	8	4	6	8	2	9	12	3
16	6	7	1	6	7	1	5	6	1
17	3	8	5	3	8	5	6	6	—
18	7	7	—	8	9	1	6	8	2
19	7	5	-2	4	9	5	6	9	3
20	9	12	3	5	11	6	9	7	-2
21	8	9	1	7	10	3	6	9	3
22	9	11	2	8	9	1	7	8	1
23	8	10	2	7	9	2	8	8	—
24	6	11	5	2	10	8	4	8	4
25	8	10	2	10	10	—	11	13	2
26	7	7	—	6	7	1	6	7	1
27	7	12	5	6	7	1	6	9	3
28	8	10	2	11	16	5	10	12	2
29	10	10	—	9	13	4	7	11	4
30	5	7	2	8	11	3	9	12	3
Av.	7.63	9.67	2.033	7.23	9.63	2.4	7.47	9.47	2.0

TABLE V

Pre and Post Wechsler Subtest Scaled Score Differences

	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	Post
Information	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Comprehension	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Arithmetic	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Similarities	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Digit Span	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Vocabulary	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Digit Symbol	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Picture Completion	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Block Design	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Picture Arrangement	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0
Object Assembly	20	18	16	14	12	11	10.5	10	9.5	9.0	8.5	8.0	7.5	7.0	6.5	6.0	5.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	3.0	2.5	2.0	1.0	1.0

Pre- - - - Post

TABLE VI-A

	Spelling			Reading			Arithmetic		
	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff	Pre	Post	Diff
1	11.3	14.7	3.4	9.6	8.7	-0.9	7.4	10.8	3.4
2	2.7	2.4	-0.3	2.4	2.6	0.2	2.5	3.0	0.5
3	1.6	4.1	2.5	2.1	2.6	0.5	4.4	4.8	0.4
4	2.2	4.2	2.0	2.1	2.3	0.2	2.9	4.1	1.2
5	6.3	7.3	1.0	5.8	6.1	0.3	4.4	10.1	5.7
6	6.3	7.7	1.4	5.0	6.3	1.3	5.2	6.7	1.5
7	6.0	8.2	2.2	5.1	5.3	0.2	4.4	6.2	1.8
8	1.8	2.4	0.6	1.9	3.0	1.1	3.9	2.9	-1.0
9	6.2	7.7	1.5	4.6	5.8	1.2	2.9	2.7	-0.2
10	3.2	4.6	1.2	3.0	3.3	0.3	5.3	2.9	-2.4
11	2.8	3.9	1.1	2.9	3.3	0.4	3.9	4.5	0.6
12	6.8	8.9	2.1	5.1	6.5	1.4	4.9	8.0	3.1
13	4.2	5.6	1.4	4.8	4.0	-0.8	6.3	6.3	—
14	5.1	8.1	3.0	4.1	4.6	0.5	3.2	7.4	4.2
15	3.2	5.6	2.4	3.3	3.3	—	4.1	5.7	1.6
16	1.6	1.8	0.2	1.8	2.6	0.8	2.1	2.3	0.2
17	4.4	4.6	0.2	3.6	4.0	0.4	3.4	2.9	-0.5
18	5.0	6.5	1.5	4.8	4.3	-0.5	2.3	3.9	1.6
19	1.3	1.4	0.1	2.0	2.2	0.2	2.4	2.4	—
20	6.9	9.6	2.7	5.8	5.5	-0.3	6.1	7.1	1.0
21	6.0	6.6	0.6	3.7	6.3	2.6	4.9	5.7	0.8
22	6.9	8.7	1.8	6.5	6.8	0.3	5.3	7.4	2.1
23	3.5	5.8	2.3	3.1	4.3	1.2	3.4	3.9	0.5
24	9.1	9.9	0.8	3.2	4.6	1.4	3.9	5.7	1.8
25	9.6	10.5	0.9	7.3	9.0	1.7	8.0	7.4	-0.6
26	8.5	9.9	1.4	5.1	6.7	1.6	4.9	6.1	1.2
27	7.4	9.1	1.7	4.2	7.6	3.4	3.9	6.7	2.8
28	8.9	10.8	1.9	6.1	6.7	0.6	3.9	7.7	3.8
29	7.1	6.0	-1.1	5.0	5.5	0.5	4.9	10.1	5.2
30	6.0	6.5	0.5	4.2	4.9	0.7	3.4	5.7	2.3
Av.	5.19	6.39	1.4	4.27	4.96	0.7	4.28	5.70	1.4

TABLE VII-A

BENDER-GESTALT TEST										
	Confused Order		Increase in Size		Large Drawing		Expansion		Constriction	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1	1	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1
2	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	3	1	3	3	3	3	1	1	1	1
4	5	5	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
6	3	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
7	5	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
8	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	5	3	1	1	1	1	5	3	1	1
10	5	1	3	1	1	1	5	5	1	3
11	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	3
12	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
13	5	3	5	1	5	1	5	3	1	3
14	5	5	5	3	5	3	5	3	1	3
15	3	1	3	1	3	3	3	3	1	3
16	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
17	3	3	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	3
18	3	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	1	3
19	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3
20	5	5	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	1
21	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	1
22	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3
23	5	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	1	1
24	5	5	1	1	1	1	5	5	1	1
25	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
27	3	1	3	1	3	1	1	3	1	1
28	3	5	1	5	1	3	1	1	3	1
29	3	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	3
30	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Av.	3.40	2.40	1.80	1.60	1.73	1.45	2.40	2.07	1.13	1.73

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Carmichael, Leonard. Manual of Child Psychology. John Wiley & Sons. New York. 1965.
- Clawson, Aileen. The Bender-Visual Motor Gestalt Test. Western Psychological Services. 1961.
- Cloward, Richard and Lloyd Ohlin. Delinquency and Opportunity. The Free Press. New York. 1960.
- Gibbons, T. G. N. and R. Ahrenfeldt. Cultural Factors in Delinquency. J. B. Lippincott Company. 1970.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Juvenile Delinquents Grow Up. New York Commonwealth Fund. 1960.
- _____. Delinquents in the Making. Harper & Row Publishers, New York. 1952.
- _____. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Commonwealth Fund. 1950.
- Hathaway, S. R. and J. C. McKinley. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. The Psychological Corp. New York. 1951.
- Healy, William. The Individual Delinquent. Brown Little Co. 1971.
- Jastak, Joseph. Wide Range Achievement Test. C. L. Story Company. Wilmington, Delaware. 1946.
- Kirkpatrick, John. Delinquent Behavior. Prentice Hall, Inc. 1970.
- Koppitz, Elizabeth. The Bender-Gestalt Test. Grune & Stratton. New York. 1965.
- Merrill, Maude. Problems of Child Delinquency. Houghton Mifflin. Boston. 1947.
- Nye, F. I. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. John Wiley & Sons. New York. 1958.
- Putzel, Henry. Cases Adjudged in the Supreme Court: The Gault Decision. U. S. Reports. CCCLXXXVII, October, 1966.

- Robison, Sophia, M. Can Delinquency Be Measured. Brown Little & Company. 1971.
- Roman, Melvin. Reaching Delinquent Children Through Reading. Charles G. Thomas. Springfield, Illinois. 1957.
- Shulman, Harry. Juvenile Delinquency in American Society. Harper & Row Publishers. 1961.
- Tannenbaum, Frank. Crime and the Community. Ginn & Company. New York. 1938.
- Tate, Merle. Statistics in Education and Psychology. The MacMillan Company. New York. 1965.
- Warren, Marguerite. The Community Treatment Project: in The Criminal and Confinement. Leon Radzinowicz and Marvin Wolfgang. Basic Books, Inc. 1971.
- Wechsler, David. The Measurement and Appraisal of Adult Intelligence. Williams & Wilkins Company. 1958. Reprint, 1965.
- Weeks, H. A. Youthful Offenders at Highfields. University of Michigan Press. 1958.
- Wert, James, Charles O. Neidt and J. Stanley Ahmann. Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research. Copy Right. Williams & Wilkins Company. 1954.

Government Documents

- U. S. Congress, Senate. Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Juvenile Confinement Institutions and Correctional Systems. Hearing, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, May 3, 1971. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1973).
- _____. Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Hearing, 93rd Congress, 1st Session, May 15, 1972. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1973).
- U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Research Project, Elizabeth Herzog. "Identifying Potential Delinquents." Children's Bureau Facts and Facets Number 5. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1965).
- _____. Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. Legislation Guide. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1972).

U. S. Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Investigation, Clarence Kelley, Director. Uniform Crime Report. Washington, D. C. March 31, 1975.

_____. Federal Bureau of Investigation. Clarence Kelley, Director. Uniform Crime Report. Washington, D. C. March 29, 1974.

State Documents

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Laws of the General Assembly. Act 333, Pennsylvania Juvenile Act. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. December, 1972.

Lingle, Oscar. Dauphin County Annual Controller's Report. 61st Annual Report. 1974.

Pennsylvania Department of Justice. Bureau of Criminal Justice Statistics. Pennsylvania Juvenile Courts Dispositions Manual. Series J-2, No. 2. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. 1973.

_____. Bureau of Criminal Justice and Statistics. James Boylan. Pennsylvania Juvenile Dispositions Manual. Series J-2, No. 2. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. 1973.

Periodicals

Bazelon, David. "Beyond Control of the Juvenile Court." Juvenile Court Journal. XXI, (1974) 45-50.

Benning, James J. and John R. Thurston. "Prediction of Delinquents Adjustment and Academic Achievement over a Five Year Period with the Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Scale." The Journal of Education Research. LXV, No. 8, (April, 1972).

Bland, David Horton. "A Study of the Achievement Levels in Reading and Computation of Incarcerated Adult Males in the North Carolina Prison System." North Carolina University. May, 1968.

Byrd, E. "The Clinical Validity of the Bender Test with Children." Journal of Projective Techniques. Vol. 20, 1956. pp 127-136.

Closson, F. I. "Delinquency: Its Prevention Rests Upon the Academic Community." Clearing House. XLV (June, 1971) pp 290-293.

Editorial. The Evening News (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania) May 25, 1975. p 16.

- Follman, John and others. "Delinquency Prediction Scales and Personality Inventories." Child Study Journal. II, No. 2, (1972). pp 99-103.
- Gormly, J. and M. J. Nittoli. "Rapid Improvement of Reading Skills in Juvenile Delinquents." Journal of Experimental Education. XL, No. 2, Winter, 1971. pp 45-48.
- Grob, H. E., Jr. and E. F. VanDoren. "Aggressive Group Work with Teenage Delinquent Boys, Chaddock Boys School, Quincy, Illinois." Children. XVI. May, 1969. pp 103-108.
- Jordan, Vernon. "The System that Propogates Crime." Crime and Delinquency. X, No. 3. July, 1974.
- Krueger, Robert G. "Let's Make Use of Learning Theory." Child Study Center Bulletin. III, No. 3, 1967. pp 59-63.
- Lamert, K. M. "Instead of Court: Diversion in Juvenile Justice." Crime and Delinquency Issue: A Monograph Series. 1971. p 102.
- Landau, Simha F. "Future Time Perspective of Delinquents and Non-delinquents - The Effects of Institutionalization." Criminal Justice and Behavior. II, No. 1, March, 1975. pp 22-36
- Lerman, Paul. "Child Convicts." Transaction. VIII, July/August, 1971. pp 35-44.
- Levine, R. H. "Martha's World." American Education. IV. April, 1968. pp 22-23.
- Lipsitt, Judge William. The Evening News. (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania). May 14, 1975. p 12.
- McConochie, William A. "Juvenile Delinquents: Relationships Between WISC Scores, Offenses, Race, Chronological Age and Residence." Correctional Psychology. IV. No. 3. November, 1970. pp 103-110.
- Magrady, R. A. "Delinquency Prevention: A Suggested Course for Teacher Education." Illinois Education. LVII. April, 1967. p 57.
- Miller, Dr. Jerome. Patriot-News. (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania) XXVI, No. 51. Col. 1. September 7, 1975.
- Pierson, George, Raymond Cattell, and John Pierce. "A Demonstration by the High School Personality Questionnaire on the Nature of the Personality Changes, Produced by Institutionalization

of Delinquents." Journal of School Psychology. LXX,
No. 2. 1966. pp 229-239.

Procunier, Raymond. "Why Prisons Fail." U. S. News & World Re-
port. LXXVII, No. 25. December 16, 1974. p 46.

Silberberg, N. E. and M. C. "School Achievement and Delinquency."
Review of Educational Research. XLI. February, 1971.
pp 17-33.

Tyler, C. E. "Teaching Youth in Trouble: Douglas County Youth
Center, Omaha, Nebraska." Childhood Education. XLIV.
May, 1968. pp 546-548

Others

Bakal, Y. Tzhak. "Strategies for Restructuring the State Depart-
ment of Youth Services." Office of Youth Development.
Washington, D. C. June, 1973.

Coates, Robert. "Only the Facts, Please." Speaking before the
Juvenile Justice Day Conference, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
August 5, 1975.

Cohen, H. L. and James Filipczak. A New Learning Environment - A
Case for Learning. Jossey-Bass Inc. 1971. p 214.

Haskins, Jimmy and Charles Friel. Project Cameo. Sam Houston
University. V. December, 1973.

Havel, Joan. "The Base Expectancy Study." V. Research Division,
Department of Corrections. California. 1961. p 166.

Leavy, Joseph. "Those Mystery Alternatives." Speaking before the
Juvenile Justice Day Conference, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
August 5, 1975.

Ohlin, Dr. Lloyd. "Only the Facts, Please." Speaking before the
Juvenile Justice Day Conference, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
August 5, 1975.

. Robert Coates, and Alden Miller. "Medical Correctional
Reform: A Case Study of the Massachusetts Youth Correc-
tional System." Harvard Educational Review. XLIV, No. 1.
February, 1974.

Robinson, J. and P. Takag. "Case Decisions in a State Parole
System." California Department of Corrections. Research
Division, Report No. 31. 1968.

Robinson, James. "The Effectiveness of Correctional Programs."
California Legislative Ways and Means Committee. Committee
on Criminal Justice. 1969.

_____. "It's Time to Stop Counting." Special Report to Cali-
fornia Legislative Ways and Means Committee. Select
Committee on Criminal Justice. 1969. pp 270-271.

PERSONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Thomas Edward Peck
5700 Ridgeview Drive
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 17112

Personal History:

Age: 43
Married: Three children; 16, 18, 20
Resident of Harrisburg since birth
Army Veteran, 3 years service

Educational History:

	Degree
Millersville State College	B. S.
Shippensburg State College	M. E.
Lehigh University	M. E. + 60

Areas of Professional Certification:

Social Studies
Guidance Counselor
Special Education - Mentally Retarded
Special Education - Supervisor
School Psychologist
Psychologist, private license

Employment History:

	Years
Carlisle Senior High School Social Studies Teacher	1958-1965
Harrisburg School District Psychologist	1966-1975
West Shore School District Director of Special Education	1975

Other Work Experience:

Selinsgrove State School and Hospital Clinical Psychologist	1966
Harrisburg State Hospital Clinical Psychologist	1966
Dauphin County Probation Department Psychologist	1970-1976
Harrisburg Area Community College Psychology Instructor	1971-1976