

POST-DICTING CONTINUING CRIMINAL ACTIVITY
WITH PERSONALITY TESTS

by
Tammy A. King

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement
for the Degree of
Master of Science
in the
Criminal Justice
Program

Advisor

Joseph Waldron, Ph.D.

Date

May 31, 1990

Dean of the Graduate School

Sally M. Hatchers

Date

June 5, 1990

Youngstown State University

June 4, 1990

WILLIAM F. MAAG LIBRARY
YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT**POST-DICTING CONTINUING CRIMINAL ACTIVITY
WITH PERSONALITY TESTS**

Tammy A. King

Master of Science

Youngstown State University 1990

To test the hypothesis, post-dicting continuing criminal activity is more effective with personality test than post-dicting continual criminal activity with personality questionnaires, a group of 23 felons, who had a minimum of two felony arrests in the last three years, and who were currently residing in a community corrections facility were evaluated. T-tests were conducted, based on race, to determine if separate calculations were necessary for black and white subjects. The results of this test did not indicate major personality trait differences between races.

The subjects were tested in groups of 5 with an average of 7 subjects per group. The subjects were evaluated over a 43-day period during which they completed three subtests of the O-A Battery Test Kit and a self-report of their criminal behavior over the past three years. Information was collected from the participants' file folders, which included arrest records and MMPI results.

Ten dependent variables were created. The dependent variables were: (1) total amount of self-reported crime, (2) amount of self-reported misdemeanors (3) amount of self-reported property crime, (4) self-reported drug offenses, (5) self-reported crimes against people, (6) total number of arrests, (7) number of arrests for misdemeanors, (8) number of arrests for property crimes, (9) number of arrests for drug offenses, and (10) number of arrests for crimes against people.

The predictor or independent variables were the results obtained from the O-A Battery Test Kit and the MMPI results listed in the file folders.

Multivariate regression analysis did not support the hypothesis. The opposite situation appears to be more correct: Post-dicting continuing criminal activity is more effective with personality questionnaires than post-dicting continual criminal activity with personality tests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Joseph Waldron for his help and guidance throughout my graduate studies. I would also like to thank him for serving as Chairman of my thesis committee. I would like to thank Dr. Lawrence Cummings for serving on my thesis committee and for assisting in the editing process. A special thanks to Dr. Richard Billak, Director of the Mahoning County Community Corrections Association, for helping to solicit participants and for serving on my committee.

Deepest gratitude is extended to Mr. Rick Simmons, Program Director, and the Staff of the Residential Treatment Center for their help and support. It was a great pleasure working with all of these individuals.

A special thank you to my husband, Raymond, to my brothers, Patrick and Michael, to my sister, Terri and to my parents Charles and Floda Callihan. Without them I would have never put forth the effort to succeed. Thank you to my friends: Jan Colucci, who constantly assisted with grammar questions, Elton Turnage, who helped in an editorial capacity and served as my computer instructor, Renee Hunt, who constantly gave me words of encouragement, Greg Bucholtz, for listening, and Lori Carter, who served as a subject in the pilot test. A final thank you to our Creator.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER I.....	1
Problem to be Investigated Continual Criminality	
CHAPTER II.....	11
Literature Review	
CHAPTER III.....	33
Methods Used in the Study	
CHAPTER IV.....	41
Results Obtained	
CHAPTER V.....	51
Conclusions and Criticisms	
REFERENCES.....	55
APPENDICES.....	58
A. Modified Gold's Deviancy Questionnaire.....	58
B. File Record Information.....	61
C. Instructions to Subjects for U.I. 23.....	65
D. Instructions to Subjects for U.I. 24.....	71
E. Instructions to Subjects for U.I. 33.....	76
F. Instruction to Subjects for Modified Gold's Deviancy Questionnaire.....	81
G. Scoring for U.I. Tests.....	83

H. Classification and Scoring of Questions for
Modified Gold's Deviancy Questionnaire.....93

I. Mahoning County Community Corrections
Association Consent Release Information.....95

J. Informed Consent Form.....97

K. Directions to Inmates.....99

TABL

TABL

TABL

TABL

TABL

TABL

TABL

TABL

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1.....	Results of the O-A Battery Test Kit Subtests	41
TABLE 2.....	MMPI Scales Information	42
TABLE 3.....	Amount of Crime (Self-Reported and Official Records)	43
TABLE 4.....	T-test Comparison Between Caucasians and Afro-Americans on Personality Measures	44
TABLE 5.....	Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Personality Traits to Measurements of Deviancy of Known Felons	46
TABLE 6.....	Stepwise Standardized Regression Equations for the Post-Diction of Criminality Based on Personality Traits	47
TABLE 7.....	Post-Dictor Variables - - Summary of Regression Analysis Equations	49
TABLE 8.....	Stepwise Standardized Regression Equations for the 7 Subjects with Invalid MMPI Results for the Post-diction of Criminality Based on Personality Traits	50

Chapter I

Problem to be Investigated

Continual Criminality

Societies have expected patterns of behavior for specified situations. These "expectations" are often called social norms. To encourage members to conform, societies use "social controls," which are formal and informal methods developed to help ensure that individuals will conform to society's norms (Akers, 1985). In Western society, as in most societies, rewards and/or punishments are used to maintain control of individuals and thus socialize its members. The desired result of using rewards and/or punishments is that the person conforms to societal norms by later controlling their own behavior.

Deviancy, or the behavioral departure from social norms to the extent that it offends public sensibilities, has various definitions across cultures. For example, someone speaking too loudly, or someone acting "high and mighty" are acts of deviancy in some cultures. Laws define the deviant behavior in society that require severe punishment when violated. The deviant behaviors to be studied in the present thesis are those punishable under

criminal law. Examples of these behaviors are rape, theft, assault, and robbery.

When a member of society violates the criminal law, and if apprehended and convicted, that offender will be exposed to one or more of the various treatments society uses to control or change the person's behavior. The Control Agency, the Criminal Justice System, is composed of independent units which are responsible for the apprehension, adjudication, and treatment of offenders. Within the System the term "treatment" includes conventional therapy and other methods which focus upon punishment, deterrence, and/or re-socialization.

Punishment is the process of causing a person to undergo pain, loss, or suffering in the hope that the offender will avoid the painful consequence of a repetition of the criminal act. Punishment can also take the form of restitution, wherein the offender repays society or the victim for damages. Deterrence can be associated with punishment.

Deterrence is the prevention of crime before it occurs. Punishment or the threat of punishment is a deterrent for some individuals. Some people will estimate the potential cost of committing a crime before they proceed with the act. The loss of respect from family members and friends, the loss of freedom if caught, and the long-term stigma of being labeled a criminal can deter individuals from committing a crime.

Re-socialization is the effort put forth to change the offender into a productive, law-abiding citizen. The underlying

philosophy behind re-socialization is a variation of the "medical model" which portrays the offender as a person who has failed to either learn or to exercise self-control. It then becomes necessary for the Criminal Justice System to "fix" the offender because the offender is a person whom the professional must cure or change.

A portion of offenders who enter the Criminal Justice System and receive some form of treatment will not re-enter the system again. Unfortunately, many people who commit a crime will do so again despite the treatment methods they receive. This has been illustrated by a study in which it was shown that all offenders are not re-socialized.

In a federal study of parolees, the criminal activity of 3,995 offenders (ages 17 to 22) was followed for six years after release from prison (Beck and Shipley, 1978). The findings were as follows:

- (1) 69 percent were re-arrested for a serious offense;
- (2) 53 percent were convicted for a new offense; and
- (3) 49 percent returned to prison.

Another study which illustrates the need for the Criminal Justice System to re-socialize offenders was conducted by Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin (1972). Wolfgang, et al., researched the history of delinquency in a birth cohort which consisted of all males born during 1945 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The boys' criminal activities were studied through the age of eighteen and, of the 3,475 delinquents studied, 627 (18%) committed over 50

percent of the total number of offenses perpetrated by the entire delinquent group. These frequently deviant individuals were considered "chronic offenders."

As the parole statistics and the cohort study illustrate, a high percentage of offenders return to the Criminal Justice System. If an instrument could be developed to predict the 18 percent who committed over 50 percent of the offenses committed by the delinquent's cohort, or the 49 percent of adults who return to prison after parole release, then time and effort expended by correctional personnel could be focused on these specific individuals in an attempt to decrease the crime rate. Perhaps the place to start would be with a procedure that identified these people at the initial arrest. This would allow Criminal Justice personnel the opportunity to work with the potential chronic offender immediately.

A major task for the Criminal Justice System is the development of a diagnostic instrument or tool which could be used to determine if an individual possesses certain traits - characteristics that lead to the tendency of the individual to repetitively participate in criminal deviancy. Diagnosis would include one or more objective routines performed to determine if a person possesses potential deviant traits. If such a diagnostic instrument were developed, the Criminal Justice System could use its scarce resources more efficiently by concentrating on the high risk group.

Results of studies also show that too many people are pushed too quickly through the system. Simply stated, there is inadequate space in community programs and in prisons and cases are too often plea bargained with "turnstile" justice as the result (Siegel, 1989, pp. 468-471). If a diagnostic instrument were developed, the more serious cases could be handled more efficiently.

Currently, the Criminal Justice System has a variety of instruments which can be used to predict a person's predisposition to become involved in future criminal activity. These instruments include official reports of the offender's past involvement in criminal activity; the offender's self-report of prior activity; an assessment of personality traits the offender possesses; and reports from acquaintances of the offender. Given the lack of funds, in some cases the lack of training, and, unfortunately, the inability of some practitioners, the Criminal Justice System often fails to appropriately identify people who pose a danger to society. Simply stated, the Criminal Justice System is not able to predict which individuals will become involved in continuous criminal deviancy with a reasonable degree of accuracy (Beck and Shipley, 1978).

The Criminal Justice System uses three basic methods for assessing¹ an offender's tendency to engage in criminal deviancy.

¹Assessment is defined here as a comprehensive diagnostic procedure that includes attention to many facets of a person's life.

The methods used in the assessment process include: official reports; self-reports; and reports from others. These assessment methods are discussed in greater detail in Chapter Two and briefly discussed in the following section.

Criminal Justice diagnostic information is collected from two primary sources: 1) the offender and 2) others. Presented below is an overview of the diagnostic processes. Each procedure has advantages and disadvantages and these are further discussed in this chapter to define the problem concerning the assessment of offenders.

Formal records are official arrest records such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) abstracts, state criminal investigation abstracts, and local police organization's files. This information is collected to assess behavior patterns and the information is used by probation officers, parole officers, prosecutors, and judges for numerous purposes. The main use of this information is to determine the offender's arrest pattern prior to sentencing and treatment. The major advantage in the use of official records is that the information is often computerized, verified, and easily obtainable. The major problem with the use of formal records is that not all crime is reported to police agencies (Newman, 1986; Siegel 1989; and Jeffery, 1990). In addition, not all offenders are charged with the crimes they commit, and unfortunately, innocent people are arrested and may be convicted as is evidenced in a 1971 case when two men were

convicted of a robbery and murder they did not commit. This case is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.

To obtain more information about the offender, victim and others' reports are used. These reports contain information supplied about the offender from those who were involved in the crime or from those who are acquaintances of the offender. This information is used for many purposes. First, the reports are used to help the courts reach a decision and second, the reports are used to obtain an understanding of the offender. What is he like? What has he done in the past and how does he react in given situations? These are some questions that may be answered by this method of assessment. A major advantage to this form of gathering information is that it gives a more detailed history of the offender and can be used as a part of the assessment of the offender. The major problem with this method of gathering information is that much of the information may be inaccurate or exaggerated (Siegel, 1989, pp. 61-62).

Self-reported information is used not only to obtain information about criminal activity but also to find other problems the offender may possess. Self-report can be divided into two types: questionnaires and tests. A questionnaire is an instrument composed of questions and statements that do not have "right" or "wrong" answers. Some questionnaires ask the subject to describe acts in which they have been involved. This information is collected to determine if a psychological problem exists and to obtain a more detailed assessment of the offender. The use of

personality questionnaires, such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory first published in 1943 by Hathaway and McKinley, is the most common method used to collect information concerning personality traits. The questionnaire requires only a sixth-grade reading ability but a weakness of the inventory centers on the possibility that a subject may distort their response to items.

The second type of self-reported information is personality test data. Tests are instruments with "right" or "wrong" answers or instruments in which the "correct answer" is the best the subject can do. However, with the exception of intellectual functioning, test information is not commonly collected. The major problems with personality tests are that they are time consuming and currently are not designed for criminal activity evaluation.

If all of the assessment tools previously described are used in the evaluation of an individual, the most comprehensive assessment of criminal careers is obtained. However, to collect all of this information is time consuming, expensive, and often the information is not accurate. Additionally, the information does not, of itself, predict future activity.

While the goal is to develop an instrument to be used for predicting continuing criminal activity and to identify the most serious offenders, it is recognized that such an instrument would require several years to construct and that it would be costly to develop. This instrument would require an assessment of carefully

collected reliable and valid data which covers ongoing criminal activity over a lengthy period of time. It would be reliable in the sense that the instrument consistently yielded the same score, and valid in the sense that it actually was able to predict future criminal activity. The development of this type of instrument must begin with small studies and initially, should focus on development of a device that will post-dict (after the fact) a person's behavior. If such a device could be constructed, future studies could involve more attempts to predict criminal activity.

To construct an instrument for pre/post-dicting² criminal activity, consideration needs to be given to the knowledge that has been acquired and the fact that current methods used by practitioners in the field to predict continuing criminal deviancy are inadequate. It would seem that of the available diagnostic procedures, personality tests administered to the offender could be the most fruitful area for further development and potentially provide a procedure that could be highly accurate.

In the following chapter an in-depth discussion of the primary instruments available for assessing offenders will be further discussed and a review of a personality test will also be presented. Further, due to the problems inherent in current instruments, it will be stressed that there is a need to determine

²In the present thesis the word "post-dicting" indicates the ability to be able to know what a person has done in the past based on information known about them after the fact. The term post-dicting can be thought of as related to predicting (foretelling the future).

if testing procedures, rather than official records, report form others, and personality questionnaires, would be the best pre/post-dictor in the assessment of criminal tendencies of an offender.

The
instru-
particly
report
self-rep
will be
instru-
records
The
tendency
records
computer
the use
organize
and a
offender
abstract

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Criminal Justice System currently has three primary instruments for assessing an offender's tendency to repeatedly participate in criminal activity. The three instruments are a report of prior criminal activities, a report from others, and self-report of crime and personality. Benefits and disadvantages will be presented with regard to each of these forms of instrumentation.

Records of Prior Criminal Activities

The most commonly used instrument for assessing an offender's tendency to repeatedly participate in criminal activity is official records. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) maintains a computer file on all known criminal activity. The information for the computer files is supplied by federal, state, and local police organizations. In return for forwarding information, the FBI will send an abstract, often called a rap sheet, concerning an offender's history to the agencies needing the information. An FBI abstract returned to the agency contains the offender's name and

aliases, sex, race, social security number, fingerprint codes, as well as the date, place, and actions following each prior arrest.

The computerized FBI abstract is a report which contains the criminal history compiled from participating agencies across the nation. This assures that an offender's official record is complete even if the offender moved to another city or state. It is important to keep the history of the offender's criminal record. Past criminal activity is currently the best predictor of future criminal activity especially with juvenile delinquents (Farrington and Tarling, 1985, p. 263).

States and local agencies participate in the completion of FBI abstracts on a voluntary basis. Most, but not all, agencies participate. This leads to the possibility that all recorded criminal activity is not reported to the FBI. Additionally, some jurisdictions only report index crimes: criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson.

A partial resolution to the incomplete information problem is the use of state recorded data similar to the data collected and compiled by the FBI. In Ohio, for example, information similar to the FBI abstracts is collected from all 88 counties by the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification (BCI). These records are a source of official, verified, criminal activity similar to the FBI abstracts previously discussed. Unfortunately, not all states have their own reporting service. Nonetheless, currently the best

sources for an offender's official criminal history are the national and state(s) abstracting services.

Criminal history is useful in determining an offender's predisposition to engage in future criminal activity. However, there are problems with making an accurate assessment of the offender with these records. One of the major problems is that one can not determine from abstracts if the offender perpetrated the offense for which they were charged. Roebuck and Johnson (1962, p. 24) have shown, or at least have provided data which leads to the conclusion, that the closer in time the offense report is made to the act, the more similar the reported act is to reality. "The further one gets away from a criminal's arrest history, the more obscure and distorted become the facts of his criminal activities." This may very well be true because many cases are disposed of quickly with the use of plea bargaining.

There are many reasons for incomplete records. First is the idea that some serious acts may be under-reported. Newman (1986, p. 16) concluded from the use of victim surveys that forcible rape is one of the most under-reported serious felonies in the United States. This finding supports the conclusion that felons have incomplete official records.

Throughout the process of official contact with the Criminal Justice System, which begins with a call to the police and may end with incarceration, in some states a completion of parole, many factors contribute to the inadequacies in official records. When the police are notified, a variety of elements come into play.

Police officers exercise a great deal of discretion. They can arrest and charge with the actual crime committed; they can arrest and charge with a lesser offense; they can arrest and charge with a more severe offense; or they can let the offender go with a warning. Ideally, police discretion is used appropriately given the circumstances surrounding the crime. However, it is unlikely that police officers always use their discretion appropriately. Another element to be considered is the errors made by police officers in the search and seizure process. If police officers do not obtain evidence in an appropriate manner this will limit the ability of the prosecutor to go forward with a case. As a check and balance, to guard against possible police indiscretions, the Criminal Justice System uses the prosecutorial and judicial functions.

At the prosecutorial level, which affects official records, the decision to go forward (or not) with a case is made. If the case goes forward, the prosecutor, through the use of plea-bargaining, affects official records. As a result of plea-bargaining process two things occur. First, an estimated 90 percent of all charged offenders will plead guilty (Newman, 1986, P. 224). The charge the offender pleads to is not necessarily the crime committed nor is it the crime for which (s)he was arrested. Secondly, the defendant pleads a case to obtain one or more of the following concession: reduced charge(s) which have shorter sentences; to be charged with only one offense in a multi-offense charge; to be convicted of a crime which carries a less offensive

stigma; and/or to obtain a guarantee from the prosecutor that a probation recommendation or other alternatives to incarceration at the sentencing stage will be given (Newman, 1986, P. 226).

If a case is not plea bargained and a trial is conducted, another limitation to official records may be created. That is, "Will the jury be able to arrive at the truthful verdict?" It is a basic assumption that the jury system is the best approach to obtaining the truth in the single instance, but unfortunately the truth may not be found. History has shown many instances where the truth was not found. All of these factors limit the usefulness of official records.

When looking at a criminal history, especially when trying to assess an offender's criminal pattern, researchers need to know what actually occurred. Keeping in mind that over 90% of all cases are plea bargained (Newman, 1986, p. 224) and that a person may not be arrested for what they actually committed, official records may not be complete or accurate. Official records are useful but limited by the element of human decision-making in the Criminal Justice System. Interpretations of behavioral acts are subject to police discretion, the prosecutor's willingness to enter into plea bargaining, and by the jury's ability to determine the truth in a particular circumstance.

Nonetheless, official records are requirements in the assessment process. It is usually possible to obtain additional documentation on a case. This documentation could be collected from the agency providing the initial information or from others

who have knowledge to contribute. With considerable effort, one can piece together a long trail of criminal activity. In addition, the record can be presented to offenders as material for further discussion. When an offender finds out that the researcher knows what (s)he was arrested for, it is thought that the offender will be more willing to discuss other elements of the past offense. The information must often be discussed with the offender if we are to develop a comprehensive history of past behavior.

There are drawbacks to using past criminal activity (Glueck and Glueck, 1959; Roebuck, 1967; and Siegel, 1989) as the only diagnostic instrument for assessing an offender's predisposition to participate repeatedly in criminal activity. The information is a reflection of the past. Not all crime is reported; consequently, some crimes are not part of official records. To enhance the assessment process, the use of information gathered from other people who were involved in the crime or who are acquaintances of the offender is helpful and at times necessary.

Report from Others

Reports from others are used to enhance official records in pursuit of the truth in court hearings. Information from the offender's victim(s) and acquaintance(s) is often collected to help assess the offender. This information could be collected from parent(s), teacher(s), spouse(s), and co-defendant(s), to list the more common sources. The benefit to this approach is that information is collected in more detail and consequently contains

more information concerning the criminal deviancy shown by the offender. The information is used to help all members involved in the court decision making process to get a better understanding of the offender and the events which took place before, during, and after a crime occurred. There are problems with this approach. It is time-consuming and costly. The individuals providing the information may be unaware of all the criminally deviant acts in which the subject was involved. Another area for concern is the idea that the person may not report the information objectively. A loving mother may paint a picture in which the subject is a law-abiding citizen. An angry, disillusioned wife may paint a picture of the same subject as an evil person with a long history of criminally deviant behavior.

Is the person supplying the information being honest? It is possible that the person supplying the information is involved in the crime themselves, such as a consensual or conspiratorial crime. This is a major concern when gathering information from people involved in the crime or involved in the criminal's life.

When information is collected from the victim it must be realized that the information itself may not be accurate. In some instances a child is the victim. In this case, it is difficult to get the necessary information. The victim may not be the only person who is in error. Eyewitnesses make mistakes. During 1971 in Quincy, Florida, for example, five black men were charged with robbery and murder of a Tallahassee resident. The case against the five black men was based completely on the testimony of white

eyewitnesses. The prosecutor had achieved two convictions when the true killer was found. The real killer was a man in New York's Sing Sing Prison. The real killer's confession was substantiated by fingerprints left at the scene of the murder (Society, 1986). When one is trying to assess the offender and trying to find the truth, the use of eyewitness testimony can be misleading and should not be the sole information considered.

Due to the inability of official records and reports from others to supply a complete history of the offender's criminal history, the addition of the third approach can prove useful: self-report of crime and/or personality is commonly used in the Criminal Justice System to assess offenders.

Self-report: Crime and Personality

Self-report instruments are techniques in which the subject, in this case the offender, is required to answer questions or respond to statements. There are three forms of the self-report instrument. The first form asks about the acts in which the subject has been involved. The second form of self-report deals with the evaluation of personality traits or characteristics. This method usually requires the subject to respond either "true" or "false" to statements that lead to the diagnosis of personality traits. These statements may or may not be related to criminal activity. The third form is composed of test-like situations in which the subject has no idea about what is to be measured. These tests may have the subject respond to statements, answer questions,

or demonstrate skills. This form of instrumentation will be discussed in detail in the next section of this chapter.

It is necessary to distinguish between personality questionnaires and personality tests. Questionnaires are instruments composed of questions and statements that do not have "right" or "wrong" answers. Items are often transparent. That is, the subject knows, or believes they know, why the question was asked. Questionnaires, the first two methods mentioned above, are processes in which subjects describe acts in which they have been involved or the subjects give responses to personality items.

A personality test is an instrument with a "right" or "wrong" answer. It can also be an instrument in which the only correct answer is the "best" the subject can do. An example of this may be having the subject find the intersection point in which two lines cross with a time limit on the process. In a personality test, the subject usually has no idea about what is being evaluated. The subject may know that clerical skills are being assessed but does not know what or how a "good" or a "bad" score is interpreted.

A review of personality questionnaires, the first form of self-reporting of deviancy discussed above, exposes both strengths and limitations. The strengths to this form of information gathering will be presented first. The information is gathered from the person who has the answers to the questions. This method has been found to be reasonably valid in teenagers and college

students on a post-hoc basis (Gold, 1966; Hardt and Peterson-Hardt, 1977; Dentler and Monroe, 1961; and Clark and Tifft, 1966).

A study of validity for self-reported criminal acts was conducted by Clark and Tifft (1966). Clark and Tifft administered a self-report questionnaire to 45 male students who were asked to record the frequency of being involved in deviant behavior since they started high school. The truthfulness of the subjects' response was tested with a polygraph. It was concluded that 81.5 percent of the subjects had answered truthfully on their questionnaires based on the polygraph results. This shows that self-report works well with people who have no fear of incarceration or continued incarceration if behaviors are brought to light. The question then becomes, how well will the instrument work in diagnosing people who are likely to be incarcerated as a result of their answers?

To address this question Gold (1966) used reports from others as his independent variable to evaluate the self-report of delinquency of 125 youth. He gathered information about past delinquent behavior from informants who knew the subjects. Seventy-two percent of the youth confessed, on their self-report form, to everything the informants had reported about the subject's delinquent acts. Although the age group was different, both groups were free from the fear of incarceration. It was shown by a comparison of these two studies that self-report is valid and that report from others was less valid than self-report from the offender.

self-reported information has also been found to be reliable over a short period of time. In a study performed by Dentler and Monroe (1961) it was reported that 92 percent of the subjects in their study gave the same responses in a test and retest two weeks apart. This shows that self-report of criminal activity is reliable.

Studies have shown that self-report is apparently a type of valid and reliable assessment. Unfortunately this instrumentation has several limitations that lessen its effectiveness as a diagnostic tool. One limitation is that the best way to assure accurate answers is to promise confidentiality. In a non-confidential situation where an evaluator needs to know in what activities a specific person was involved, the self-report method may not meet this goal.

Another problem is that subjects may deliberately distort their answers for numerous reasons. Gold (1966) suspected this was the case when subjects wished to conceal their deviant behaviors. Gold noticed that subjects at times wanted to exaggerate their criminal activities. Besides lying, the subject may not understand the question and thus give an inappropriate answer (Siegel, 1989). Subject may not be able accurately to recall past events (Hagan, 1982; and Farrington, 1973) which leads to guessing.

If a person cannot accurately recall past events, the self-report approach is not as reliable as Dentler and Monroe (1961) found it to be in all circumstances. Farrington tested the

reliability of self-report over a two year period. Farrington (1973, p. 109) had subjects fill out a self-report questionnaire of past criminal activity. On a retest of the same form with the same subjects two years later, he found that one-fourth of the admitted deviant acts were now denied. He also noted the acts now denied were of a serious nature.

Self-report of criminal activity was apparently reliable over a short period of time but may not be reliable over a lengthy period of time. The technique has several problems which limited its usefulness in predicting who will be involved in future criminal activity.

Due to problems with self-report of criminal activity, report from others, and official records, the use of personality traits and the diagnosis of mental illness may be useful in assessing a person's predisposition to repeatedly participate in criminal activity. Self-report personality questionnaires require the subject to respond to questions or statements in which the responses will be used to diagnose the subject's personality.

A major benefit derived from using personality questionnaires is that the results show enduring tendencies exhibited by the subject, thus these instruments are relatively reliable. The most widely used form of personality questionnaire is the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). The assessment requires subjects to respond with "true", "false", or "cannot say" to 566 statements. The MMPI has fourteen scales, four of these evaluate the validity of the offender's answers.

Validity in this sense refers to evaluating whether the person being tested attempted to distort their responses. The interpretation of the instrument is based upon patterns of scores rather than on the individual answers (Wicks, 1974, p. 19). The four validity scales are used to detect deviant test-taking attitudes. The first validity scale is known as the "?" or Cannot Say Scale. This scale is the number of omitted items and includes a count of the items to which the testee gave more than one response. There are numerous reasons why individuals leave answers blank. The testee may not want to show themselves negatively, the testee may not be able to decide how to answer, or the testee may not understand the question. If too many questions are left unanswered, this lack of responding will lower the scores on other scales and thus lower the usefulness of the resulting scores (Graham, 1977, pp. 17-18).

The second validity assessment is the "L" or Lie Scale. This scale, as with the other scales, has numerous explanations for why the individual either scored high or low. Elevated L scales are obtained when the person desires to create a "favorable impression" (Graham, 1977, pp. 18-20).

The third validity scale is the "F" or Infrequency Scale. This scale is used to determine if the individual was answering the questions in a distorted manner. If the testee scored high on the F scale, (s)he may simply have responded randomly to the items (Graham, 1977, pp. 20-22). The final validity scale is the "K" or Clinical Defensiveness Scale. This scale is similar to the L scale

except it is more subtle in assessing the testee's denial of psychopathology.

If the testee scores high on the K scale, this may indicate a defensiveness to the test. If the testee scores low on the K scale, then the testee may be unusually frank or "self-critical" (Graham, 1977, pp. 22-23). In addition, the "K" Scale is used to "correct" the respondent's scores to various measured of psychopathology depending upon the respondent's level of defensiveness. These four scales taken together are used to determine the usefulness of the questionnaire.

The validity of the instrument was questioned by Siegel (1989) when he concluded that personality questionnaires are often transparent. Cattell, Schmidt, Bjerstedt (1972), among others found that the subject can guess what the appropriate answer should be and will give that answer to make themselves viewed the way they think will be self-beneficial.

Another problem with the use of personality questionnaires is that subjects often exhibit one or more test-taking attitudes. Some subjects may choose socially desirable responses (Anastasi, 1968; and Waldron, 1987). Some subjects have a tendency to answer in a positive manner, true or yes, "acquiescence", or they may have a tendency to answer in a negative manner, false or no, "nay saying" (Anastasi, 1967, p. 460). Some subjects have a tendency to give uncommon or unusual answers, "deviation" (Anastasi, 1968, p.460). Finally, some subjects suffer from anxiety when answering questions. Test anxiety can cause physical ailments which limit

the subject's ability to answer questions. Intellectually dull subjects tend to suffer from test anxiety more often than from other situational factors (Cronbach, 1949; and Anastasi, 1968). These attitudes can have a negative effect on the obtained results.

Personality Questionnaires were not designed for Criminal Justice purposes; they were constructed for theoretical studies of aggression and similar phenomena. Despite the problems, they are still widely used in the system. For example, Wilbanks (1985, p.79) notes that when inmates are considered for parole, the following information is collected:

- (1) common background information such as criminal history , age, race, and other items;
- (2) changing attitude during incarceration; .
- (3) "the sociological classification such as 'convention', 'respected citizen', 'socially maladjusted', and similar classification";
- (4) psychological traits; and
- (5) "release plan, employment records, and whether the person completed high school".

Despite all of the information collected and assessed, parole assessment of many individuals did not result in granting successful releases. Siegel (1989) reviewed three studies on parole effectiveness and concluded that between 40-60 percent of parolees recidivate. Beck and Shipley (1987) estimated from their study that 69 percent of parolees were rearrested.

As Wilbanks' list indicates, all the primary instruments are used to assess an individual's tendency to be involved in a criminal act after release from the correctional system. Siegel, Beck, and Shipley point out that these instruments often fail to locate the individuals who will repeat criminal behavior. The use of personality tests may be able to improve the effectiveness of parole consideration as well as the appropriate correctional program for offenders.

Personality Tests

Personality tests are assessment devices which have correct answers. They are used to diagnose personality traits. The uniqueness to this approach is in the idea that correct answers are not transparent. In other words, the subject realizes that there are "wrong" and "right" answers but does not know what the correct answers are, or how the scores will be used. Personality tests can be useful because it is necessary to collect information from the person who has the best knowledge of all prior criminal activity, the offender. However, the offender is unlikely to reveal this information when his or her liberty is at stake. The problem then becomes acquiring information that could be used to predict continuous, future, criminal activity when the offender does not want to reveal this information.

Forensic psychologists often link one or more personality traits to a person's involvement in crime. If a person has or has developed an "abnormal" personality, they will be more prone to

anti-social behavior than "normal" people because the offender perceives the world differently (Siegel, 1989, p. 148). Personality tests, the last approach to be considered, show promise for predicting one's tendency to persist in various types of criminal activity by focusing on personality traits that can reveal "abnormal" personalities.

Personality tests have many advantages. The most important advantage is that the tests are designed in such a manner that the subject cannot calculate the purpose for which the results will be used. This adds to the validity of this instrument. During 1988 Wright tested the usefulness of personality tests in predicting criminal activity. She found that tests appear to be valid. Personality tests were also found to be reliable on a test retest basis (Cattell and Schuerger, 1978, p. 9). Another important benefit is that personality tests tend to hold the attention of the subject.

A basic form of personality testing that not only holds the subject's attention but are also "disguised" measures are projective techniques. In these tests, subjects are shown a shape or perhaps a distorted picture. The subject must either tell what the shape represents or make up a narrative about the picture or shape. Examples of this type of test are Rorschach's Inkblot Test (Siegel, 1989, p. 148) and the subtest number 6, "What Do You See?", in U.I. 23 of the O-A Test Kit (Cattell and Schuerger, 1978). These tests are disguised so the subject will not be able to distort the results.

personality tests have many benefits but are currently not used in the Criminal Justice System as a primary device for assessing offenders. They are not commonly used because they are time-consuming. The personality test battery examined in this study is the O-A Test Kit (Cattell and Schuerger, 1978). To complete the entire Kit, approximately four hours and 50 minutes are required compared to 90 minutes to complete the MMPI personality questionnaire. Another possible reason tests are not more often used by the Criminal Justice System is because personality tests are not constructed to assess criminal activity; however, personality questionnaires also possess this drawback, a fact often ignored by those who conduct assessments.

The idea that personality tests appear to be reliable, valid and have few limitations leads to the conclusion that they are promising for predicting one's tendency to repetitively persist in various types of criminal activity. Further research in this area is warranted. Based on this information, the following hypothesis was constructed:

Post-dicting continuing criminal activity is more effective with personality tests than post-dicting continuing criminal activity with personality questionnaires. (The null hypothesis: There is no difference when post-dicting continuing criminal activity, between personality tests and personality questionnaires.)

During 1988 Wright tested the hypothesis that personality tests are better predictors of criminal deviancy than personality

questionnaires. Due to multi-trait, multi-method problems and findings in her study, it was concluded that personality tests are as good as questionnaires for the prediction of self-reported criminal deviancy in a college population.

One of the limitations in Wright's study, as she concluded, is that a known group of criminals was not tested: she used college students. In the current study a known group of criminals was used as subjects to better control the criterion variables.

Wright used computerized personality tests which caused many problems. Specifically, she had problems with her Fingertapping Test and with the Porteus Maze test written for use on an IBM personal computer. For the Fingertapping test to be valid, the subject must keep his hand in the described position. Wright believed that the subjects moved their hands to avoid discomfort, though the discomfort is a part of the procedure. Wright also had to eliminate subjects because they were not able to use properly the microsoft in-port mouse which was used to maneuver through the computerized maze (Waldron, 1989). Due to the problems Wright experienced with computer usage, paper-and-pencil tests were used in the current thesis.

One of the benefits of the paper-and-pencil test, versus the computer test, is that a group of people can be tested at a single session.

Cattell and Schuerger's Objective-Analytic (O-A) Test Kit

The Objective-Analytic Personality Test Battery, or O-A, by Cattell and Schuerger (1978) is a series of personality tests which use a pencil and paper format. The Kit consist of 82 subtests grouped into ten major categories designed to evaluate different personality traits. The subjects are not required to report on their behavior in any detailed manner. These tests have been used in the past (Cattell and Schuerger, 1978; Cartwright, Howard, and Reuterman, 1980; and Knapp, 1965) and show promise in post-dicting criminal activity, although they were not specifically developed to assess criminal deviance.

Cattell and Schuerger (1978, p. 25) categorized the test by Universal Index (U.I.). Their definition for a "universal index, U.I. number, aims to identify a reference to a well-replicated pattern, regardless of debate over subsequent interpretation and naming". An example of how this categorizing would be interpreted is that Cattell and Schuerger (1978, p. 258) concluded that drug addicts score higher on U.I. 24, a test for detecting anxiety, than non-addicts.

Cartwright, Howard, and Reuterman (1980, p. 12), using the O-A test Battery, concluded from their study of juvenile gangs that these adolescents tend to be homogeneous in personality patterns. They found personality characteristics of the gang members to include low Assertion, low Exuberance, low Realism, low Self-Realization, and high Manic Smart. This leads to the conclusion

that it is probable that there are common personality traits shared by people prone to criminal activity.

Though Cartwright, et al., found that specific personality traits are common to juvenile gangs, to generalize this proposition to incarcerated adults is problematic. To find an answer to this question, a review of Knapp's (1965) work provides some information. Knapp conducted a study of the offenders in the Navy Brig, Marine Corps Barrack, Navy Station, San Diego. He tested a group of non-offenders and a group of 92 confined men with an earlier version of the O-A Test Battery. The confined group showed signs of being more "highly Self-Centered (U.I. 26), highly Over Responsive (U.I. 29), and as showing greater Independence (U.I. 30), and more Anxiety (U.I. 24)" than the non-offenders. Cattell and Schuerger (1978, p. 258) also found that certain personality characteristics are common among convicted criminals. They stated that convicted criminals, who were incarcerated, scored "higher on Anxiety U.I. 24 than noncriminal and lower on U.I. 23 and U.I. 33".

Due to the findings that personality tests, especially the O-A Test Kit, show promise as diagnostic instruments, it was decided that these promising instruments should be used in the present study. As mentioned, the entire O-A Kit is quite lengthy. Cattell and Schuerger finding that there are common results for incarcerated criminals on three scales in the O-A Test Kit, only these scales will be used in this study to post-dict misdemeanors, property, person and drug offenses. A brief explanation of the tests summarized from Cattell and Warburton (1967) follows:

U.I. 23 - Mobilization of Energy -vs- Regression

This test discriminates between neurotics and normals better than any other factor. Low Scores indicated "Withdrawal of interest in the psychoanalytic sense, distractibility..." (p. 199). Test requires 27 minutes to complete.

U.I. 24 - Anxiety -vs- Adjustment

Subjects who obtain high scores tend to be easily annoyed and highly irritable. They are highly emotional and display a strong desire to do the right thing. Subjects also show uncertainty in decision making (p. 200). Test requires 25 minutes to complete.

U.I. 33 - Reactive Dismay (Pessimism) -vs- Sanguine Poise

Subjects with high scores are pessimistic, "slow in warming to new task, inhibited, compulsive, but tend to have good intellectual achievement" (p. 201). Test requires 21 minutes to complete.

The following chapters describe how the tests were administered, to whom they were administered, and compare the results obtained from the O-A Test Kit to self-reported personality questionnaires, namely the MMPI, using arrest record and self-reported criminal activity as dependent variables.

CHAPTER III

Methods Used in the Study

To disprove the null hypothesis (there is no difference, post-dicting continuing criminal activity, between personality tests and personality questionnaires) multivariate regression analysis was used based on the data obtained from a group of known offenders. Multivariate regression analysis allowed for the examination of 16 predictor variables and 10 independent variables.

Subjects

The offenders who participated in the study were male clients at a Community Corrections Facility in Northeast Ohio. The subjects each had a minimum of two felony arrest in the last three years recorded on their Pre-Sentence Investigation Reports (PSI). The subjects were solicited by staff members at the facility. The subjects volunteered and were allowed to withdraw at any time. One subject withdrew from the study because he had a previous commitment and would not have time to complete the subtests. The subject who withdrew personally destroyed all of the information he had supplied prior to leaving the test area.

The test period lasted approximately two hours; time variation was due to the diversity in the number and length of breaks given to each group. Five groups with an average of seven subjects in each group were tested over a 43-day period. Thirty of the subjects were probationers, one was a parolee, and five were on furlough. When the subjects entered the test area, they were informed that they did not have to participate in the study. The introduction to the test session is found in Appendix K.

The subjects were given consent forms to fill out. They completed a release form from The County Community Corrections Association (Appendix I) and a release form approved by the Youngstown State University Human Subjects Research Committee (Appendix J). After the forms were filled out and collected, each subject filled out a slip of paper which had a case number on it, which corresponded with his booklet, and asked for the subject's name. The name and case number were needed to collect information from the subjects' fill folders. Once the information was collected, the slip of paper was destroyed. The Principal Investigator informed the subjects that no names or any other identifying information would leave the facility.

The original number of subjects was 37. However, one subject did not complete the subtests. Six of the subjects' data was not used for analysis because the MMPI results (the MMPI was representative of personality questionnaires) were not available in the subjects' file folders. An additional seven subjects were

eliminated from the study because their MMPI results were invalid³ because of a score being more than two standard deviations above the mean on any of the validity scales ("L", "F", or "K" Scales).

The final test group consisted of 14 male Caucasians and 9 male Afro-Americans. The ages of the inmates ranged from 19 to 37 years old ($\bar{x} = 26$). I.Q.'s were not recorded in the subjects' file folders. Highest grade achieved was examined to obtain a general idea of intellectual abilities. The highest grade achieved in the analyzed group was sophomore university level. The lowest was eighth grade level and the mean was at the eleventh-grade level.

Instrumentation

The following instruments, in booklet form, were used to test the subjects. The three subtests discussed in Chapter Two from the O-A Test Battery: U.I. 23 - Mobilization of Energy -vs- Regression; U.I. 24, Anxiety -vs- Adjustment; and U.I. 33, Reactive Dismay (Pessimism) -vs- Sanguine Poise⁴ were representative of personality tests. In addition to the three personality subtests, a modified Gold's Deviancy Questionnaire (Appendix A) was used for self-reported criminal behavior. The offenders reported on the amount of crime they had been involved in over the past three years. The

³subjects eliminated invalidated the results of their MMPI's. Four of the subjects scored between 80 and 84 on the "F" scale, and three subjects scored between 76 and 83 on the "L" scale.

⁴ Cattell and Schuerger (1978, p. 258) found convicted criminals who were incarcerated scored "higher on anxiety U.I. 24 than non-criminals and lower on U.I. 23 and U.I. 33" (Chapter 2)

types of crimes were categorized as misdemeanors, property crimes, drug offenses, or crimes against people. This classification is outlined in Appendix A.

All of the directions, except those for the Modified Gold's Deviancy Questionnaire (Appendix F), were presented on a tape recorder. The directions for the entire personality tests are found in Appendices C (U.I. 23), D (U.I. 24), and E (U.I. 33).

After the subject completed the booklet, the Principal Investigator collected the completed personality subtests and the self-report of criminal activity. Information from the subjects' official file folders was collected. The file folder information included demographic and the criterion variables. Those variables were sex, age, race, and educational level. Also, information concerning 5 of the dependent variables was collected from the subjects' file folders (Appendix B). Those variables consisted of the number of times the subjects were arrested for crimes, the number of times arrested for misdemeanors, property crimes, drug offenses, and crimes against people. This information was obtained from the subjects' PSI's.

The PSI included information from FBI abstracts, BCI abstracts, local police authorities and in some cases judicial records. The PSI quality was recorded with the file information (Appendix B). The PSI quality was based on clarity, completeness, and objectivity. Quality was based on a 5 point scale, 1 - 5 points. A rating of 1 indicated the PSI was inadequate, 3 was average, and 5 was outstanding. The mean quality score for all of

the PSI's was 3.3 with the a mode score of 3. None of the files had unacceptable PSI quality ratings.

MMPI results were obtained from the official file folders, to represent personality questionnaires (Appendix B). The MMPI's were administered by the facility. The Community Correctional staff used a computer generated MMPI analysis sheet called The Marks Adult MMPI Report Version 2.1 by Strassberg, Cooper, and Marks. This version of the MMPI does not include the "?" / Cannot Say Scale. MMPI results were recorded in T-score format.

Scoring of Test Results and Self-Reported Deviance

After all needed information was collected, the data were scored. Scoring for the U.I. tests followed the procedures described by Cattell and Schuerger (1978) (Appendix G). U.I. results were recorded in Z-score format. Classification and grading of questions for the Modified Gold's Deviancy Questionnaire are found in Appendix H. Results were based on the number of times a person was involved in criminal behavior.

Statistical Procedures

To test the hypothesis (post-dicting continuing criminal activity is more effective with personality tests than post-dicting continuing criminal activity with personality questionnaires), multivariate regression analysis in a stepwise direction was used with the above-mentioned data. Stepwise analysis (Norusis, 1988, p. 351) allows the computer program to "enter" and "remove"

variables one at a time until the significant F statistic does not indicate that any variables in the equation should be entered or removed.

Prior to calculating the multivariate regression analysis, t-tests on predictor variables based on race were conducted. The reason for the t-tests was the suspicion that there may exist personality trait difference between Caucasians and Afro-Americans. This suspicion was caused by recent data announced by the U.S. Justice Department's Bureau of Justice Statistics. The Department reported that one out of every four young Afro-Americans is currently under the supervision of the Criminal Justice System nationwide. The Department found that the number of Caucasians and Hispanics was less than those reported on Afro-Americans. Caucasians have a one-to-16 ratio and Hispanics have a one-to-10 ratio for young males under the supervision of the Criminal Justice System (Washington Crime New Service, 1990, pp. 1-4). With the use of the t-test it will be determined if the difference in supervision rates resulted because the two groups possess different personality traits.

Predictor Variables (Independent Variables)

The predictor (independent) variables were the 13 Scales from the MMPI, personality questionnaire, and the 3 scales from the O-A Test Battery, personality tests.

Dependent Variables

These independent variables were used to predict 10 dependent variables. The dependent variables consisted of the crimes arrested for and self-reported crime. The following is a list of the 10 dependent variables:

Officially Reported Arrest Data

- (1) total
- (2) misdemeanors
- (3) property crime
- (4) drug offenses
- (5) crimes against people

Self-reported Crime

- (6) total
- (7) misdemeanors
- (8) property crime
- (9) drug offenses
- (10) crimes against people

The number of crimes for which the offender was arrested was based on each offender's PSI (Appendix B). The amount of self-reported criminal activity was based upon a modification of Golds Deviancy Questionnaire (Appendix A). To insure that the classification of crimes for which subjects were arrested coincided with those for which the subjects gave self-report, the following is a summary of changes or inclusions which varied from the initial categorizing established on the File Folder Information Form (Appendix B):

1. Misdemeanors

Included intoxication and unruliness for the offenders who committed one of these acts in the past three years as a juvenile.

2. Property Crimes

Included robbery and armed robbery to coincide with the classification used on the self-report instrument.

3. Drug Offenses

Included trafficking and abuse to coincide with the classification used on the self-report instrument.

4. Crimes Against People

Included intentional violence, homicide, and prostitution to coincide with the classification used on the self-report instrument.

In the following chapter descriptive statistics, correlations, t-tests and multivariate regression analysis will be presented in an attempt to support the hypothesis.

CHAPTER IV

Results Obtained

In this chapter descriptive statistics on all of the predictor and dependent variables, results of the subtests of the O-A Battery Test Kit, correlation matrix of predictor and dependent variables, t-test results based on race, and linear equations resulting from multivariate regression analysis are presented. The predictor variables consisted of the MMPI Scales and the 3 subtests of the O-A Battery Test Kit.

The mean scores and standard deviation of the O-A Test Battery are presented in Table One; Z-score format was used. When the U.I. scores are examined, there is little deviation from the norms established by Cattell and Schuerger (1978).

Table 1 - - Results of the O-A Battery Test Kit Subtests

Subtests	Mean	Standard Deviation
U.I. 23 Mobilization of Energy -vs- Regression	-.10	1.20
U.I. 24 Anxiety -vs- Adjustment	-.75	.80
U.I. 33 Reactive Dismay (Pessimism) -vs- Sanguine Poise	.25	.73

The MMPI Scales were used as the other predictor variables, personality questionnaire. The mean scores and standard deviation results from the 13 Scales are listed in Table Two. The results are in T-score format. The information describing each scale was obtained from Graham (1977, pp. 34-62). When the results are examined, there is a strong deviation in Scale 4, Psychopathic Deviancy. The other scales are within two standard deviation points from the general mean of 50.

Table 2 - - MMPI Scales Information

<u>MMPI SCALES</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard Deviation</u>
L or Lie Scale create a "favorable impression"	63.652	7.463
F or Infrequency Scale responding randomly	59.087	8.284
K or Clinical Defensiveness Scale high score indicated defensiveness	53.870	9.809
Scale 1 (Hypochondriases) preoccupied with their body and have a persistent fear of illness	52.087	10.677
Scale 2 (Depression) dissatisfaction with life	61.913	10.991
Scale 3 (Hysteria) involuntary psychogenic loss in reaction to stressful situations	57.130	8.572
Scale 4 (Psychopathic Deviancy) asocial or amoral personality types	72.261	12.945
Scale 5 (Masculinity and Femininity) related to intelligence, education, and in some cases socioeconomic level	59.043	8.668
Scale 6 (Paranoia) excessive fear, unjustified, or unreasonable fear	62.609	11.309
Scale 7 (Psychasthenia) obsessive - compulsive neurosis	59.739	15.630
Scale 8 (Schizophrenia) disturbance of thinking and a misinterpretation of reality	59.652	13.435
Scale 9 (Hypomania) elevated mood and accelerated acts and periods of depression	61.348	10.089
Scale 0 (Social Introversion) "tendency to withdraw from social contacts and responsibilities"	51.739	9.392

Descriptive statistics were also calculated for the dependent variables. Table Three shows the test group's amount of self-reported crime and the amount of crime for which the offenders were arrested over a three-year period. The self-reported crime and official arrests are categorized into five different variables; total amount of crime, misdemeanors, property crimes, drug offenses, and crimes against people. The total amount of self-reported crime is much greater than criminal offenses known to the Criminal Justice System.

Table 3 - - Amount of Crime (Self-Reported and Official Records)

Offense	Amount of Crime Arrest Record	Amount of Crime Self-Reported
Misdemeanors	$\bar{x} = 3.9$ sd = 3.9	$\bar{x} = 20.2$ sd = 16.2
Property Offenses	$\bar{x} = 2.8$ sd = 1.9	$\bar{x} = 17.9$ sd = 17.4
Drug Offenses	$\bar{x} = 1.0$ sd = 3.1	$\bar{x} = 9.9$ sd = 10.1
Person Offenses	$\bar{x} = 0.1$ sd = 0.3	$\bar{x} = 12.6$ sd = 12.8
Total Amount	$\bar{x} = 7.9$ sd = 5.8	$\bar{x} = 60.6$ sd = 48.0

\bar{x} - indicates the mean
sd - indicates the standard deviation

It is uncertain which figure, arrest or self-reported amounts, represents the actual amount of crime that the subjects perpetrated. In this study, the emphasis shall be placed on the

observed behavior, the crimes for which the individual were arrested. If the individual lied or answered questions incorrectly on the MMPI, then one may assume that (s)he possibly lied or misinterpreted on the self-reported questionnaire. It is also

Table 4 - - T-test Comparison Between Caucasians and Afro-Americans on Personality Measures

Variables	Caucasians n = 14		Afro-Americans n = 9		t ₍₂₁₎	p <
	\bar{x}	sd	\bar{x}	sd		
MMPI SCALES						
- Lie (L Scale)	65.286	7.097	61.111	7.705	1.33	.197
- Infrequency (F Scale)	59.500	7.773	58.444	9.475	.29	.773
- Clinical Defensiveness (K Scale)	54.571	11.092	52.778	7.902	.42	.679
- Hypochondriases (Scale 1)	51.714	11.317	52.667	10.235	-.20	.840
- Depression (Scale 2)	63.643	7.612	59.222	14.990	.94	.358
- Hysteria (Scale 3)	57.429	7.959	56.667	9.937	.20	.841
- Psychopathic Deviancy (Scale 4)	74.143	15.580	69.333	7.106	.86	.399
- Masculinity and Femininity (Scale 5)	61.357	8.863	55.444	7.418	1.66	.112
- Paranoia (Scale 6)	62.429	13.421	62.889	7.672	-.09	.927
- Psychasthenia (Scale 7)	57.143	16.915	63.778	13.293	-.99	.332
- Schizophrenia (Scale 8)	58.286	15.549	61.778	9.757	-.60	.555
- Hypomania (Scale 9)	57.643	10.203	67.111	7.026	-2.43	.024
- Social Introversion (Scale 0)	54.071	8.389	48.111	10.191	1.53	.141
O-A Battery Test Kit Subtest						
- U.I. 23 (Mobilization of Energy -vs- Regression)	6.000	2.569	4.222	1.965	1.77	.092
- U.I. 24 (Anxiety -vs- Adjustment)	3.836	1.968	4.200	1.063	-.51	.617
- U.I. 33 (Reactive Dismay "Pessimism" -vs- Sanguine Poise)	6.314	1.610	5.600	1.193	1.14	.267

\bar{x} - indicates the mean
 sd - indicates the standard deviation
 n - indicates sample size
 t - indicates the results of t-tests
 p < - observed level of significance associated with the t-value

possible that there will be a stronger correlation between similar instruments; in this case, both instruments are questionnaires. Observed or arrested behavior, even if not complete, offers a new way in which to analyze the data.

In Table Four a t-test comparison between Caucasians and Afro-Americans on personality measures is presented. In the previous chapter, an issue concerning whether or not personality differences caused more Afro-Americans to come under the control of the Criminal Justice System was raised. In Table Four the data leads to the conclusion that it is unlikely that a significant difference exists between the two groups with the possibility of a slight difference existing on the Hypomania - Scale Nine of the MMPI. As a result of this finding, all analysis will include all subjects regardless of racial classification.

The main analysis to be used to test the hypotheses is multivariate regression analysis. Prior to running the procedure, a matrix of Pearson Correlation Coefficients consisting of personality traits to measurements of deviancy of known criminals was presented. See Table Five.

The MMPI appears to be the best instrument for post-dicting criminality at this point of the analysis based on the correlation coefficients. Correlation Coefficients were calculated between the two personality instruments used in the study. The U.I. 24 subtest, a personality test, was correlated with three of the MMPI scales: Clinical Defensiveness (Scale K), $-53, p < .01$; Hypochondriases (Scale 1), $-68, p < .001$; and Hysteria (Scale 3), $61, p < .001$.

Table 5 - - Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Personality Traits to Measurements of Deviancy of Known Felons

	Crimes Arrested					Self-Reported Crime				
	Msd	Prop	Drug	Per	Total	Msd	Prop	Drug	Per	Total
MMPI Scales										
- Lie (L Scale)	-37	-01	-22	-09	-37	-23	10	-22	-18	-13
- Infrequency (F Scale)	06	06	32	27	25	06	33	-02	18	19
- Clinical Defensiveness (K Scale)	-41	-15	-25	-16	-46	-19	-25	03	-18	-20
- Hypochondriases (Scale 1)	-43	05	-10	14	-32	-39	-07	09	-08	-16
- Depression (Scale 2)	00	-02	16	-31	06	-36	-30	-19	-36	-37
- Hysteria (Scale 3)	-28	10	-17	-28	-27	-57	-35	-22	-55	-52
- Psychopathic Deviancy (Scale 4)	26	10	24	00	34	-01	-11	-10	-06	-08
- Masculinity and Femininity (Scale 5)	-11	19	-10	-34	-09	-07	-07	18	-23	-07
- Paranoia (Scale 6)	-01	30	-13	-21	18	-18	06	14	-11	-04
- Psychasthenia (Scale 7)	11	23	-10	-11	07	-14	07	12	-03	-01
- Schizophrenia (Scale 8)	18	26	03	-22	13	-05	04	17	-08	01
- Hypomania (Scale 9)	44	35	16	-08	42	22	19	-10	14	16
- Social Introversion (Scale 0)	-08	-05	-09	15	03	-05	-08	07	-16	-08
O-A Battery Test Kit Subtest										
- U.I. 23 (Mobilization of Energy -vs- Regression)	04	-36	17	00	00	-22	-17	-29	-08	-22
- U.I. 24 (Anxiety -vs- Adjustment)	29	11	25	14	37	48	37	02	44	42
- U.I. 33 (Reactive Dismay "Pessimism" -vs- Sanguine Poise)	22	18	17	-04	29	23	14	27	-09	16

Msd - indicates number of Misdemeanors
 Prop - indicates number of Property Crimes
 Drug - indicates number of Drug Offenses
 Per - indicates number of Crimes Against People
 Total - indicates the total of all the forms of crimes
 * - indicates a significance level of < .01; 1-tailed significance

Results of Multivariate Regression Analysis

Table Six lists the results obtained from the multivariate regression analysis. Included are the predictor variable which were found to be significant at the .05 level.

Table 6 - - Stepwise Standardized Regression Equations for the Post-diction of Criminality Based on Personality Traits

DV	PV1	Weight	PV2	Weight	R	R ²	F	p<
<u>Amount of Crime Arrested For</u>								
Msd	MP9	.444	*	*	.444	.197	5.166	.05
Prop	*							
Drug	*							
Per	*							
Total	MPK	-.509	MP4	.395	.609	.371	5.893	.01
<u>Self-Reported Crime</u>								
Msd	MP3	-.579	*	*	.579	.335	10.579	.01
Prop	*							
Drug	*							
Per	MP3	-.551	*	*	.551	.304	9.163	.01
Total	MP3	-.517	*	*	.517	.267	7.654	.05

DV	-	indicates the dependent variable
PV	-	indicated the predictor or independent variable
R	-	indicates the correlation coefficient; how well the least squares line fits, ± 1 indicates a perfect correlation and 0 no correlation (Norusis, 1988)
R ²	-	indicates the square of the correlation coefficient; the proportion of the total variability in the dependant variable which can be accounted for by the independent variable (Norusis, 1988)
F	-	the ratio of the means square for regression to the mean square of the residual, and the mean squares are the sum of squares divided by their respective degrees of freedom (Norusis, 1988)
p <	-	indicates the level of significance
Msd	-	indicates number of Misdemeanors
Prop	-	indicates number of Property Crimes
Drug	-	indicates number of Drug Offenses
Per	-	indicates number of Crimes Against People
Total	-	indicates the total of all the forms of crimes
*	-	indicates that the dependent variable was not predictable at the .05 level of significance
MPK	-	indicates MMPI's K Scale, Clinical Defensiveness
MP3	-	indicates MMPI's Scale 3, Hysteria
MP4	-	indicates MMPI's Scale 4, Psychopathic Deviancy
MP9	-	indicates MMPI's Scale 9, Hypomania

The formulas derived from multivariate regression analysis and the summary in Table Seven lead to the conclusion that there is no support for the hypothesis that post-dicting continuing criminal

activity is more effective with personality tests than post-dicting continuing criminal activity with personality questionnaires. The O-A Battery Test Kit subtests were not selected as post-dictors of any of the 10 dependent variables.

The null hypothesis, there is no difference, post-dicting continuing criminal activity, between personality tests and personality questionnaires, was not supported either. One can derive from the presented data that the MMPI, personality questionnaire, showed more potential as a predictor variable than the O-A Battery Test Kit or personality tests. Total self-reported crime, self-reported misdemeanors, and self-reported crimes against people were predicted by Scale Three - Hysteria of the MMPI personality questionnaire.

The MMPI showed potential as a post-dictor of individuals who have official arrest records. Scales K - Clinical Defensiveness and Four - Psychopathic Deviancy were useful in post-dicting the total amount of crimes. Scale Nine - Hypomania was a predictor of official arrest records for misdemeanor crimes. The MMPI failed to predict self-reported property crimes and drug offenses, as well as official arrest for property crimes, drug offenses, and crimes against people. Property crimes and drug offenses, whether self-reported or official arrest, were not predictable from any of the independent variables at the .05 significance level. Table Seven is a summary of these findings.

The null hypothesis was not supported because one could conclude that personality questionnaires are better post-dictors

Table 7 - - Post-dictor Variables - - Summary of Regression Analysis Equations

<u>TYPES OF CRIME</u>	<u>For Crimes Arrested</u>	<u>Self-Reported Crime</u>
Total Amount	MMPI's K Scale and Scale 4	MMPI's Scale 3
Misdemeanors	MMPI's Scale 9	MMPI's Scale 3
Property Crimes	*	*
Drug Offenses	*	*
Crimes Against People	*	MMPI's Scale 3

- * - indicates that the dependent variable was not predictable at the .05 level of significance
- MPK - indicates MMPI's K Scale, Clinical Defensiveness
- MP3 - indicates MMPI's Scale 3, Hysteria
- MP4 - indicates MMPI's Scale 4, Psychopathic Deviancy
- MP9 - indicates MMPI's Scale 9, Hypomania

of criminal activity. A new hypothesis can be formulated based upon the findings of this study: post-dicting continuing criminal activity is more effective with personality questionnaires than post-dicting continuing criminal activity with personality test.

In an effort to find some support for the original hypothesis, multivariate regression analysis was used on the data supplied by the seven subjects who had been eliminated from the study due to invalid MMPI results (Chapter 3). Almost one-fifth (19.44 %) of this group, for one reason or another, did not perform adequately on their personality questionnaire. In this incident perhaps personality tests would be the best instrument to diagnose these individuals. In Table Eight are the results of the multivariate regression analysis performed on these seven subjects.

Table 8 - - Stepwise Standardized Regression Equations for the 7 Subjects with Invalid MMPI Results for the Post-diction of Criminality Based on Personality Traits

DV	PV1	Weight	PV2	Weight	R	R ²	F	p<
<u>Amount of Crime Arrested For</u>								
Msd	*							
Prop	MP4	.843	*	*	.843	.711	12.289	.05
Drug	*							
Per	*							
Total	*							
<u>Self-Reported Crime</u>								
Msd	MPL	-.805	*	*	.805	.649	9.234	.05
Prop	MPF	.860	*	*	.860	.739	14.147	.05
Drug	UI24	.761	*	*	.761	.579	6.872	.05
Per	UI23	-.767	*	*	.767	.589	7.163	.05
Total	MP9	-.888	*	*	.888	.789	18.699	.01

SEE TABLE 6 FOR CODING

MPL	-	indicates MMPI's L Scale, Lie Scale
MPF	-	indicates MMPI's F Scale, Infrequency
MP4	-	indicates MMPI's Scale 4, Psychopathic Deviancy
MP9	-	indicates MMPI's Scale 9, Hypomania
UI23	-	indicates O-A Battery Test Kit Subtest U.I. 23, Mobilization of Energy -vs- Regression
UI24	-	indicates O-A Battery Test Kit Subtest U.I. 24, Anxiety -vs- Adjustment

This table shows that personality tests were useful in post-dicting self-reported drug offenses and crimes against people. Personality tests were not able to post-dict any of the crimes for which the subjects were arrested. This information does not support the hypothesis but it does present the investigator with an additional instrument that can be used when personality questionnaires are invalid.

The following chapter contains the criticisms of the study and suggestions for the future studies.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions and Criticisms

The hypothesis was in general not supported, though there was some support for the need to use Personality Tests when offenders invalidated their MMPI results. In the current study, seven individuals' past criminality, with the uses of multivariate regression analysis, was post-dicted in two areas with personality tests. U.I. 24, Anxiety -vs- Adjustment post-dicted self-reported drug offenses and U.I. 23, Mobilization of Energy -vs - Regression post-dicted self-reported crimes against people (Table Eight, Chapter Four).

In the current study, with subjects who had valid MMPI results, the selected Personality Tests were not useful in post-diction. The MMPI was able to post-dict the individuals who had been arrested for criminal behavior but it failed to separated the types of crimes involved, except for the misdemeanors classification. It is possible that the MMPI is only able to post/predict non-serious crimes for which individuals will be arrested.

The non-support for the hypothesis may have resulted not because personality tests are inadequate instruments, but because the appropriate personality tests were not selected. Wright (1988) used the Porteus Maze and Fingertapping Test and had positive results. The reason the O-A Battery Test Kit was selected instead of Wright's preferred tests is two fold. First, the O-A Battery Tests were written in a paper-and-pencil format. This was intended to eliminate the problems Wright had with her computerized testing procedures. Secondly, it was thought that the O-A Battery Test Kit, which required years to construct and had detailed and objective administration/scoring procedures, would have been more useful.

The non-support for the hypothesis may have resulted from the selected personality tests. Only three sections of the O-A Battery Test Kit were selected. It is possible that perhaps the other seven or the entire test kit would have yielded different results. Also, the personality tests may have been more effective if a computer were used to test the offenders despite problems that occurred in Wright's study. The subjects may have felt more comfortable with the absence of a tester in the room.

Limitations that may account for the lack of support for the hypothesis include the idea that a small number of subjects was selected from one facility. Also, the MMPI results were obtained from file folders and the questionnaires were not administered by the principal investigator which resulted in the elimination of

the MMPI's ? Scale, Cannot Say Scale. Finally, the study did not include reports from others.

All the data pertaining to the offenders' past criminal behavior was obtained from official arrest records and from self-reported information. The use of report from others may have indicated which, if either, of the instruments presented the more accurate amount of criminal activity. As noted in Chapter Two, it is expensive and time-consuming to collect all of this information. The validity of both instruments, self-reported crime and official arrest records, was questionable and this drawback will plague any future study performed based on Wright's study unless a method of determining true criminal activity is discovered.

A new study which might clear up the discrepancies between the results obtained by Ms. Wright and the present thesis would be to use the computerized versions of the Porteus Maze, Fingertapping, and the entire O-A Battery Test Kit on a known group of offenders. Wright's major drawback was her lack of an observed criminal group. She was dependent on self-reported information. The current study had a known group of offenders but perhaps the better instruments were not used. Once all the data are collected, multivariate regression analysis could be performed on the results to estimate which instrument is the better post-dictors.

This study would represent a short-term study. To change this to a long term or predicting study it would be necessary to follow the offenders for several years. Information would have to be collected on all criminal activities in which the individuals were

involved. It would also be useful to collect report from others to determine which data should represent the dependent variables. Should the dependent variables consist of self-reported information or should they consist of official arrest records?

This future analysis could help correctional officials delegate time and supervision more efficiently. Less time could be spent on the individuals who are predicted not to be involved in future criminal activity. More time could be spent on those who are predicted to be criminalistic and/or violent.

REFERENCES

- Akers, Ronald L. Deviant Behavior: A Social Learning Approach. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company. 1985.
- Anastasi, Anne. Psychological Testing. Toronto, Ontario, United States of America: MacMillan Company. Third Edition. 1968.
- Anonymous Author. "Eyewitness testimony". Society. Volume 23. Number 2. pp. 2-3. January/February 1986.
- Beck, Allen J. and Bernard E. Shipley. "Recidivism of young parolees". Bureau of Justice Statistics: Special Report. Washington D. C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. May 1978.
- Carlson, Kenneth A. Carlson Psychological Survey. Research Psychologists Press, Inc.: 1982.
- Cartwright, Desmond S., Kenneth I. Howard and Nicholas A. Reuterman. "Multivariate analysis of gang delinquency: IV. personality factors in gang and clubs". Multivariate Behavior Research. Volume 15. pp. 3-22. 1980.
- Cattell, Raymond B., Lothar R. Schmidt and Ake Bjerstedt. "Clinical diagnosis by the objective-analytic personality batteries". Journal of Clinical and Special Monograph Supplement. Number 34. pp. 239-312. 1972.
- Cattell, Raymond B. and James M. Schuerger. Personality Theory in Action: Handbook for the Objective-Analytic (O-A) Test Kit. Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. 1978.
- Cattell, Raymond B. and Frank W. Warburton. Objective Personality and Motivation Tests: A Theoretical Introduction and Practical Compendium. Urbana, Chicago, London: University of Illinois Press. 1967.
- Clark, John P. and Larry L. Tifft. "Polygraph and interview validation for self-reported deviant behavior". American Sociological Review. Volume 31. Number 4. pp. 516-523. August 1966.
- Cronback, Lee J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. 3rd edition. New York, Evanston, London: Harper and Row, Publishers. 1949.
- Dentler, Robert A. and Lawrence J. Monroe. "Social correlates of early adolescent theft". American Sociological Review. Volume 26. pp. 733-743. October 1961.

- Farrington, David P. "Self-reports of deviant behavior: Predictive and stable?". The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. Volume 64. Number 1. pp. 99-110. March 1973.
- Farrington, David P. and Rodger Tarling. Prediction in Criminology. Albany: State University of New York Press. 1985.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Predicting Delinquency and Crime. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 1959.
- Gold, Martin. "Undetected delinquent behavior". The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. Volume 3, Number 1. pp. 27-36. January 1966.
- Graham, J.R. The MMPI: A Practical Guide. New York: Oxford University Press. 1977.
- Hagan, Frank E. Research Methods in Criminal Justice and Criminology. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc.; London: Collier MacMillan Publishers. 1982.
- Hardt, Robert H. and Sandra Peterson-Hardt. "On determining the quality of the delinquency self-report method". Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. pp. 247-261. July 1977.
- Hare, Robert D. Psychopathy: Theory and Research. New York, London, Sidney, and Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1970.
- Jeffery, C. Ray. Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Approach. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 1990.
- Knapp, Robert E. "Delinquency and objective personality test factors". Journal of Applied Psychology. Volume 49, Number 1, pp. 8-10. 1965.
- Newman, Donald J. Introduction to Criminal Justice. New York: Random House. 1986.
- Norusis, Marija. SPSS/PC+. Chicago, Illinois: SPSS Inc. 1988.
- Roebuck, Julian B. Criminal Typology. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher. 1967.
- Roebuck, Julian B. and Ronald Johnson. "The negro drinker and assaulter as a criminal type". Crime and Delinquency. Volume 8. pp. 21-33. 1962.
- Siegel, Larry J. Criminology. 3rd edition. West Publishing Company: St. Paul, New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco. 1989.
- Waldron, Joseph. Personal Communication, Forensic Research Lab. Youngstown State University. May 2, 1989.

- Waldron, Joseph, Betty and William Archambeault, Louis Carsone, James Conser, and Carol Sutton. Microcomputers in Criminal Justice: Current Issues and Applications. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company. 1987.
- Washington Crime New Service. "New report shows devastating impact of criminal justice system on young blacks". Corrections Digest. Volume 21. Number 5. pp. 1-4. March 7, 1990.
- Webb, James T. and Kathleen M. McNamara. Configural Interpretation of the MMPI. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Psychology Publishing. 1978.
- Wicks, R.J. Applied Psychology for Law Enforcement and Correctional Officers. New York: McGraw - Hill Book Company. 1974.
- Wilbanks, William L. "Predicting failure on parole". Predicting In Criminology. Albany: State University of New York Press. pp. 78-94. 1985.
- Wolfgang, Marvin E., Robert M. Figlio and Thorsten Sellin. Delinquency in a Birth Cohort. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press. 1972.
- Wright, Bonita L. Computerized Measurements to Predict Social Deviancy. Master's Thesis. Youngstown State University. 1988.

Appendix A

Modified Gold's Deviancy Questionnaire

Please
how often

1. gone
when he

2. gone
long when

3. told
going to

4. got
something

5. didn't
you didn't

6. didn't
thing no

7. hurt
for him/h

8. hurt
for him/h

9. taken
gasoline

10. taken
response,

11. taken
ing to you

12. gotten
about what

13. gotten
about what

14. drive
not have

15. used
alcohol

16. used
lived

17. used
driven a

18. not have
property

Vertical text on the right edge of the page, possibly from an adjacent page or binding.

SELF-REPORT INSTRUMENT

Please check the best answer, which in the past three years, tells how often you have participated in these actions.

	0 never	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10-12 times	13+ times
1. gone onto someone's property when he did not want you there						
2. gone into a house or building when you were not supposed to						
3. told a person that you were going to hurt them						
4. got something by saying that something bad would happen if you didn't get it						
5. damaged or messed up something not belonging to you						
6. hurt someone badly enough for him/her to need bandages						
7. hurt someone badly enough for him/her to need to see a doctor						
8. taken a part of a car or some gasoline						
9. hit your mother, father, spouse, or steady date						
10. taken something not belonging to you worth \$2.00 to \$5.00						
11. gotten something by lying about who you are or were						
12. gotten something by lying about what you would do for someone						
13. driven a car when you should not have because of too much alcohol						
14. used illegal drugs of any kind						
15. used illegal drugs and driven a car when you should not have						
16. carried a gun or a knife						
17. taken something not belonging to you worth over \$50.00						
18. set fire to someone's property						

Please check the best answer, which in the past three years, tells how often you have participated in these actions.

	0 never	1-3 times	4-6 times	7-9 times	10-12 times	13+ times
19. used or threatened to use a weapon to get some-thing from somebody						
20. taken something from a store without paying for it						
21. taken a car without the owner's permission (even if it was returned)						
22. carved or marked up public property						
23. offered to have sex with someone for money						
24. had sex with someone who was younger than 16 years old						
25. had sexual intercourse with the opposite sex (not your spouse or steady date) who wanted to						
26. had sexual contact with someone of the same sex who wanted to						
27. offered to fix someone up with a prostitute for money						
28. given illegal drugs to someone						
29. offered to sell drugs illegally						
30. gotten a ticket for driving too fast or recklessly						
31. caused an accident because you did not care (were care-less)						

Appendix B

File Record Information

1) Case

2) Date

01 Jan.

02 Feb.

03 Marc.

04 April

3) Esti.

4) Numb.

5) Numb.

6) Numb.

File Record Information

1) Case number _ _ _ _

2) Date of birth _ _ _ _ _

Numerical Coding for Months

01 Jan.	05 May	09 Sept.
02 Feb.	06 June	10 Oct.
03 March	07 July	11 Nov.
04 April	08 Aug.	12 Dec.

3) Estimated I.Q. _ _ _

4) Number of Felony Convictions _ _ _

5) Number of Misdemeanor Convictions _ _ _

6) Number of Arrest _ _ _

Arrested for:

a. misdermeanors _ _

Person Offenses

b. Abduction _ _
 c. felonious assult _ _
 d. inducing panic _ _
 e. rape _ _
 f. extortion _ _
 g. felonious sexual penetration _ _
 h. gross sexual imposition _ _

Homicide

i. aggravated murder _ _
 j. murder _ _
 k. voluntary manslaughter _ _
 l. involuntary manslaughter _ _
 m. negligent homicide _ _
 n. aggravated vehicular homicide _ _
 o. vehicular homicide _ _

Property

p. theft _ _
 q. burglary _ _
 r. auto theft _ _
 s. arson _ _
 t. breaking and entering _ _
 u. criminal trespassing _ _
 v. receiveing stolen property _ _

Drugs

- w. narcotic addition _ _
 x. other drug addition _ _
 y. alcoholism _ _

Victimless crimes (excluding drugs)

- z. prostitution _ _
 aa. gambling _ _

Other crimes

- bb. engaging in organized crime _ _
 cc. escape _ _
 dd. armed robbery _ _
 ee. weapon offenses _ _

7) MMPI results - T scores

Validity Scales

- a. ? scale _ _
 b. L scale _ _
 c. F scale _ _
 d. K scale _ _

Clinical Scales and Codes

- e. scale 1 _ _
 f. scale 2 _ _
 g. scale 3 _ _
 h. scale 4 _ _
 i. scale 5 _ _
 j. scale 6 _ _
 k. scale 7 _ _
 l. scale 8 _ _
 m. scale 9 _ _
 n. scale 0 _ _

8) Race _

Numerical Coding for Race

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 Caucasian/White | 4 Mexican/Spanish American |
| 2 Afro-American/Black | 5 Oriental American |
| 3 American Indian | 6 Other |

9) Reading Ability _ _ _ _

10) Arithmetic Ability _ _ _ _

PSI

1. Charge PSI is being completed for _____
 2. Complete list where information was obtained for past criminal record
 - Local _____
 - State _____
 - Federal _____
 3. If missing information, Why? _____
 4. Quality of PSI (5 pt. scale - 0 is inadequate, 3 is average, and 5 is outstanding)
 - Based on Clarity _____, Completeness _____, and Objectivity _____
- _____ Overall Rating 1 2 3 4 5

Looking for the following information:

Based on Hatcher, Hayes A. Correctional Casework and Counseling. Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey. 1978. and Mills, Robert B. Offender Assessment: A Casebook in Corrections. Anderson Publishing Co. Cincinnati, Ohio. 1980.

Long Form (Hatcher pages 164-165)

1. description of offense and circumstances surrounding it
2. prior criminal record
3. educational background
4. military record
5. employment history
6. social history
 - a. family relationships
 - b. peer-group relationships
 - c. marital status
 - d. leisure time activities
 - e. residence history
 - f. religious affiliations
7. community environment
8. reports from specialized agencies
 - a. juvenile commitments
 - b. child guidance clinics
 - c. mental health clinics
 - d. other social agencies
9. information concerning special community service available to the offender
10. summary and treatment plan
11. physical health
12. personal adjustment
 - a. alcohol and drugs
 - b. bad habits
 - c. communication skills, etc...

(Mills adds page 25)

-If verification of information is not feasible, such as military service, that should be acknowledged-

APPENDIX C
INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS FOR U.I. 23

TEST NO.	T NO.	TIME	DIRECTIONS
		0:30	Does everyone have a booklet and a pencil?
1	38b	0:40	<p>Now open your booklet to the first page and look at test 1, Annoyances. Read the directions to yourselves while I read them aloud. (Read T 38b): Circle the answer below the statement. Circle "a" if you are very annoyed and angry about one of the things mentioned, "b" if you are a little bit annoyed, and "c" if you are not annoyed. Don't start until you are told. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second. Pencils ready. Begin Annoyances.</p> <p>(After 1 min. 30 sec., say): Don't forget, go right on to the second page.</p>
		2:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 2.
2	44c	0:50	<p>Now turn to page 3 in the booklet and look at test 2, Comparing Letters. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T44c): There are two sets of letters after each number. If both sets are exactly the same and in the same order, write "S" after the sets of letters. If one or more letters in a set are different, mark "D" after the sets of letters. Work quickly, when you are told to begin. Remember, "S" for the same, "D" for different. Any questions? (pause) Pencils ready. Begin Comparing Letters. Part I.</p>
		0:30	Stop working.
		0:20	On the next page is another part of this test. It starts with item 41; Now turn to page 4 and get ready to do Part II of Comparing Letters.

TEST NO. T NO.

TIME

DIRECTIONS

3

112

2:05

Pencils ready. Begin Part II.

0:30

Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 3.

Now turn to page 5 and look at test 3, Where do the Lines Cross? I will read the directions aloud. (Read T112): Your job in this test is to decide just where two lines would cross. THE lines are not draw in for you. You will be given the end points of the imaginary lines. For example, AB-CD means that the first imaginary line is from A to B, and the second line is from C to D. The problem is to find the place marked by a small letter where those lines cross. In the example below, the problem is to find the letter where the two lines, 1B and DC cross. We have dots near the letters and numbers so you will know exactly where the lines start. In this example we have drawn the imaginary lines. You see that they cross near the small "a", so for that item on the answer sheet you would mark "a". Don't actually draw any lines in the test booklet. Just imagine where they will be. Just look for the small letter where the two imaginary lines cross, and after the set of end points, write where the lines cross. Any questions? (pause) Now turn to page 6 and get ready to do Part 1. If you finish before time is called, do not go on to Part 2. Remember, do not draw any lines in the booklet. Any questions? (pause) Pencils ready. Begin Part 1.

1:15

Stop working. Part 2 is like Part 1. It starts with item 9. Find that. Pencils ready. Begin Part 2.

1:15

Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 4.

TEST NO.	T NO.	TIME	DIRECTIONS
4	197	0:40	<p>Now turn to page 7 and look at test 4, Which Would You Rather Do? I will read the directions aloud. (Read T197): Circle "a" if you would rather do "a". Circle "b" if you would rather do "b". Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin Which Would You Rather Do?</p> <p>(after 1:30, say): Don't forget, go right on to the second page.</p>
		2:30	<p>Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 5.</p>
5	11b	1:50	<p>Now turn to page 9 and look at test 5, Assumptions II. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T11b): In this test there are four sentences like this one: Example A: Bossie is contented because she is a cow. For this to be true, it must be true that: 1) All contented animals are cows, 2) all cows are contented, 3) Bossie is not a horse, 4) Bossie gives more milk, 5) cows may or may not be contented depending on how well they are cared for. Under the example you see five statements. You are to decide which ones must be true for the sample sentence to be true. In the example above, number 2) must be true, and number 3) must be true. If Bossie is contented because she is a cow, then it must be true that all cows are contented, and that she is not a horse. In the rest of the test there will be four problems like this one. If the statement must be true for the sentence to be true, circle the "T"; if it does not have to be true, circle the "F". In each problem there can be one or two statements which must be true. Any questions? (pause) Turn to page 10. Pencils ready. Begin Assumptions II.</p>

TEST NO. T NO.

TIME

DIRECTIONS

(after 1:30, say): Don't forget, go right on to the second page.

3:00

Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 6.

6

20b

0:45

Now turn to page 12 and look at test 6, What Do You See? I will read the directions aloud. (Read T20b): On this and the next page you will see a drawing with some words under it. If you see the object in the picture, circle the word for that object. If you do not see the object simply move to the next object listed. Make sure you consider every object.

0:45

Stop working.

0:15

Turn to page 13 for Part II of What Do You See? This part starts with question 21. Pencils ready. Begin Part II.

0:45

Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 7.

7

224b

1:00

Now turn to page 14 and look at test 7, Matching Words. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T224b): In this test, pick one of the three words-a, b, or c, that goes best with the word in capital letters. If you think the word next to "a" would go best with the key word in capital letters, circle the "a". If you think the word next to "b" would go best, circle the "b". If you think the word next to "c" would go best, circle the "c". By go best, we mean pick the word you would most naturally think of. Don't begin until you are told. Any questions? (pause) Time will be short, so work quickly. Pencils ready. Begin Matching Words.

TEST NO. T NO.

TIME

DIRECTIONS

1:30

Stop working. Pencils down while we
get ready for section 2.

APPENDIX D
INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS FOR U.I. 24

TEST NO.	T. NO.	TIME	DIRECTIONS
1	430	0:45	<p>Now turn to the next page and look at test 1, Humor Test. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T430): Below are some jokes. Show how funny you think each joke is by circle "a" under the joke if you think it is very funny, "b" if you think it is funny, "c" if you think it is a little funny, and "d" if you think it is not funny at all. Don't start until you are told. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin Humor test.</p> <p>(After 1:30, say): Don't forget, go right on to the second page.</p>
		2:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 2.
2	27b	1:00	<p>Now turn to page 3 and look at test 2, How Do You Like...? I will read the directions aloud. (Read T27b): Circle "a" if you would like or do like the thing very much, "b" if you like it, "c" if you are uncertain, and so on. Work very quickly. Don't bother to think much about each item, but just give your first impression. Use the following key: a) like very much, b) like, c) uncertain, d) dislike, e) dislike very much. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin How Do You Like...?</p> <p>(after 1:30, say): Don't forget to go right on to the second page.</p>
		2:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 3.
3	41a	1:10	<p>Now turn to page 5 and look at test 3, Do You Sometimes...? I will read the directions aloud. (Read T41a):</p>

TEST NO. T. NO.

TIME

DIRECTIONS

All of us have sometimes done something we shouldn't, or something we're ashamed of later. Nobody is perfect, but sometimes it's hard to admit things we've done wrong. If there is one of these things you have done very often, circle "a". If you have done or thought it often, circle "b"; if sometimes, circle "c", and so on. Use the following key: a) very often or almost always, b) often, c) sometimes, d) seldom, e) very seldom. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin Do You Sometimes..?

(after 1:30, say): Don't forget, go right on to the second page.

2:00 Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 4.

4

36

1:10 Now turn to page 7 and look at test 4, What's Your Comment? I will read the directions aloud. (Read T36): Below are 12 statements about some things which have happened or could possibly happen in the future. Underneath each statement there are comments somebody might make when hearing it for the first time. Select the one comment that comes nearest to what you would probably say. Circle either the "a", "b", or "c". Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin What's Your Comment?

(after 1 min., say): Don't forget to go right on to the second page.

2:00 Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 5.

TEST NO.	T. NO.	TIME	DIRECTIONS
5	187a	0:45	Now turn to page 9 and look at test 5, Jokes and Tricks. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T187a): In front of you is a list of practical jokes that when you were a teenager you might have thought it would be fun to play on someone. Circle "Y" for yes if you think you would probably have considered it a good trick to play. Circle "N" for no if you would not think it suitable. Any questions? (pause) Pencils ready. Begin Jokes and Tricks.
		2:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 6
6	163aA	0:45	Now turn to page 10 and look at test 6, Putting Up With Things. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T163aA): Circle "Y" next to the item number if you like or don't mind doing the things listed. Circle "N" if you don't like to do it. Any questions? (pause) Remember, Y for yes, I would like it, N for no, I wouldn't like it. Pencils ready. Begin Putting Up With Things.
		1:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for the next page.
6	163aB	0:55	Turn to page 11, Putting Up With Things. I will read the direction aloud. (Read T163aB): You just marked some things you like or don't like doing: Now tell us whether you would do them, regardless of whether you like doing them, if your family and friends asked you to. Circle "a" if you would always do it, "b" if you would do it most of the time, "c" if you would do it sometimes, and so on. Use the following key: a) always, b) most of the time, c) sometimes, d) rarely, e) never. Any questions? (pause) Pencils ready. Begin Putting

TEST NO.	T. NO.	TIME	DIRECTIONS
			Up With Things.
		1:30	Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 7.
7	38c	1:00	<p>Now turn to page 12 and look at test 7, What Bothers Me. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T38c): Circle "a" if you are very much bothered or angry about the thing mentioned in each item; circle "b" if you are a little bothered, and "c" if you are not at all bothered. Use the following key: a) very much bothered, b) a little bothered, c) not bothered. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin What Bothers Me.</p> <p>(after 1:30, say): Don't forget to go right on to the next page.</p>
		2:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 8.
8	25	0:55	<p>Now turn to page 14 and look at test 8, Favorite Titles. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T25): Here are 12 pairs of book titles, with a brief description telling what the book is about. You are to decide which book of the two you would rather read. Circle the "a" if you prefer the first book, and "b" if you prefer the second book. When you are told to begin, work as quickly as you can. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second. Pencils ready. Begin Favorite Titles.</p> <p>(after 1:30, say): Don't forget to go right on to the second page.</p>
		2:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we for section 3.

APPENDIX E
INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS FOR U.I. 33

TEST NO.	T NO.	TIME	DIRECTIONS
1	22b	0:40	<p>Now turn to the next page. Look at test 1, Performance Estimated. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T22b): Below is a list of things which not many people have tried. Circle the answer of how well you think you could do each of them without much experience or practice. Use the following key for marking your answers: a) very well, b) well, c) fairly well, d) poorly, e) very poorly. If your finish page 1 before time is called, go right on to the second page. Any questions? (pause) Pencils ready. Begin Performance Estimates.</p> <p>(after 1:00, say): Don't forget to go right on to the second page.</p>
		1:30	<p>Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 2.</p>
2	64b	1:10	<p>Now turn to page 3 and look at test 2, How Many Friends? I will read the directions aloud. (Read T64b): Good friends are people you want to continue to know for a long time. You trust them and they trust you. If you ever need them you know they will stand by you, and you would do the same for them. According the above definition of a friend, circle the answer corresponding to each item below. Use the following key: a) If you have no friends whom you could call on in the situation described, b) if you have only one friend you could call on, and c) if you have two or more friends you could call on in this situation. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin How many Friends?</p> <p>(after 1 min., say): Don't forget, go right on to the second page.</p>

TEST NO.	T NO.	TIME	DIRECTIONS
		2:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 3.
3	40c	0:50	Now turn to page 5 and look at test 3, What is Fun? I will read the directions aloud. (Read T40c): Circle "Y" if you would like to do what is said in the item. Circle "N" if you would not like to do it. Don't start until you are told. "Y" yes, would like, "N", would not like. Any questions? (pause) Pencils ready. Begin What Is Fun?
		2:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we get read for test 4.
4	156b	0:55	Turn to page 6 and look at test 4, My Feelings. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T156b): The following items ask you to tell how you have felt at certain times. Read each item and try to remember how you felt at that time. Use the following key and circle your answer: a) if you felt very happy, b) if you felt fine, c) if you felt O.K., d) if you felt not really good, and e) if you felt unhappy. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin My Feelings. (after 1:30, say): Don't forget to go right on to the second page.
		2:00	Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 5.
5	39	0:50	Now turn to page 8 and look at test 5, Chances of Success. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T39): Below is a list of things which many people would like to be able to do. Show whether you think your chances are low, average, or good of doing these things. We are not asking what your chances of doing the things are now, but what your chances are for
TEST NO.	T NO.	TIME	DIRECTIONS

reaching these goals in the future. Use the following key in marking your answers: a) good chance, b) average chance, c) low chance. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin Chances of Success.

(after 2:00, say): Don't forget to go right on to the second page.

2:30 Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 6.

6 9e1 0:45 Now turn to page 9 and look at test 6, Opinions VII. I will read the directions aloud. (Read T9e1): Circle the "a" if you strongly agree with the statement, circle "b" if you agree, "c" if you are uncertain, and so on. Use the following key in marking you answer: a) strongly agree, b) agree, c) uncertain, d) disagree, e) strongly disagree. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. Pencils ready. Begin Opinions VII.

(after 1:30, say): Don't forget, go right on to the second page.

2:00 Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for test 7.

7 24 1:00 Now turn to page 11 and look at test 7, How Would Events Affect You? I will read the directions aloud. (Read T24): Things happen fairly far away in the world that can nevertheless affect you personally. A list of such things is given below. Try to decide whether in the end its effects on your live are likely to be good or bad. Circle your response. Use the following key: a) very bad, b) rather bad, c)

TEST NO. T NO. TIME

DIRECTIONS

neither good nor bad, d) rather good, e) good. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. If you finish the second page before time is called, go right on to the third page. Pencils ready. Begin How Would Events Affect You?

(after 1:00, say): Don't forget, go right on to the second or third page.

2:00

Stop working. Pencils down while we get ready for the last section.

TIME
01:50

APPENDIX F

INSTRUCTION TO SUBJECTS FOR
MODIFIED GOLD'S DEVIANCY QUESTIONNAIRE

13:00

TIME

DIRECTIONS

-
- 0:50 Now turn to the next page and look at Self-Report instrument. I will read the directions aloud. (Read Self-Report Instrument): Please check the best answer, which in the past three years, tells how often you have participated in these action. Check the first box for never, second box for 1-3 time, third box for 4-6 times, fourth box for 7-9 times, fifth box for 10-12 times, sixth box for 13 or more times. Any questions? (pause) If you finish the first page before time is called, go right on to the second page. You have 15 minutes to complete this section. Pencils ready. Begin Self-Report Instrument.
- (after 10 min, say): Don't forget, go right on to the second page.
- 15:00 Stop working. Pencils down while materials are collected. Thank you for helping me with this study. The Center will take care of your pay. If you wish to some day read the study, please contact the Forensic Research Lab. at Youngstown State University. The study should be completed by June of 1990. Again thank you.

APPENDIX G
SCORING FOR U.I. TESTS

SCORING FOR U.I. 23

Each test will follow the following formula: (Derived Raw Score - Mean of Derived Raw Scores) X Weight = Special Subtest Standard Score. The z-score form for each subject will be obtained by adding the special subtest standard scores together -Factor Score

Test 1
T38b

Annoyances

The rationale for this test is that some persons are more annoyed by social inconveniences than by nonhuman sources of irrational.

To use the scoring scheme below, first get the four subtotals, find the values S and N, then do the final division; i.e., divide the item sum by the number done for social annoyance items, divide the item sum by the number done for the nonsocial annoyance items, then divide the first quotient by the second.

Formula:

Item Score Sum Social Items
Number done social items (odd items)

Item Score Sum Nonsocial items
Number done nonsocial items (even items)

Where Sum social items is a usual item sum (a=3, b=2, c=1), taken only on the odd (1, 3, 5, etc.) items.

Other subtotals are similar.

Scoring scheme:

Item sum for odd items ΣO _____ ----> $\frac{\Sigma O}{NOD} = S$ _____

Number done for odd items NOD _____ ---->

Item sum for even items ΣE _____ ----> $\frac{\Sigma E}{NED} = N$ _____

Number done for even items NED _____ ---->

$\frac{S}{D} =$
Derived Raw Score

mean = 1.05
weight = .2

Test 2
T44c

Comparing Letters

$\frac{\text{Number right}}{\text{Number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$
(2 parts)

Key:

DSDDS SDSSS DDSSS DDSDD SDDDS
SDSDD SSSSD SDSDD DDSSS DSDSD
SDDSD DDSSD SDDSD SSDDS DDSDS DSDDS

mean = .88
weight = 1.0

Test 3
T112

Where do the lines cross?

$\frac{\text{no. right} - 1/4 \text{ wrong}}{\text{Number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$
(2 parts)

Key:

aebd edcb bdae bcbc

mean = .70
weight = 1.8

Test 4
T197

Which would you rather do?

$\frac{\text{number right}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$

Key:

aabb abba abbb bbab

mean = .71
weight = 1.5

Test 5
T11b

Assumptions II

$\frac{\text{number right}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$

Key:

FFTFF TFFF TFFF FFTF

mean = .70
weight = 4

Test 6
T20b

What do you see?

$\frac{\text{number right}}{\text{number of options}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$
(2 parts)

Key:

The total among these not circled is the right score.

2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33,
35, 38, 39.

mean = .65
weight = .2

Test 7
T224b

Matching words

$\frac{\text{number right}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$

Key:

abcba cbacc cc

mean = .87
weight = .02

SCORING FOR U.I. 24

Each test will follow the following formula: (Derived Raw score - Mean of Derived Raw Scores) X Weight = Special Subtest standard Score. The z-score form for each subject will be obtained by adding the special subtest standard scores together -Factor score

Test 1
T430

Humor test

$\frac{\text{sum of item scored}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$

Key:
note: before computing the sum of item values, set the even item responses to a=4, b=3, c=2, d=1, coding, and the odd item responses to a=1, b=2, c=3, d=4.

mean = 3.04
weight = .04

test 2
T27b

How do you like?

$\frac{\text{sum of item scores}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$

Key:
note: before computing the sum, set the "highbrow" items (items 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16) to a=1, b=2, c=3, d=4, e=5. All other item values are a=5, b=4, c=3, d=2, e=1.

mean = 3.4
weight = .4

test 3
T41a

Do you sometimes...?

$\frac{\text{sum of item scores}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$

Key:
note: even items set to a=1, b=2, c=3, etc. Odd items set to a=5, b=4, c=3, etc.

mean = 2.89
weight = .7

test 4
T36

What's your comment?

number right = Derived Raw Score
number done

Key:
bbc bc cab cc

mean = .29
weight = .7

test 5
T187a

Jokes and Tricks

number right = Derived Raw Score
number done

Key:
"y" is counted right for all items

mean = .62
weight = 1.5

test 6
T163

Putting up with things

sum of item scores = Derived Raw Score
number done

Key:
create seven horizontal columns Y, N, a, b, c, d, e. Enter the number 1-12 as vertical columns. Enter Y or N for the questions. Sum the N column = sum # done.
For all no response question, continue by entering a tally in the appropriate box for the answer given.
Count the # of tallies for column a, b, etc.
Multiply # tallies by the following values: a X 1, b X 2, c X 3, d X 4, and e X 5. Add the results of the multiplication functions to get sum of items scores.

mean = 2.28
mean = .06

Test 7
T38c

What bothers me ?

$$\frac{\text{sum of item scores}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$$

Key:
item values are a=3, b=2, c=1.

mean = 2.15
weight = .7

Test 8
T25

Favorite titles

$$\frac{\text{number right}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$$

Key:
aaaab abaaa aa

mean = .70
weight = .7

SCORING FOR U.I. 33

Each test will follow the following formula: (Derived Raw Score - Mean of Derived Raw Scores) X Weight = Special Subtest Standard Score. The z-score form for each subject will be obtained by adding the special subtest standard scores together -Factor Score

Test 1
T22b

Performance estimates

$\frac{\Sigma \text{ item scores}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$

Key:
for this sum, let a=1, b=2, c=3, d=4, e=5.

mean = 3.22
weight = .4

Test 2
T64b

How many friend?

$\frac{\Sigma \text{ item scores}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$

Key:
for this sum, let a=3, b=2, c=1.

mean = 1.39
weight = .1

Test 3
T40c

What is fun?

$\frac{\text{number right}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$

Key:
"N" is scored correct for all items.

mean = .34
weight = .2

Test 4

T156b

My feelings

$$\frac{\Sigma \text{ item scores}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$$

Key:

For this sub, let a=1, b=2, c=3, d=4, e=5.

mean = 2.35

weight = .01

Test 5

T39

Chances of success

$$\frac{\Sigma \text{ item scores}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$$

Key:

for this sum, let a=1, b=2, c=3

mean = 2.00

weight = .8

Test 6

T9e1

Opinions VII

$$\frac{\Sigma \text{ item scores}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$$

Key:

for this sum, let a=1, b=2, c=3, d=4, e=5 for all items except 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18. For those seven items, let a=5, b=4, c=3, d=2, e=1.

mean = 2.83

weight = .1

Test 7

T24

How would events affect you?

$$\frac{\Sigma \text{ item scores}}{\text{number done}} = \text{Derived Raw Score}$$

Key:

for this sum, the usual weights, $a=5$, $b=4$, $c=3$, $d=2$, $e=1$, are uses.

mean = 3.14
weight = 1.6

APPENDIX H
CLASSIFICATION AND SCORING OF QUESTIONS FOR
MODIFIED GOLD'S DEVIANCY QUESTIONNAIRE

Modified Gold's Deviancy Questionnaire

Items in the questionnaire were classified as follows:

Misdemeanors	11 items
Property Offenses	9 items
Drug Offenses	3 items
Person Offenses	8 items

Category, item numbers:

Misdemeanor;	1, 2, 8, 10, 13, 15, 22, 24, 27, 28, 31
Property;	4, 5, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21
Drug;	14, 29, 30
Person;	3, 6, 7, 9, 19, 23, 25, 26

Dependent Variables:

The mean scores of the number of times the subjects were involved in the criminal act.

Variable 1	Number of times the individual committed a Misdemeanor offense
Variable 2	Number of times the individual committed a Property Offense
Variable 3	Number of times the individual committed a Drug Offense
Variable 4	Number of times the individual committed a Crime Against a Person
Variable 5	The Total Amount of self-reported crime, felonies and misdemeanors

APPENDIX I

**MAHONING COUNTY COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ASSOC.
CONSENT TO RELEASE INFORMATION**

MAHONING COUNTY COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ASSOC.
CONSENT TO RELEASE INFORMATION

Re: Client _____

person requesting information: _____

Person/Agency releasing information: _____

Information requested: _____

Purpose/Need for information: _____

CONSENT

I, the undersigned, do hereby give my consent for release of the above stated information for the above stated purpose.

This consent is invalid after the date of _____

Signed _____

Date _____

Witness _____

If under 18, Parent or Guardian _____

APPENDIX J
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Youngstown State University Human Subjects Research Committee

Form _____
(subjects)

To _____
Tammy A. King

I hereby authorize Tammy A. King to retrieve the following information from my file:

- 1. date of birth
- 2. I.Q.
- 3. number of felony convictions
- 4. number of misdemeanor convictions
- 5. number of arrest and charges arrested for
- 6. MMPI results
- 7. ethnic classification
- 8. reading and arithmetic abilities

I understand my responsibilities as a subject and I understand that I may terminate my participation whenever I desire. If I chose to drop out of the study, I will destroy any information given. I will also forfeit the payment of \$5.00. I understand that all information I supply or allow to be collected from my file will be kept completely confidential. All questions have been satisfactorily answered and I am voluntarily participating in this study.

Subject or authorized representative

Witness

APPENDIX K
DIRECTIONS TO INMATES

Hello, my name is Tammy King, please sit anywhere you would like to. Before we get started, I want to inform you that I do not work for the Residential Treatment Center. The results of the study are kept confidential. When I leave here today, I will not know who supplied what information. The results of the study have absolutely no effect upon your stay or release from this Center.

I am conducting this study for my thesis to obtain a Master's Degree at Youngstown State University. Please do not open your booklets until instructed to do so. Attached to your booklets are consent forms. The first two forms are exactly the same. The forms are from the Mahoning County Community Corrections Assoc. Consent to Release Information. I will read the form aloud. (Read Form) Are there any questions? Please print your name on the line that says "Person/Agency releasing information". Please date and sign at the bottom of the form. You will have to repeat this procedure on the second form.

If everyone would now look at the Informed Consent Form from the Human Subjects Research Committee at Youngstown State University. I will read the form aloud. (Read Form) Any questions? Would you please print your name on the line labeled "From". Now, please sign your name on the line labeled "Subject or Authorized Representative". Everyone finished? I will now collect these forms.

Next you will see a slip of paper which has a case number on it and ask for your name. The reason your name is needed is because information will be collected from your files. Once the information is recorded, the slip of paper with your name will be destroyed. If you would like you may destroy the slip yourself after I have collected the needed data. Your name is not recorded on the form which has your file information on it. What is recorded, though, is the case number. To put it coldly, you simply become a case number with no name. Now please write your name on the case number slip and I will collect them. Again I want to assure you that your name will not be recorded on any information you supply or any information obtained from your files. Is everyone finished filling out your names? I will now collect these forms.

The instructions for the booklet are on a tape recorder. The sections are timed. In some sections, you will not be able to complete every question. If you happen to finish a section before time is called, please put down your pencil and wait for instructions for the next section. Any questions so far?

Follow the directions exactly. It is imperative that you do this. I also ask that there be no talking during the testing. If at any time you decide you do not want to complete the study, raise your hand and I will have you destroy all of the information you have provided. Please note that if you do not complete the study, you will forfeit the \$5.00 payment. Is there any questions? We will now begin. Wait for directions from the tape recorder.

(Begin Tape Recorder)