

ROOM USE ONLY

183

A

T

social s

delinque

determin

tion.

the soc

an appl

behavior

in

file de

is r

A

data, an

provides

individ

offers a

personal

information

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE SOCIAL POSITION, REPUTATION AND ADJUSTMENT OF THE MENTAL RETARDATE IN AN INSTITUTIONALIZED DELINQUENT POPULATION

by Paul John Spata, Jr.

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the social status and adjustment of the institutionalized delinquent who is also mentally retarded, in order to determine the suitability of this milieu for his resocialization. Other interests involved a systematic study of the social valuing system of a delinquent population, and an application of the theory of anomie to explain the behavior of the delinquent retardate.

The study group consisted of 365 institutionalized male delinquents, among whom 39 mental retardates, with I.Q.'s ranging from 63 to 79, were identified.

A sociometric technique was employed to gather the data, utilizing the Lewis Sociometric Scale. This scale provides an object measure of reputation, locates the individual within the social ordering of the group, and offers a means of evaluating the individual on three key personality variables--acceptability, aggressiveness, and withdrawal.

A rese

two parts:

1. A

in

fa

in

2. A

re

de

de

co

va

Seven r

tested indire

of which each

hypotheses we

1. A p

gen

2. The

cho

3. The

beh

4. The

and

ment

A research design was developed which consisted of two parts:

1. A systematic pairing of the research variables of intelligence, social position, and adjustment factors in all possible combinations to test for independence.
2. A combination of the personality variables into reputation components in a facetized design to determine the social valuing models for both delinquents and the institutional staff. These components were tested against the research variables of intelligence and social position.

Seven major hypotheses were developed which were tested indirectly by testing the two to three subhypotheses of which each major hypothesis consisted. These major hypotheses were:

1. A positive relationship exists between intelligence and social position.
2. There is a positive association between reciprocal choice and similarity in intelligence.
3. There is an association between intelligence and behavioral adjustment.
4. There is an association between social position and adjustment mode which varies with the adjustment factor and the rater role.

5. There is an association between social position and reputation in the institution which is differentially perceived in accordance with rater role.
6. There is a positive association between reputation and intelligence.
7. A positive association exists between low intelligence and anomie in the delinquent social structure of the institution.

The main postulation, that social position would vary directly with intelligence, was formulated from the overwhelming evidence in the literature. It was also a thesis that the retardate would be seen as malaggressive by staff but not by peers, and that he would be perceived as anomic by both staff and peers. It was reasoned that the reputation hierarchy established by those assigned high and low social position by friendship choice, would determine the delinquent and staff valuing systems. These two systems were predicted to differ mainly in the high value postulated to be placed on malaggression by delinquents.

Tests of the hypotheses were accomplished by means of two statistics, the chi square and the phi coefficient. These nonparametric tests were employed because the nature of the group could not meet the assumption of a normally distributed population.

The major findings may be summarized as follows:

1. Social position is independent of intelligence in an institutionalized delinquent population.
2. The personality characteristics of acceptability and withdrawal are independent of intelligence, but malaggression is inversely associated with intelligence.
3. Social acceptability is directly associated with social position as measured by both types of rater. Withdrawal is inversely associated with social position as measured by peers and directly associated with it as measured by staff. Social position appears to be uninfluenced by aggression in either staff or peer ratings.
4. While both retardates and nonretardates tend to reciprocate in friendship choices to a greater degree within their own respective intelligence groups, they do not appear to do so to a significant degree.
5. There is a direct and highly significant association between social position and reputation. Staff and delinquents value reputations differentially and the predicted hierarchies of reputations were found tenable.

6. Reputation is independent of intelligence.
7. Retarded delinquents are no more anomic, alienated, isolated or rejected than their intellectually more well endowed compeers; but delinquents as a group tend to perceive their members as more anomic than eunomic.

A S

A

in p

Department

A STUDY OF THE SOCIAL POSITION, REPUTATION
AND ADJUSTMENT OF THE MENTAL RETARDATE
IN AN INSTITUTIONALIZED
DELINQUENT POPULATION

By

Paul John Spata, Jr.

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Elementary and Special Education

1965

6353003
9-9-66

PREFACE

"It is not to die, or even to die of hunger, that makes a man wretched; many men have died;. . . .But it is to live miserable we know not why;. . . .to be heart worn, weary, yet isolated, unrelated."

. . . .Thomas Carlyle

Past and Present (in
book III The Modern
Worker, Chapter XIII
Democracy. New York:
Harper Bros., 1843).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The investigator would like to express his appreciation to his project director, Dr. John E. Jordan, and to the other members of his committee, Drs. G. Marian Kinget, Fred Vescolani and W. Vernon Hicks for their helpfulness and support in aiding this study through to completion. Acknowledgment is also made to Dr. James Crowner for helping to initiate the project.

For stimulating and encouraging the original ideas, and for collaborating on the initial phases of the study, the researcher is greatly indebted to Dr. Bobbie Palk.

More than any other individual, the investigator owes deepest gratitude to his colleague, Mr. John Felty, for providing crucial breakthroughs in theory, design, and data treatment methodology, and without whose consultation this study might never have been completed.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Willard G. Warrington for statistical advice and to Mr. John Johnson for his assistance in the final stages.

The patience of Mrs. Lura Pearl Carr, who undertook the typing of the manuscript, and her willingness to endure the long hours and frustrations of numerous rewrites were also much appreciated.

The investigator will not attempt to describe semantically, that which can only be expressed affectively, concerning his feelings for the support given him by his many friends and family. Far beyond the computational and proof reading tasks undertaken by his wife, Elizabeth, the decision to embark on doctoral studies would never have been made without her encouragement, nor could have been feasible without her willingness to assume, by herself, almost the entire parental responsibility for a large family. In this regard, fond appreciation is also extended to the researcher's children, who managed so well during this almost fatherless period, especially to daughter Patricia, whose voluntary assumption of the many and varied household tasks made it possible for her mother to return to teaching to provide the necessary financial support.

Finally, the contribution of his sister Antoinette, to improve the family habitability arrangements, did much to relieve the concerns of the investigator during this period and free him to pursue his studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	11
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	111
LIST OF TABLES.	1x
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	xi1
LIST OF APPENDICES	xi11
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM.	1
Purposes of the Study	1
Background	1
Importance of the Study.	3
Summary	8
Definitions of Terms.	8
Limitations of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH.	14
Orientation of the Review	14
General Findings in Social Adjustment	14
Specific Findings in Social Adjustment.	15
Research Related to Intelligence in Social Position and Adjustment	15
Summary of Research on Intelligence.	19
Research Related to Personality Char- acteristics in Social Position and Adjustment	19
Summary of Research on Personality in Social Position and Adjustment	26
Research Related to Social Setting and Adjustment	28
Summary of Research on Social Setting and Adjustment.	32
Research Related to Staff Perceptions and Attitudes in Leadership	33

	Page
Summary of Research on Staff Attitudes and Perceptions in Leadership	38
Summary of the Literature on Intelligence and Personality in Social Position and Adjustment.	39
Questions Not Answered by the Research on Social Adjustment.	41
Research and Discussion Related to the Retardate as a Social Deviant. . . .	42
Research and Discussion Related to the Delinquent as a Social Deviant . . .	48
Research and Discussion Related to the Theoretical Foundation and Development of the Study.	50
Anomie and Its Relevance as a Theoretical Foundation for This Study . .	52
Summary of Theory of Anomie as Related to This Study	58
Theory Utilization in Hypotheses Development	59
Summary of Relationship Between Theory and Hypotheses.	62
Summary of Related Research	64
III. METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN	65
Introduction	65
Hypotheses to be Tested.	65
The Research Setting.	70
The Population.	71
General Procedures	71
Instrumentation	72
Design of the Study	74
Rationale for the Design	74
Study Design	76
Summary	81
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.	82
Introduction	82
Statistical Rationale	82
Statistics Employed and Procedures Utilized.	83
Subjects.	85
Format of the Analysis	87

	Page
Intelligence and Social Position. . . .	88
Results of Testing Hypothesis (1) . . .	93
Intelligence and Reciprocal Choice . . .	93
Results of Testing Hypothesis (2) . . .	96
Intelligence and Behavioral Adjustment. . .	97
Results of Testing Hypothesis (3) . . .	102
Social Position and Adjustment Mode. . . .	102
Results of Testing Hypothesis (4) . . .	107
Social Position and Reputation	107
Results of Testing Hypothesis (5) . . .	113
Reputation and Intelligence	113
Results of Testing Hypothesis (6) . . .	115
Intelligence and Anomie.	116
Results of Testing Hypothesis (7) . . .	117
Summary of the Analysis.	118
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	120
Summary of the Study.	120
Conclusions.	121
Intelligence and Social Position. . . .	121
Intelligence and Reciprocal Choice . . .	122
Intelligence and Behavioral Adjustment.	122
Adjustment and Social Position	123
Reputation and Social Position	124
Reputation and Intelligence	125
Intelligence and Anomie.	125
General Study Conclusions	126
VI. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . .	127
Implications of the study	127
Recommendations	135

	Page
Problems for Further Study	137
Summary of the Investigation	140
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	144
APPENDICES	158

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. A typology of modes of individual adaptation .	55
2. Retardate variables of possible influence on social position, reputation and adjust- ment	86
3. Analysis of social position as measured by peers in relation to intelligence . . .	89
4. Analysis of social position as measured by peers in relation to level of retardation.	90
5. Analysis of social position as measured by peers in relation to intelligence and equated for reputation	91
6. Percentages of potential reciprocal social choices made between and within intelli- gence groups	94
7. Analysis of total reciprocal social choices by cottage as measured by peers in rela- tion to intelligence.	95
8. Analysis of the facet of aggression as measured by staff in relation to intelli- gence.	98
9. Analysis of the facet of aggression as measured by peers in relation to intelli- gence.	99
10. Analysis of the facet of withdrawal as measured by peers in relation to intelli- gence.	100
11. Analysis of the facet of withdrawal as measured by staff in relation to intelli- gence.	100
12. Analysis of the facet of acceptance as measured by peers in relation to intelli- gence.	101

Table		Page
13.	Analysis of the facet of acceptance as measured by staff in relation to intelligence.	102
14.	Analysis of the facet of acceptance as measured by peers in relation to social position.	104
15.	Analysis of the facet of acceptance as measured by staff in relation to social position.	104
16.	Analysis of the facet of aggression as measured by peers in relation to social position.	105
17.	Analysis of the facet of aggression as measured by staff in relation to social position.	105
18.	Analysis of the facet of withdrawal as measured by peers in relation to social position.	106
19.	Analysis of the facet of withdrawal as measured by staff in relation to social position.	106
20.	Analysis of reputation as measured by staff in relation to social position	109
21.	Analysis of reputation as measured by staff in relation to the entire range of social position.	110
22.	Analysis of reputation as measured by peers in relation to social position	111
23.	Relationship of reputation to social position throughout the ranges as measured by peers.	112
24.	Analysis of reputation as measured by peers in relation to the entire range of social position.	112
25.	Analysis of reputation as measured by staff in relation to intelligence	114

Table		Page
26.	Analysis of reputation as measured by peers in relation to intelligence	114
27.	Analysis of the highest and lowest reputation categories as measured by peers in rela- tion to intelligence.	115
28.	Analysis of the highest and lowest reputation categories as measured by staff in rela- tion to intelligence.	116
29.	Analysis of anomie as measured by peers in relation to intelligence	117
30.	Analysis of anomie by highest and lowest repu- tations and social position quartiles as measured by peers in relation to intelli- gence.	118
31.	Total possible reciprocal social choices by cottage	169
32.	Reputation and social position by IQ category as measured by peers.	170



LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Variables of Reputation Components.	77
2. Hypothesized Relation of Social Position to Reputation in a Normal Population.	78
3. Hypothesized Relation of Social Position to Reputation in a Delinquent Population as Ranked by Delinquents.	79
4. Hypothesized Relation of Social Position to Reputation in a Delinquent Population as Ranked by Staff and Peers	80
5. Comparison of Hypothesized and Observed Orderings of Reputations in a Delinquent Population	171

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study are: (1) to ascertain the social position of the educable mental retardate in an institution serving male delinquents; (2) to determine the nature of his behavioral adaptation; (3) to study the social valuing system of the delinquent population of the institution.

The motivations for this investigation are threefold:

1. To determine whether an institution for delinquents is an appropriate rehabilitative setting for a youth who is also retarded.
2. To obtain knowledge of the adjustment and sociometric status of the mentally retarded delinquent to assist in individualizing treatment prescriptions for future wards with this particular combination of dysfunctions.
3. To determine what implications exist in these approaches for the educational and rehabilitative programming for all institutionalized delinquents.

Background

The treatment of delinquency, even under conditions of high rehabilitative potential, optimal facilities and

competent staff is still a complex task in social engineering, involving the reorientation of norms and values to conform to society's expectations of its members. But when additional handicaps, such as mental retardation, are presented, the problem is considerably more complicated.

Most, if not all, state institutions for delinquents are faced with this problem of mentally retarded inmates. Delinquents are usually committed to these institutions on the assumption that, although socially damaged, they are physically and mentally capable of profiting from the training school experience. For institutions serving the mentally deficient, as well as those housing delinquents, the law is generally written to provide for the nonacceptance of those who cannot qualify on the basis of criteria established for this purpose. But because of the various and well documented limitations of psychometry, the whole problem of discrepancies between intellectual measurements and functioning levels, and the shortcomings of our judicial system, public institutions find themselves with substantial numbers of charges ill equipped for the milieu in which their rehabilitation is supposedly to take place (Westwell, 1951). The result is a significant population in our institutions representing a "grey area" of responsibility between the state governmental agency responsible for mental health and the agency responsible for social welfare.

Both types of training schools are currently faced with the situation of coping with the special problems which the retarded-delinquent youth presents, apparently because no clear guide lines exist for courts to assist them in making a determination of institution suitability, or at least discriminating between mental and social deviancy as to the primary problem in each individual case. Knowledge of the nature of the retardate's adjustment in a training school for delinquents could help determine the advisability of his placement in this rehabilitative environment. An analysis of this adaptation in terms of social structure, hierarchy, and relationships could materially assist in both resolving the placement dilemma and providing clues to future approaches in this youth's socialization and education. Concomitantly, much could be learned about the informal organization and social structure of a delinquent society which could be of value in improving programs for institutionalized delinquents. It is to these ends that the present study will attempt to make a contribution.

Importance of the Study

Although the mere fact that the delinquent-retardate exists could be considered sufficient justification for this investigation, more pragmatic evidence can be presented on several bases:

1. The changing roles and functions of state institutions and the social implications of institutional placement have been recently identified as areas in which research has been lacking (Gardner & Nisonger, 1962). This is easily confirmed by a comparison of the number of studies involving the placement and adjustment of mentally retarded children in regular and special classes in the public school with those studies involving institutional placement. In a careful review of the literature published since 1950, a total of 29 studies were found which were done with public school retardates while in the same period only three investigations of retardate adjustment in institutions, and about as many studies of institutionalized delinquents in this regard,¹ were uncovered.
2. The impact of automation has made it more important than ever that we consider ways in which to increase our understanding of the delinquent-retardate in order to help him to a better community and economic adjustment. Aside from the fact that this boy's present involvement in crime and delinquency is a considerably drain on public funds, the problem is nowhere near the magnitude it portends to become in the future. The simple fact is that the social problems

¹These studies are cited and discussed in the Review of Related Research, Chapter II.

4

7

of the delinquent-retardate in the community affect him economically and, when he cannot support himself, he and his progeny will become dependent upon public support, either through welfare or incarceration. Rogers (1963) calls this the "social price" we pay for automation and points out that it is the lower level job--the one most likely to be filled by a retardate--which is most vulnerable to elimination by a machine, while at the same time his intellectual limitations prevent this person from competing for the new technological positions which automation creates.

3. While some studies (Baller, 1936; Bobroff, 1956; Charles, 1953; Dinger, 1961; Kennedy, 1948; Porter and Milazzo, 1958) show that the retardates adjust quite well in the community, several (Channing, 1932; Collman and Newlyn, 1956; O'Connor, 1954; Peckham, 1951) suggest that they do not and that the main reason for failure of retardates to successfully adjust on the job is not low intelligence, but rather social dysfunctioning--antisocial conduct, social instability, temperament, and lack of social sophistication. Added to this is the emphasis of other researchers (Bolduc, 1959; Dexter, 1958; Foale, 1956) on the social restrictions and demands placed on the retardate in our culture, which are so unrealistic

that he is unable to cope with them, and which predispose him to--if not actually predetermine--his social deviancy. Indeed, Merton (1957) suggests, and Dexter and Erikson (in Becker, 1964) concur, that all deviants find themselves alienated as a result of society's circularity in reasoning, leading to a "self-fulfilling prophecy" which first creates the "facts" concerning the deviancy, and later uses these facts to confirm its imposition of negative sanctions against these individuals (Erikson, 1964, p. 17). Studies of the nature of the retardate's adjustment, and of the relationship between this adjustment and his social position, are important to effective treatment planning toward his eventual release.

4. In comparison to other times and other cultures, the unique position of today's youth as an alienate is of particular concern to our consideration of the retardate. Kvaraceus (1963), echoing some of his earlier remarks (1959) states: "[All] youth's importance and function have diminished to the point where youth now represents, in many parts of the world, a surplus commodity on a glutted market." (p. 87).

If this is the position of the typical youth, what must the situation be for those who cannot run as fast as the rest in the race for social, economic and even psychological survival? If today's normal youth is

"stigmatized, infantilized, down graded, disengagedshut out. . . .disenfranchized. . . .[and] shunted. . . .from the mainstream of social, civic, and economic life-activity of family and community," (p. 87) how much more so must the youth, beset by behavioral and cognitively handicapping conditions, also suffer status deprivation? If the modern juvenile is "shelved for deferred purposes" (p. 87) and denied even apprenticeship for eventual adulthood, how intolerable must be the existence of the youngster who is not even allowed to mutually share in the aimlessness and misery of his peer group, banished even from the street corner society, faceless even in his own neighborhood? This study will attempt to determine to what degree the above description of estrangement is representative of the social position among his peers of the delinquent who is also retarded.

5. The importance of an investigation of this social position is specifically pointed out by several writers (Charles, 1953; Johnson, 1950; Palk, 1962) all of whom agree that there is far too much opinion and not enough scientific investigation in what little has been written on the subject of the retarded child in society. Becker (1963), makes the same claim for deviant behavior in general, and according to Bowman (1957), the mentally defective delinquent is the one who has been ignored most of all by research.

6. Finally, the multidisciplined approach to delinquency treatment has suffered for lack of an organizing and coordinating theory by which the behavior of groups, as well as individuals, can be better understood and treated. The application of a theory in this investigation to explain and confirm the nature of a delinquent social structure can be of considerable usefulness to the field.

Summary

It appears clear then, that on both theoretical and pragmatic grounds, this investigation has relevance and importance to the general fields of delinquency and mental retardation, and to those whose particular concern is institutional treatment programs.

Definitions of Terms

Adjustment Mode:	This term refers to the characteristic behavior of the individual, his personality "signature," or to the general direction of his actualizing activities. It will be categorized in a manner similar to Karen Horney's paradigm: accepted behavior (moving toward); maladjusted, aggressive behavior (moving against); and withdrawing behavior (moving away). The term "adaptive mode" will refer to these same categories.
---------------------	---

"Aggressive" behavior will be synonymous with "malaggressive" or "acting out" behavior. "Withdrawing" behavior will be variously referred to as "self-estranging" or "self-isolating." Assignment to a category will be determined by the relative frequency with which individuals are selected for these categories by the responses to the questions in the instrument.

Anomie: While originally in the Greek it referred to a state of lawlessness, this term will include the concepts of "alienation: and "maladjustment," and will be measured by a combination of both the individual's social position and his reputation component. It is a sociological construct that attempts to describe the degree to which an individual is out-of-step with his society. In this study an anomic individual will define one whose social functioning is not effective. This concept is discussed more fully in the section devoted to theory development and discussion.

Delinquent: An individual between the ages of 12 and 17, so adjudicated by the court, and committed to an institution whose main purpose it is to

treat norm-violating behavior. This includes the whole study population, hereafter called "ward," "inmate," "client," etc.

Delinquent-
Retardate:

An individual who meets the criteria listed in both the retardate and delinquent definitions. This individual is a member of the subset of retardates in the delinquent set which will be hereafter identified by the terms "research group," "retardates," "defectives," "mentally deficient population" and similar terms.

Eunomie:

A sociological construct which attempts to describe the degree to which an individual (or group) is in tune with the society in which he (or it) functions. It is the opposite of anomie and represents a stable, homeostatic adjustment to a formerly anomic situation.

Mental
Retardate:

An individual who scores between 60-79 on an individually administered intelligence test (Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, or Wechsler-Bellevue I and II) such that the difference between the verbal and performance scores does not exceed 20 points and neither scale scores exceeds the upper confidence

bound of 89.¹ Those retardates who score above IQ 74 will be referred to as "high retardates" and those who score at IQ 74 below will be known as "low retardates." This is only for the purpose of extracting an upper and a lower group and not to define behavioral level.

Reputation: The social assets and liabilities of an individual constituting a behavioral description. In this study, reputation will be defined in terms of the degrees to which one is perceived as acceptable, malaggressive and withdrawn.

Social Interaction: A relation between persons such that "the behavior of either one is stimulus to the behavior of the other." (English and English, 1958, p. 270). In this study the term "interpersonal relationships" will be used interchangeably with "social interaction."

Social Isolate: An individual whose relative frequency of choice as friend is low in comparison to others. It will not necessarily define one whose adjustment mode is "withdrawing" unless he also has low social choice scores.

¹See Appendix A, No. 1.

Social Position: This term will be variously called "social status," social choice position," and "sociometric position" and will refer to the individual's popularity as measured by the relative frequency of choice as "friend" on the sociometric instrument.

Sociometry: The term will be defined according to Bronfenbrenner (1945, p. 364) as "a method for discovering, describing, and evaluating social status, structure, and development through measurement of the extent of acceptance or of rejection between individuals and groups."

Limitations of the Study

This research was conducted at one institution and involved not only all the residents but, at the time, the entire population of mental retardates then assigned to a state institution for male delinquents in Michigan. In this sense, our experimental group represents a universe but, because of such variables as criteria for commitment, (which may be subject to considerable variance among the States) no attempt will be made to generalize to other States and training schools from the data gathered in this study.

Also, the experimental group contained so few subjects in the low end of the retardation range that sharp categorical

distinctions between intelligence groups were not possible and intelligence effects tended to be blurred.

Furthermore, because of the difficulty in measuring parameters in this type of research it was decided to deal conservatively with the analysis by means of non-parametric techniques and avoid an elaborate defense, based at best on a weak foundation of assumptions, for the use of more sophisticated analytic statistical techniques. As a result, the findings, no matter how favorable, have definite inferential limitations, while at the same time eliciting greater confidence than those obtained by more advanced techniques whose assumptions would be questionable and whose results would therefore be suspect.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Orientation of the Review

A systematic investigation of the literature uncovered some findings, both general and specific, of importance to this study. The review was made from several orientations assumed to be relevant to the research; namely, intelligence, personality, social setting, leadership, social deviancy, and the concept of anomie.

General Findings in Social Adjustment

The vast majority of studies of the social position of the retardate in an educational milieu are concerned with his adjustment in the public schools rather than in institutions. None was found which dealt specifically with the efficacy of institutions serving delinquents as compared with those for retardates for the type youth in which this study is interested. In all, only three were discovered, in a search going back thirty years, which involved institutions at all, in each case the comparison being with public schools (Capobianco and Cole, 1960; Channing, 1932; Reynolds and Stunkard, 1960). In fact, it is difficult to find any literature with the retarded delinquent as a special concern in a controlled experiment,

the closest being four which focused on the defective delinquent (Bowman, 1957; Foale, 1956; Weber, 1953; Westwell, 1951) as the subject of speculation and judgment.

The research on retardate social position and adjustment has, for the most part, been done in the area of later community adjustment, rather than in the institution, and almost no attempt has been made to predict the former from a measurement of the latter.

In summary, it would appear that the retarded delinquent, as a specific research concern, has been conspicuously overlooked by behavioral and social scientists (Bowman, 1957), and that the available research must be utilized more inferentially in developing hypotheses for this study.

Specific Findings in Social Adjustment

Research Related to Intelligence in Social Position and Adjustment.--In the early part of this century, even reputable and highly esteemed investigators such as Fernald, Goddard, Lombroso, and Tredgold concluded that mental retardation was a prime causal factor in crime and delinquency (Wallin, 1955). Today we know that, while social ills have a multicausal source, mental deficiency, in and of itself, contributes very little to the problem¹ (Tizard and O'Connor, 1956).

¹See Appendix A, No. 2.

Intelligence, nevertheless, is an important factor in social and occupational adjustment (and in self-discipline and control) which cannot be ignored in the assessment of variables which bear on malbehavior of any kind.

Some early studies, which investigated the factors in the social positions of normal children, found Mental Age to be the controlling variable (Almack, 1922; Furfey, 1927; Hsia, 1928). A tendency toward intragroup reciprocity of choice was evidenced in Almack's study while Hsia found Intelligence Quotient and reading ability also to be correlated with social position. In a recent study, however, Capobianco and Cole (1960), found that MA seems to be a little significance in the choice influencing social behavior of mental retardates, IQ proving to be far superior as a prognosticator of play behavior in their experiment. The results of this latter study appear puzzling, not only because it runs counter to earlier studies of the influence of MA but because of the opposing directionalities of effect between two such closely related variables as MA and IQ. Capobianco and Cole's study, however, is typical of many recent investigations which tend to confirm a positive relationship between IQ and social choice and position (Baldwin, 1958; Barbe, 1954; Brown, 1954; Grace and Booth, 1958; Grann, 1956; Grossman and Wrighter, 1948; Hays, 1951; Jennings, 1950; Johnson, 1950, 1961, 1962; Johnson and Kirk, 1950; Jordan, A., 1959, 1960; Thurstone, 1959; Turner, 1958). Grace and Booth

found popularity and degree of giftedness to be positively correlated. Barbe included nonretardates in his study and found IQ significantly related to their acceptance and choice.

Johnson, a most active investigator in this area, has done several studies of regular and special classes which establish IQ as a variable closely associated with social position. In a very carefully controlled study (1950), he found that the peer acceptance of the retardates was lower than for intellectually normal children, that the degree of social isolation varied inversely with IQ, and that the degree of active rejection varied directly with IQ. His review of the literature also suggests that a correlation appears to exist between the intelligence of mutual friends.¹ Johnson concluded that the social expectations for mentally retarded children in the regular grades are beyond their abilities and that under this "discriminative strain, [their] integration is broken down resulting in the various forms of bizarre and disintegrated activities and behaviorisms" (p. 87).²

¹But not, however, for unreciprocated pairs (p. 63).

²For a more detailed description and explanation of this deviant behavior, and the social forces which precipitate it, see H. S. Becker, Outsiders. Studies in the Sociology of Deviance (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1963), 179 pp., Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press [2nd ed. Rev.], 1957), 645 pp.; and H. S. Becker, ed., The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), 297 pp.

Turner

of the means
the high and
special clas
however, wer
maximum perm
would tend t
Grossman and
selection-re
obtained the
sixth grade
ability, enj
tantly, mani
the low statu

Sutherland

metric analys
acceptance wa
length of res
Days (1951), s
deficient fou
to be signifi
Bennings (195
New York Stat
MA nor IQ acc
being how per
p. 142).

Turner obtained significant t-ratios for the differences of the means of intelligence and social quotient between the high and low social status mentally retarded groups in special classes. One third of Turner's research subjects, however, were later found to have intelligence beyond the maximum permissible for special placement (p. 81), which would tend to invalidate the findings of this study. Grossman and Wrighter established social position along a selection-rejection continuum and found the more intelligent obtained the higher scores. These high status children (sixth grade nonretarded pupils) also had better reading ability, enjoyed higher socio-economic status and, significantly, manifested a better personality adjustment than the low status children.

Sutherland et al. (1954), concluded from a socio-metric analysis of institutionalized defectives that social acceptance was significantly related to IQ but not to CA, length of residence, or attitude toward the institution. Hays (1951) studied a group of institutionalized mentally deficient fourteen-year-old girls and found social choice to be significantly correlated with both MA and IQ, while Jennings (1950), also working with adolescent girls at the New York State Training School, determined that neither MA nor IQ accounts for choice status, the important factor being how personality characteristics interact collectively (p. 142).

Weber (1953), in a plea for maintaining perspective, warns that the IQ as the sole criterion for social deficiency is inadequate because the fact remains that some people with IQ's around 70 function competently in social situations.

Summary of the Research on Intelligence in Social Position and Adjustment

With the few exceptions noted above, the main body of research appears to be in close agreement that:

1. There is a positive relationship between intelligence and social position.
2. Reciprocity in social choice appears to be related to intelligence.

There is less agreement, however, concerning the relative contributions of MA and IQ to this status. That more studies show IQ to be related to social position may be merely an artifact of the greater number of studies done with this variable.

Research Related to Personality Characteristics in Social Position and Adjustment.

The results of investigations into the personality components which affect social choice with retardates are generally congruent with the studies of more typical children. Looking first at the latter, Bonney (1943), Dahlke (1953), Dunnington (1957), Grossman and Wrighter (1948), and Loughlin (1954), all substantiate the importance of personality characteristics in the peer status of children in the regular grades.

Bonney found that strong, positive, personality traits were more influential than negative virtues (moral and religious) in the determination of popularity of fourth graders. Dahlke confirmed the primacy of sex status in the elementary school child's evaluative system and substantiated prior studies which show personality adjustment to be more important than socioeconomic class in social choice.

Dunnington, studying pre-school children, determined that low status children were maladaptively more aggressive than high status children while the latter rated higher on the more normal, positive-type aggression. Similarly, Grossman and Wrighter established that there was less personality deviancy among the highest scorers in a selection-rejection test than among the lowest scorers, and that these selectees were also more intelligent and came from economically more privileged homes. Loughlin adds further support to the importance of personality, concluding that among the variables of class membership, mental ability, academic achievement, and personality characteristics, the latter was the most significantly related to peer status.

Alexander and Alexander (1952), however, arrived at a counter conclusion in their study of fourth grade children. Using the Thematic Apperception Test to determine the personality characteristics of those enjoying the greatest popularity, their findings indicate that choice is not made on the basis of desirable characteristics but as an outlet

for the aggressive and directive needs of the choosers. This interesting conclusion suggests that childrens' choices may be suspect as a criterion on which to base adjustment evaluations, an inference which Gronlund (1959) refutes.

As previously reported in the research on the intelligence variable, above, Jennings (1950) found that it was the interactions of personality characteristics among institutionalized adolescent girls, rather than the individual characteristics separately, which determined choice status, while CA and IQ contributed little.¹ Another finding, significant to the present study, was that length of residence had little effect on the social position accorded an individual in this environment.

Turning now to the intellectually subnormal, Johnson (1950), Jordan, A. (1959), Miller (1956), and Moreno (1952), in addition to many others, concluded from their studies that mental retardates are not well adjusted among their more intellectually well endowed peers. Several writers have tried to shed some light on the possible reasons for this maladjustment of retardates in studies done under varying

¹A possible explanation for Jennings' counter finding concerning the influence of IQ on popularity, may lie in the setting in which the experiment was conducted. Institutionalized delinquents, especially adolescent girls, may well order intelligence to the lower end of a priority list of criteria for popularity, valuing a whole complex of inter-related personality characteristics much higher, due to the more intimate contact and closer confines attendant to institutional living, and to the inherently more complicated nature of their personality makeups as compared with boys.

conditions; in the regular grades, in institutions, out in the community, with children, and with adults. Most researchers have obtained results which indicate that the educable retardate is rejected and isolated, neither because of tendencies to actively withdraw, nor because of passivity in social interactions, but because of socially unacceptable behavior. The retardates in the upper IQ group in Johnson's (1950) study demonstrated more social interaction than those in the lower IQ group, but of an aggressive and maladaptive nature. Teasing, fighting, roughness, and meanness were at the top of a list of reasons for rejection of these children (p. 80), and Johnson saw the sources of their unacceptability as inability to conform to group standards, fighting, showing-off, and cheating. It should be kept in mind, however, that this was a typical public school situation, involving children who generally conformed to the social norms and internalized the social goals which prevailed in the community. That aggressive behavior will not always be rejected has been shown by Pope (1953) who found this characteristic valued among low socioeconomic groups. Boys in his study who successfully demonstrated aggression were rewarded with popularity. This has been partially confirmed by Trent (1957) and, as we shall see later in the section on theoretical considerations, supported by theories of lower class behavior in the writings of Becker, Cloward, Merton, Riesman, and Trippe.

While
date to make
unidimension
work within
social rather
found consid
dates, altho
well in hold
study on the
percentage th
rate of invol
population.
with the find
the law. Cas
instability a
for job failu
numerous othe
dates are ess
regard to the
Newlyn, 1956;
Helps, 1956;
Tizard a
retarded are c
cent. The inf

Although
apparent if one
variation betwe

While studies show various factors causing the retardate to make a good community adjustment, there is near unidimensionality found in the reasons for failure. In work within their cognitive capacity, retardates fail for social rather than intellectual reasons. Baller (1936) found considerably more trouble with the law among retardates, although considering the economic period, they did well in holding jobs. Charles (1953) did a follow-up study on the same group and found an even better employment percentage than did Baller,¹ but still twice as great a rate of involvement with the police as did the rest of the population. Peterson and Smith (1960) are in agreement with the finding of retardate proneness for conflicts with the law. Cassidy and Phelps (1955) list temperamental instability and low frustration tolerance among the reasons for job failures among retardates, and the results of numerous other studies of community adjustment of retardates are essentially congruent with these findings in regard to the personality variables involved (Collmann and Newlyn, 1956; Kolstoe, 1961; O'Connor, 1954; Peckham, 1951; Phelps, 1956; and Reynolds and Stunkard, 1960).

Tizard and O'Connor (1956) propose that no more mentally retarded are criminals than would be expected in this environment. The inference here is that studies which compare

¹Although perhaps not as great a differential as apparent if one were to equate this factor for the economic variation between the two periods involved in the studies.

retarded with intellectual normals from the population-at-large on social adjustment, are biased against the retarded because the retardate population comes mainly from the lowest socioeconomic class, which has a higher rate of conflict with the law to begin with. Thus, only studies of community adjustment which control for the important variable of social class could be considered valid.

Bobroff (1956) and Dinger (1961) showed fine work adjustments by retardates but neither investigated community adjustment exclusive of the job.

Some researchers have focused on the personality needs and deficiencies of the retardate. Cromwell (1961) points out that repetitive failures may result in reduced motivation and responsiveness and an increase in avoidance behavior. This study supports Bijou's (1952) conclusion that the retarded child has learned the futility of even working up to capacity. This thwarted opportunity for expression is emphasized by Walker (1950) while others (Davis, 1951; Doll, 1952; Itoga and Tanaka, 1956) stress the need for security, love, sense of self-worth, acceptance, and feeling of belonging. Bolduc (1959, p. 2), influenced by Foale (1956), summarizes the difficulties of the retardate in the modern world as resulting from a lack of capacity to (1) acquire norms of behavior which apply broadly in social situations, (2) generalize and discriminate in behavioral situations, (3) apprehend the

character of his expressions, (4) reason analogically, (5) conceptualize, and (6) abstract. Lucito (1959) found it characteristic of the retarded to be more other-directed and other-dependent than normal children in obtaining goal satisfaction.

Some studies tend to associate popularity with an absence of neurosis (McCandless et al, 1956; Thorpe, 1955). Trent (1957) found a significant negative correlation between anxiety and popularity among institutionalized delinquent boys and no relationship between social choice and CA, IQ, or length of stay.¹ Trent's study revealed that delinquents in the institution are rewarded for aggressiveness by friendship from some compeers but at the same time are punished by others for this quality by rejection. The experiment did not indicate, however, which personality types did the rewarding and which the punishing of these aggressives. One possible explanation is that the less aggressive members aligned themselves in a dependency relationship with those who were more aggressive but did not internalize this quality as a social norm,² while the more autonomous residents rejected those who attempted to impose their aggression on them or to intimidate them.

¹See Appendix A, No. 3.

²See Appendix A, No. 4.

In a study of competitive behavior in mental defectives, Albee and Pascal (1951) found no relationship between success in this area and popularity, or between success and strength or size. The sample size was very small, however, and the success criterion, involving competition for candy rewards, could be criticized as an artificial one, or parochial, at best. A larger sample, combined with the substitution of athletic prowess as the success measure, might have derived results which could have been at considerable variance to those obtained. The assumption for this conjecture is that the success-goal must have social value, and not merely material or utilitarian value, before a relationship between it and social position can be established--a consideration seemingly ignored by the authors of this study.

Summary of the Research on Personality in Social Position and Adjustment

The literature on personality characteristics of retardates and delinquents appears to establish that:

1. Personality characteristics are a significant factor in social position. Where retardates fail to adjust in the community, the reason is generally personality maladaptation rather than intellectual deficiency.
2. Personality deviation from social expectations is negatively related to social position.

3. Mental retardates tend to be maladjusted in two ways:
 - a. Aggressive, as a result of immature judgement and lack of controls.
 - b. Withdrawn, due to repeated failures in social situations.
4. If withdrawn, retardates tend to seek out more autonomous compeers to satisfy dependency needs while withdrawn delinquents appear to establish symbiotic relationships with aggressive peers.
5. In a delinquent society, social pressure exists to alter values to include aggressiveness as a social asset.
6. Aggressive retardates tend to be more popular in institutional settings but rejected among normal children in the regular grades.
7. Among institutionalized delinquents, anxiety is negatively related to popularity.
8. Among both defectives and delinquents of both sexes, length of residency, as compared with personality characteristics, has a negligible effect on social position.
9. Aggression among delinquents can simultaneously be rewarded with popularity and punished with rejection.
10. Insufficient research exists on which to base judgments concerning the adjustment of mental retardates in institutions for delinquents, or for the defective-delinquent in any setting.

Research Related to Social Setting and Adjustment

As pointed out earlier, research with the retarded delinquent has been hampered by the absence of comparative studies of adjustment in varied institutional settings. It is possible, however, to draw some inferences related to our concern for the optimal placement of this youth from the available literature.

There are a few studies which compare institutions and day school classes, some which evaluate the institution in terms of later community adjustment, and others which focus on variables within the institution itself. There are, in addition, studies of normal children which bear on the placement problem for the atypical. The majority, however, compare regular and day school classes in the public schools. When these are regarded as comparisons of heterogeneous versus homogeneous placement--precisely our problem in the institutionalizing of the delinquent-retardate--the relatedness of this research to our needs is seen more clearly.

While the evidence is overwhelming that the mental retardates in regular day classes achieve, academically, at a significantly higher rate than in special classes or in institutions, there is much less agreement regarding social adjustment, those in special classes apparently enjoying some advantage over the others in this respect (Johnson, 1950). Blatt (1958), Cassidy and Stanton (1959), Elenbogen

(1957), and Thurstone (1959) all found that the heterogeneously grouped retardates were evidently academically stimulated by their environment but experienced a poorer social adjustment than those in special classes. Porter and Milazzo (1958) demonstrated that special class "graduates" made a better community adjustment than their regular class compeers, although the small size of the sample in their study precludes any broad generalizations from this finding.

Johnson (1962, p. 68) summarizes the research in this area and suggests that slightly better social adjustment of the special class children may reflect the lack of academic pressure to achieve at the norms for the grade level, or be due to the nature of the preparation which special teachers undergo, emphasizing, as it does, the mental hygiene aspects of the classroom. Thurstone (1959) concurs and further infers that the type of teacher personality selected for these classes may spell the difference in social adjustment. Martin (1941) concluded that the mental retardate in a heterogeneous group is generally an unhappy child and one who often develops antisocial behavior as a result of being thrust into a social and educational milieu with which he cannot cope.

Various factors influence social position. Jennings (1950) found social choice to change with the nature of the activity for which chosen. Kinney (1953) studied normal

children and found that social acceptability varied inversely with the size of the group. Johnson and Kirk (1950) replicated Johnson's original study, but in a progressive school system with a small pupil-teacher ratio, and still found the retardate to be a social isolate in the regular grades, a finding which somewhat weakens Kinney's results as supplied to retardates.¹

Johnson (1950) and Jordan and DeCharms (1959) both found the regular class retardate to be more rejected and have more fear of failure than those in special classes, which would lead us to believe that such children might display avoidance and self-isolating type behavior. While several studies (Ainsworth, 1959; Johnson, 1961; Jordan, 1960; Kennedy, 1948; Mullen and Itkin, 1961; Wilson, 1960) show no significant differences between special classes and regular classes in social adjustment, only Lapp (1957) found retardates in heterogeneous classes to be as well accepted as other children. In light of all the evidence then--none of which shows heterogeneously grouped children to be better adjusted--exception must be taken to Johnson's conclusion that only a slight advantage in social adjustment is enjoyed by the special classes grouping children homogeneously. A conclusion which definitely favored special

¹These studies, though contradictory, make us aware of the necessity to consider the factor of class size differences when analyzing studies which compare regular and special classes.

classes on the factor of social adjustment would appear more tenable from an overall evaluation of the research.

Studies of institutionalized children reveal several interesting points. Channing (1932) found institutionalized retardates to make a somewhat less favorable community adjustment than day school "graduates," while Capobianco and Cole (1960) found no differences in social behavior between the institutionalized and non-institutionalized. Stevenson and Knights (1962) tested female retardates immediately after returning to the institution, and again three months later, and found that their response to social reinforcement declined, suggesting that the institution might have a depressing effect on motivation. Caditz (1959), in comparing delinquents and nondelinquents with the MMPI found, among other things, that the Pd scale was unaffected by the training school experience.

Bowman (1957) points out that we have thus far failed to integrate defective delinquents into either penology or psychiatry and that administrators of training schools for both delinquents and retardates tend to reject this type child because they are not geared to his needs--neither by facilities, staff, nor program. He decries the trend toward placement of this youth in custodial type institutions and the lack of interdisciplinary cooperation which creates this situation, and proposes that mental health

agencies build the necessary facilities for this child, rather than turn him over to institutions for delinquents.

Johnson (1950) sums up the situation in a statement which accurately reflects the available evidence in the literature:

The small number of studies inadequately dealing with this problem has left us unable to formulate any definite policies concerning proper placement of mentally handicapped children (p. 63).

Summary of the Research on Social Setting and Adjustment

In the absence of more definitive and more closely related research, it is difficult to reduce the studies to postulates concerning the effects of placement in an institution for delinquents, as a factor in itself, on the social adjustment of the youth who is also retarded. These general statements, however, appear to be viable:

1. No conclusive evidence presently exists to accurately determine the placement of retarded children in general, and particularly delinquent ones, which will result in optimal conditions for social adjustment.
2. Retardates appear to make a better personal-social adjustment in homogeneously grouped social settings than in heterogeneously grouped ones.
3. Institutions, in general, may have a socially debilitating effect on children and evidence is not strong that they perform more than a custodial function with children.

Research Related to Staff Perceptions
and Attitudes in Leadership

Knowledge of the attitudes and perceptions of staff members who are in direct contact with institutionalized children is essential to the study of the institution as a social system and to an analysis of the nature of the child's adaptations in this system.

There has been a prodigious effort by researchers in the area of personality and attitude measurement of those working with children, most of it directed to the nature of the relationship between teacher personality or attitudes, and teacher effectiveness (Getzels and Jackson, 1963). Our concern is with the possible existence of a differential attitude toward, or perception of, the student by staff, and the part that the intelligence of the student plays in its influence on this variance. Evidence, for instance, that teachers show bias in their relationships with (and evaluations of) children based on the child's intelligence, would be considered as a factor legislating against such a grouping method.

It is not sufficient to proceed only this far with the problem, however, since students' feelings about staff perceptions of them are also of significance. In fact, some feel that the total interactions must be considered--student-student, staff-student, student-staff, and student-others (staff and students combined)--before the student's

adjustment can be accurately assessed (Spector, 1953).¹ Itoga and Tanaka (1956) studied the social adjustment of a Japanese population with IQ's under 70 and concluded, similarly, that the degree of social adjustment is determined by the interrelationship of many factors, "acceptance by others" included prominently among them.²

Teachers evidently tend to evaluate student behavior in terms of conformity and decorum rather than mental health (Stern, 1963), and several studies have obtained results which were in close agreement in this respect on the kinds of behavior teachers rated as minor and serious (Hunter, 1957; Slobetz, 1950; Stauffer, 1956). Myers (1961) conducted an investigation which showed teachers to be, at best, mediocre judges of social position. Significantly, this study was with mentally retarded children and the analysis further revealed that neither the teacher's nor the student's sex made a significant difference in the accuracy of judgment. Bonney (1947)

¹Also see Jennings (1950).

²One example of an exploration of this complex interaction involved an experiment which used a type of bipolar semantic differential scale (Davidson and Lang, 1960). The investigators confirmed their hypothesis that childrens' perceptions of teachers' feelings correlate positively with childrens' self-perceptions. They also concluded that favorable perception of teachers' feelings was associated with desirable classroom behavior. In other words, the student's interpretation of the way a teacher feels about him influences both the way he feels about himself and his behavior in class.

is another who found teachers to be inaccurate in this respect. The teachers in this study consistently over-rated students in popularity who were active in school affairs, high achievers, and who generally conformed to teacher's expectations. Similarly, they underrated those whose academic work was poor and who were lacking in obedience. It is therefore surprising, with this evidence, that any research reveals teachers to be even fairly accurate in judging the sociometric status of their pupils. Gronlund (1959), however, reports that while measures of dispersion show a large variance in teachers' abilities to judge student popularity, some teachers can do this quite accurately.

Kvaraceus (1956) reported an experiment with graduate students enrolled in a course in the education of exceptional children which revealed their (the graduates) attitudes toward various categories of deviates. The results showed they least preferred to teach delinquents, followed closely by the mentally retarded as a non-preference category. We could logically infer then, were these results to hold true in general, that the delinquent-retardate would have a greater probability of exposure to teachers with rejecting attitudes than would any other combination of exceptionalities, and certainly more than the gifted, who were chosen the most preferred deviate category to teach.

The effect of the type of staff leadership and the personalities of the leaders on student behavior is of some interest to this study, and research in social climate reveals some vectors for consideration. The earliest major work in the manipulation of the social climate variable by leaders was done by Lippitt (1940) who organized children into clubs which were exposed successively to democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire types of leadership. Among the conclusions of this study was the observation that different styles of leadership create different social climates, the democratic leadership eliciting the most effective interactions among the members of the groups. This result is in line with the findings of Thurstone (1959) and Washburne and Heil (1960), who also found that teacher personality affected the social growth of children. Similarly, Tizard (1953), studying sheltered workshops in Great Britain, found that the climate set by supervision influenced the performance and behavior of retardates, and observed a differential reaction to a single supervisory type, based on the retardate's personality characteristics. This would support the centrality of the total interactions in the problem of analyzing social adjustment, suggested by Itoga and Tanaka (1956) and Spector (1953). Palk (1962) was also interested in teacher behavior in classroom climate for its possible influence on the behavior of retardates in special classes and their subsequent

learning, but found little effect of this variable on the students involved. He suggests, however, that the contravening results of his study may have been due in part to the adaptive changes in both teacher and pupil over the relatively long period of the experiment, in contrast to the more rigidly defined climates established and adhered to in the leadership studies. Palk used the Lewis Sociometric Scale in measuring pupil behavior and employed product-moment correlations to determine relationships among the measures of this behavior. His results are interesting and relevant to this study in that both extremes of social structure in the classroom--permissiveness and pupil autonomy on the one hand, and authoritarianism and teacher-direction on the other--resulted in the greatest degree of social isolation. He reasoned that the brighter students dominated the permissive classes too much while the authoritarian teachers were too concerned with control activities and the middle IQ child's academic achievement, both of which resulted in social isolation for the retardate. Johnson (1962) reached much the same conclusion concerning the teacher's influences on the retardate in the regular class.¹

¹For a study which points up the need for teachers of the retarded to have competencies in developing social growth as well as academic achievement see R. Mackie, H. Williams and L. Dunn, Teachers of Children Who Are Mentally Retarded (U.S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1957, No. 3), 97 pp. While offering little empirical data to support its claims,

Summary of the Research on Staff Attitudes
and Perceptions in Leadership

The foregoing studies of social climate set by staff, and of the interactions of staffs' perceptions and attitudes with those of the students, would indicate that:

1. Social adjustment of students is influenced by the interrelationship of many factors in a complex social network involving the perceptions and attitudes of staff, other students, and themselves in all possible combinations. Prominent among the factors is staff attitudes.
2. Social class expectations and traditional concepts of behavior and decorum tend to bias the attitudes of teachers with regard to behaviorally and intellectually deviant children.
3. Teachers, at best, show wide variance in accurately assessing the social positions of students and, in most cases, would probably be poor judges of retarded student status, mainly as a result of the biasing factor mentioned in number 2, above.
4. The attitudes of teachers toward children appears to affect both the ways in which children regard themselves and the ways in which they behave in the classroom. As a result, teacher attitudes apparently influence childrens' social growth.

this study lists the prevention of social isolation, and the development of socially acceptable behavior, among the important teacher competencies for work with the retarded.

5. The sex of the staff evaluator and student evaluated is apparently of little significance in the ability of staff to accurately predict the social position of retardates.

Summary of the Literature on Intelligence and Personality in Social Position and Adjustment

Research in the social adjustment of both normal and exceptional children was reviewed from several stand-points considered to be relevant--intelligence, personality, social setting, and staff leadership. Conclusions from these studies which are significant to this investigation indicate that:

1. There appears to be a positive relationship between intelligence and social position.
2. Reciprocity in social choice is apparently related to intelligence so that those of like intelligence tend to choose each other as friends. Conversely, where social choice involves pairs which are intellectually dissimilar, there appears to be a lack of reciprocity.
3. Personality characteristics seem to be of more significance than intellectual deficiency to retardate adjustment; and deviations from social expectations are regarded negatively.
4. Mental retardates as a group are not well adjusted in society and tend to manifest maladjustment by either malaggression or social withdrawal.

5. In a significant proportion of a delinquent society aggression is evidently viewed as a positive value and to some extent this appears to be true in a retardate social system, also. Among children in the regular grades, however, this behavior leads to social rejection.
6. Length of residency (seniority) appears to be a negligible factor in social position with institutionalized delinquents.
7. While institutions, in general, may actually retard the social growth of the children they are intended to assist, those which provide for homogeneous intellectual groupings may effect a better social adjustment than those which do not.
8. The more closely a social situation is identified with academic achievement (and the more the latter is accorded social value), the more poorly the retardate will function in social interaction.
9. Staff attitudes and perceptions seem to occupy an important position in a complex social matrix influencing adjustment which includes other students (both separately and in combination with staff) as well as the individual's own self-attitudes. Children's self-perceptions appear to be heavily influenced by adult attitudes toward them.

10. Teachers are seemingly poor judges of childrens' social position, especially those who are behaviorally and intellectually exceptional. They apparently are biased by unrealistic social class expectations, (adult norms) and traditional concepts of social conduct. The sex of evaluator and evaluated, however, seems to be a negligible factor.
11. Teachers tend to view the behavioral adaptations of delinquents and retardates less favorably than more typical children and underrate their social positions.
12. Withdrawn retardates tend to seek friendships among more autonomous peers.

Questions Not Answered by the Research
on Social Adjustment

There are several questions suggested by the literature on social adjustment for which no answers have been offered. Most of the research has been done in public schools, a good portion of it with intellectually typical children, and with groups which hold the norms and values for the prevailing culture. Would these same results have been obtained in institutional settings and do they apply equally as well to delinquents and retardates as to typical children? Does the social structure of the institution differ markedly from that of the community or public school? And is the retardate accepted in a society of delinquents any better than he is in the community-at-large?

In order to answer these questions through this investigation, it is first necessary to consider a whole new social system--the deviant society of the delinquency training school--to examine and analyze it, and to view the retardate within this framework in order to assess his social adjustment.

Research and Discussion Related to the Retardate as a Social Deviant

The central interest in this investigation lies in the social status of the retardate among his delinquent peers, and we have already seen evidence which tends to establish him as a deviant member of this subculture.

Becker (1963), in his study of deviance, says:
 ". . . social groups create deviance by making rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders." (p. 9). He continues:

Social rules are the creation of specific social groups. Modern societies are not simple organizations in which everyone agrees on what the rules are and how they are to be applied in specific situations. They are, instead, highly differentiated along social class lines, ethnic lines, occupational lines, and cultural lines. . . .Insofar as the rules of various groups conflict and contradict one another, there will be disagreement about the kind of behavior that is proper in any given situation. (p. 15)

Deviance is seen, then, ". . . not [as] a quality of the act a person commits but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an

'offender.' The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label. . . ." (p. 9).

Thus, in an already deviant social system (the delinquent population of the institution), the mental retardate may be treated as an outsider, not only by the delinquent members themselves, but perhaps even, (and more importantly) by the staff. In this way the mental deviate may find himself ordered to the low end of the social acceptance-rejection continuum. The fact that an individual, who does not rate high socially with the other delinquent members of the institution population, may actually be making a better "adjustment," (in terms of the society of the community for whose membership he is being rehabilitated), than those who are accepted because they identify closely with delinquent norms and values, is only indirectly of interest and significance to this study's concerns. To demonstrate a negative relationship with a negative value system, as evidence of the existence of a positive relationship with a positive value, is spurious, because it neither exhausts the alternatives nor presents support for the appropriateness of the supposedly therapeutic setting as one facilitating favorable behavioral change. It is extremely doubtful, for example, that the youth himself views this alienation as a badge of success and a mark of progress. All that it may do, as far as his peer relationships are concerned, is to further convince him of his

worthlessness and add to his already negative self-attitudes--hardly the outcomes expected of a treatment program. If the staff also perceive him in this same socially alienated role, it could only result in serious doubts concerning the ability of this type institution to re-educate this youth for a productive place in society. The simple fact is that no treatment setting can be justified which creates a climate of isolation, a feeling of not belonging, a sense of inadequacy, or an atmosphere of rejection, regardless of how efficiently it culls the person from a negative social system. The important question here is not from what is he separated, but with what is he identified? The answer, if he is shown to be a true alienate, is "nothing"; at least nothing positive and rehabilitative.

Dexter (1958) pursues this subject of deviancy specifically in relation to the retardate and points out that, while in most societies, those who cannot learn the "meanings" given by the society to certain valued symbols, events, or things are considered as deviant, in our society this failure is viewed as even more of a social problem because we require a demonstration of the skill of coordinating meanings--reading, writing and computing--as a prerequisite for induction into the adult world, "although such formal skills are not necessarily related to the capacity for effective survival or economic

contribution." (p.920). Dexter suggests that this failure to learn the "correct" meanings is often the only reason for many retardates to be denied their rightful social status and that this status has little relationship to their ability to perform successfully in the work world.

He states:

The indirect consequences of the high valuation placed upon such skill manifest themselves in discrimination and prejudices against the 'stupid'. . . If this hypothesis is in fact valid, a substantial proportion of the cost and trouble resulting from the presence of mental defect in our society is a consequence, not of the biological or psychological characteristics of mental defectives, but of their socially prescribed or acquired roles and statutes [sic] . . . The technique of learning has become a value in and of itself. (p. 921-22).

This social labeling, often done at an early age, ignores the delayed maturation which may occur later, ignores the errors in the instrument used to measure the intelligence, and is too often based on "the type of intelligence and clerical aptitude which enables people to do well at school" (p. 923), rather than on the ability to be economically successful.

It is little wonder then that mental retardates become social problems as they discover the extent of their devaluation in society. Sociologically, we treat "members of a null class," or as Dexter puts it, "people who lack or appear to lack some particular characteristic, as though they have positive characteristics in common" while all they may mutually share is the socially prescribed deviant status role. (p. 962).

In a later article (in Becker, 1964), Dexter amplifies this thesis. He postulates that intellectuality (or its corollary, stupidity) as a value in our society (a negative one in the case of stupidity) is taken as a given and its consequences viewed "as self-evident facts of nature" (p. 38). His polemic presents "stupidity" as an artifact of the historical, political and ethical forces which have shaped our present society (i.e., the French Revolution, Jacksonian democracy and the Protestant Ethic) and cites other societies as evidence that the retardate can function adequately in a social system organized differently from ours. Analogically, he shows how another human attribute (grace of movement) could just as easily have given rise to a wholly different currency for valuing people, complete with its own unique educational curriculum, technology, psychometrics (the child would naturally have to have a GQ or "grace quotient") and social institutions. In this hypothetical system the ordering of retardates and intellectually gifted could easily be reversed. Thus, mental retardates in our society are the victims of the historical quirks which gave the society its present structure, norms, and values. That retardates are discriminated against can be easily demonstrated by our literature, from nursery rhymes and fairy tales to English classics and modern humor (Wolfenstein, 1954). In fact, Dexter observes

(p. 41) that our attitudes toward retardates have changed from merely simple derision to genuine apprehension as we have learned to associate sex crimes with "morons."

Paradoxically, our egalitarian philosophy, committed to providing opportunity for all to succeed has, by its insistence on one's obligation to take advantage of this opportunity (the Protestant Ethic), doomed the retardate to devaluation and alienation. The public school is the main instrument utilized in this social surgery. We are even reluctant to admit, if not downright resentful of the notion, that retardates can be successful (pp. 43-44). We justify our attitude by means of a communications system based on so highly abstract a symbolization that it forces conferment of high status on the more intelligent. This is done despite the existence of a differential in the utilitarianism of this commodity of intellect at the various levels of economic production (p. 44). In other words the discrimination exists as a result of a social label rather than because of any particular relevance of the individual's intelligence to his ability to perform the social and economic functions required of him (p. 40). Were this contemptuousness unperceived by retardates, as a result of some social insensitivity related to their cognitive handicap, the problem would not be so acute; but, unfortunately, there is no evidence to support such a

correlation. The mental retardate must therefore be assumed to suffer psychological deprivation and trauma (p. 42).

Research and Discussion Related to the
Delinquent as a Social Deviant

Trippe (1959, 1960), in a very illuminating discussion of deviant behavior, points out that the delinquent, unlike the physically disabled, continues to pursue the success-goals of society even though the socially prescribed means of attainment are inaccessible. This socially induced abandonment of commitment to, or conduced deviation from, the "approved" means of goal attainment is what determines the delinquent's social deviancy, both in direction and degree. This is typical of one adaption to lower class subcultural existence, another being to abandon both the goals and the behavioral norms and become a public liability.¹ Lower middle class people, on the other hand, Trippe feels are more likely to rigidly conform to the social mores but relinquish, to some degree at least, the cultural goals. Thus their deviancy is less likely to be in a delinquent direction. While all three social patterns are probably attempts at maintaining psychological integration, they actually lead to social disorganization.

¹For an unusually lucid and perceptive reflection on the estrangement and encapsulation of lower class urban society, see Samuel Tenenbaum, "The Teacher, The Middle Class The Lower Class," Phi Delta Kappan, 45 (Nov. 1963), p. 82-86. In this article the author discusses his growing awareness

It would appear from Trippe's analysis and the previous discussion of Foale's and Bolduc's view, that social pressure is the important dimension in the delinquent's and the retardate's behavioral deviancy. Trippe summarizes:

Contemporary American culture seems to hold promise of success for all, but specific groups in our society do not enjoy equal opportunity to attain recognition and reward¹. . . . For those segments of our society which are denied access to goal attainment, high rates of nonconforming behavior are observed, not because members of these groups are biologically different, but because they are responding normally to unique social situations. (p. 171).

If Trippe's assumptions are correct, it should be valid to generalize that the limited goal realization opportunities of the subculture from which both the delinquent and the retardate tend to be spawned, create a saliency toward two types of coping with the social structure--personal (leading to disorganization through frustration and, eventually, to neurotic behavior), or social

of the reason for the lower class child becoming the school's problem child. He claims that they are alien to the school because they cannot meet the school's and teachers' expectations. Even the bright lower class child, he feels, is isolated from the school faculty and classmates. Relevant to this study, it poses the question that if this is the situation for the intellectually able lower class child, what must the dull one experience? Regardless of the relative rates of delinquency increase between rural and urban areas in recent years, when we speak of delinquents we are speaking, demographically, of the urban lower class child.

¹Our assumption being that the mentally retarded constitute one of these groups.

(leading to disorganization through delinquent and anomic behavior)--unless some other social force (family, church or school) intervenes to legislate socially conforming behavior. This approach sets the stage for the theoretical reference point from which this research problem will be explored.

Were our interest to be with the first alternative--personal disorganization--self concept would offer a logical, parsimonious and very fruitful theoretical model on which to base a study of the delinquent retardate. Our main concern, however, is with the appropriateness of the therapeutic setting, with the retardate's adaptive mode in this environment, and with the nature of the social system itself. Our theoretical approach will, as a consequence, be to predict the structure of the social system of the institution and to further predict the retardate's adaptations to this system.

Research and Discussion Related to the Theoretical Foundation and Development of the Study

Introduction

Many psychologists, sociologists, and social-psychologists have analyzed the coping behaviors of individuals and groups in ways which are relevant to our study. The personality theory of Karen Horney for instance, which classifies behavior as moving toward, away from, and against, offers a model for categorizing the research

subjects and comparing the experimental group with the controls to determine the presence of a behavioral differential. But it does little to reveal the structure of the social system operating within the institution. Seeman (1959) offers a paradigm of alienation in which he lists five components: normlessness, meaninglessness, powerlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. This model would provide a means for sharp discrimination of the nature of the alienation in the individual's personality, but essentially concerns man's feelings of helplessness in attaining his perceived social role (Clark, 1957), and does not adequately fulfill our need for more specific placement in the social system, nor tell us precisely how he interacts with others. Likewise, Festinger's theory of cognitive dissonance, which seeks to explain behavior as activity which attempts to bring about consonance between the systems of self-knowledge and knowledge of society, presents a possible theoretical entry into our investigation of the delinquent-retardate's social position. But this theory, and the models of other balance theorists (Newcomb, 1961; Osgood, 1957; McClelland, 1961) all have the same drawback in satisfying our purposes. They are mainly psychologically oriented and lead us too deeply into the individual's personality makeup and away from our study of the group.

These balance theories are mentioned, not with the thought of effecting a rapprochement, but to present them

as convergencies (Waisanen, 1963) on another theory--anomie--which has been developed into a sociological model by Robert Merton (1957).

Anomie and Its Relevance as A Theoretical Foundation for This Study

Originally from the Greek "anomia," meaning "lawlessness," anomie has come into more popular usage in the post World War II literature to describe the aimlessness, purposelessness, and normlessness--thus, "anomic" behavioral style--of a segment of today's youth, particularly in the lower class. It was first developed as a theory by Emile Durkheim¹ at the turn of the century and psychologically formulated as a concept by MacIver (1950) and Riesman (1961). Although defined in terms of normlessness, it has historically included another concept, the progressive disintegration of interpersonal relationships and mutual supports which is of paramount importance to this study. Mainly as a result of this latter concept, Merton sees anomie as "bridging social and psychological dynamics" (Witmer and Kotinsky, 1956, p. 40), a linkage which allows us to couple the objectivity of a sociometric approach with psychologically laden material involving personal and group interactions and behavior.

¹Durkheim was less interested in the sources of anomie than he was in its consequences and developed this theory in his now classic study of Suicide, (The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill.) 1951.

As originally conceived and developed, this concept "referred to a property of the social and cultural structure, not to a property of individuals confronting that structure" (Merton, p. 61). Later the concept was extended to the individuals themselves (p. 161). Riesman¹ (p. 242) uses the term as "virtually synonymous with maladjusted" but without the "negative connotations," and it is more in this sense than any other that it will be used in this study to describe those whose adaptive mode is variously characterized by nonconformity. These are the nonadjusted--though not necessarily maladjusted--in society.

Merton offers a means by which the role behavior which we have been discussing may be analyzed. Some insight into Merton's paradigm has already been offered by Trippe² (1959) who undoubtedly was influenced by Merton. Merton stresses the importance of recognizing that social and cultural structures vary independently³ (Witmer and Kotinsky, p. 29) although, it may be added, not mutually exclusively. He says, (and Trippe agrees):

¹See Appendix A, No. 5.

²We have already seen that Trippe describes deviant behavior in terms of norm non-conformity as a result of the inequalities of opportunity which exist in our society for goal realization (p. 171). This is a keystone construct in Merton's theory.

³Merton defines the cultural structure as "that organized set of normative values which is common to members of a designated group," and the social structure as "that organized set of social relationships in which members of the group are variously implicated or involved" (Witmer and Kotinsky, p. 28).

Some unknown but substantial proportion of deviant behavior does not represent impulses of individuals breaking through social controls, but, on the contrary, represents socially induced deviations--deviations which the culture and the social organization conjoin to produce. In other words, social and cultural structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons to engage in nonconforming rather than conforming conduct. (Witmer and Kotinsky, p. 29)

Merton (1957) feels that, more than any other society our nation has enjoined its members, regardless of social origins or class position, to pursue the value of success. The fact that equal opportunity is not available to all members of the society to realize this value creates an imbalance which leads to deviant behavior by those with the least access to the success goals. This process ends, eventually, in anomic behavior as a result of the malintegration of cultural emphases with social organization. (Witmer and Kotinsky, p. 30). Said another way, we can expect an anomic adaptation when contradictions exist between cultural norms and patterned social situations (Witmer and Kotinsky, p. 45).

In Merton's view, the "strain toward anomie" prevails throughout our social structure, albeit unevenly (p. 157). His typology of adaptive modality lists five categories, covering all the possible combinations of acceptance or rejection of both the cultural goals and the institutionalized means of goal pursuit and achievement:

TABLE 1.--A Typology of Modes of Individual Adaptation.¹

Modes of Adaptation	Culture Goals	Institutionalized Means
I. Conformity	+	+
II. Innovation	+	-
III. Ritualism	-	+
IV. Retreatism	-	-
V. Rebellion	±	±

+ = acceptance

± = rejection of prevailing values
and substitution of new values

- = rejection

The above portrayal reveals how patterns of "dysfunction [can occur] between culturally induced high aspirations and socially structured obstacles to [their] realization" (p. 174) to create a saliency toward deviant behavior and anomie. This is what Merton calls his "central hypothesis" (p. 134) to explain aberrant behavior.

In the first modal type--conformity--there is acceptance of both the culturally prescribed goals and the moral mandates for their attainment, which is representative of the stable elements of our society.² The delinquent,

¹Merton (1957), p. 140.

²It should be pointed out that Merton in defining these adaptive types is making no value judgments regarding their relative worth but only discriminating between elements which create homeostatic conditions and those which create imbalances in society.

by definition a norm violator, is excluded from this category. The innovator in society, however, is the individual "who has assimilated the cultural emphasis upon the goal without equally internalizing the institutional norms governing ways and means for its attainment," (p. 141).

This type includes, if not defines, the delinquent, whom we know to be less concerned with how ends are achieved than with achieving them. The delinquent--at least, on the other hand, depending upon his level of intellectual competence, may or may not, fit this definition. As a proposition--the more mentally defective, the less the capacity exists for the cognitive processes resulting in innovating activity--would appear to be viable.

The ritualist, having abandoned the quest for status and success, (or at least modified the goal), while compulsively continuing to conform to the socially sanctioned rules, would hardly describe the delinquent, nor lower class people in general. This adaptation is more typical of lower middle class behavior. It may, however, be representative of a significant portion of the mentally retarded, especially at lower functioning levels, and may be related to their propensity for perseverant-type behavior.

Retreatism, according to Merton, represents an "escape" from society's requirements which:

Arises from continued failure to near the goal by legitimate measures¹ and from an inability to use the illegitimate route because of internalized prohibitions, this process occurring while the supreme value of the success-goal has not yet been renounced. The conflict is resolved by abandoning both precipitating elements, the goals and the means. The escape is complete, the conflict is eliminated, and the individual is asocialized.²
(p. 153-54)

The rebellion adaptation is described by Merton as a transitional phase in an attempt to "institutionalize new goals and new procedures to be shared by other members of the society," (p. 140). This effort to change the existing structure by rejecting both the goals and norms of society and instituting new ones, describes the institutionalized delinquent's social system. Once accomplished--as in the delinquent subculture of the training school--the situation within can no longer be considered anomic but, rather, to

¹Although the individual is assumed to have assimilated both the cultural values and the social norms.

²Cloward (1959, pp. 210-11) presents a construct of considerable importance here. He notes that Merton assumes that "internalized prohibitions" in the engagement in illicit activity would be a necessary factor conducing toward retreatism, otherwise innovation would be the logical result. Cloward suggests that retreatist activity can result "even in the absence of internalized prohibitions," as in the case of individuals who "fail in the use of both legitimate and illegitimate means" and thus, through a process of "double failure," become defeated and leave the field. This may come very close to the actual position of a significant portion of the delinquent-retardates, who may have experienced unsuccessful attempts at innovation, and this construct may offer a means of both prediction and explanation of the retardate's adjustment in the institution.

use Merton's term, becomes "eunomic."¹ In other words, however deviant the delinquent may be in society, however unstable an element he may become in the structure of our social chemistry, within the confines of the institution he may well be a healthy, stable, and productive member who conforms to delinquent norms and values and contributes his share to the attainment of the deviant ends of the system. It is important to establish this social order, reintegrated around its own set of norms, because it allows us to observe the retardate in this system, to determine whether he represents a stable or an anomic element, and to establish the specific mode of adjustment which characterizes his interactions in this subsociety.

Summary of Theory of Anomie as Related to This Study

By way of summarizing the theory of anomie we have seen that Durkheim initiated the concept as a means of describing how the overly ambitious and aspiring eventually experienced a breakdown in their regulatory social apparatus. Merton extended Durkheim's theory and systematized it by identifying the types of malintegrated societies which aspire (but are denied access) to cultural goals, and by pointing out "differentials in access to success-goals by legitimate means, showing how the social

¹Witmer and Kotinsky (1956, p. 67).

structure exerts a strain upon the cultural structure, leading in turn to anomie or normlessness." (Cloward, p. 189-90).

Cloward introduced a third concept variable to the theory in the form of illegitimate means of achieving society's ends. In this system, as in the greater society, nonconformance brings retribution by way of social isolation and anomie. The retardate could find himself a social isolate in this society of deviants, either because he identified with the values of the larger society, or because he failed to assimilate and place high value on the delinquent norms, or simply because he could not discriminate between the two.¹

Theory Utilization in Hypotheses Development

Merton's paradigm of anomie is presented here for its clarity in providing a grasp of the dimensions of adjustment from a sociological viewpoint and not as a model on which to base the design of this study. We will see in the next chapter that our purposes will be better satisfied by a facetized design which will facilitate an analysis of the

¹We are all aware of examples of this latter situation in the form of the unfortunates who are either used as tools by their more intelligent peers or who "go along" with the gang in an attempt to "belong" without much real commitment or display of innovating behavior. Such individuals are often only on the fringe of the gang, rejected for the most part, for real membership. Only with ideas of exploitation as objects with which to "have fun," or to perform tasks which the other gang members find unpleasant, are these persons sought out and utilized. More often they are only tolerated.

social system of the training school by means of the social statuses and reputations of its residents. The focus will, of course, be mainly on the retardate, although the non-retardate will also be located and classified. Hopefully, it is expected that some light will be shed on possible differences between the valuing systems of a delinquent subculture and society in general, so that treatment programs can be more effectively directed towards rehabilitative objectives.

In order to utilize Merton's theory for these purposes, it must be understood that the institutional society, although made up, as it is, of members who qualify as anomics by reason of their having rejected our social norms, is, as we have seen before, by no means an anomic situation, but rather eunomic. This understanding should clarify that the measure of the retardate's possible adjustment deviancy will be from the standpoint of his relative assimilation into the delinquent social structure of his compeers and not that of society in general. Redl (Witmer & Kotinsky, p. 60) for instance, claims that the delinquent gang rejects as members those whose behavior is dysfunctional for the group, and includes in this category neurotics and schizoid character types who are too behaviorally unpredictable for trustworthy membership. This experiment will research the position of the mental retardate in this regard.

The assumption will be that those delinquents whom the group, as a whole, identifies as "accepted" individuals will also be popular and therefore evaluated as "eunomic" whereas, those who are seen as "withdrawn" will not be popular and will qualify as "anomic." The members labeled "aggressive" will serve to predict and confirm the existence of differentials in the valuing process of the delinquent social system by measurement of their degree of popularity in the group. The retardate population will be examined as a subgroup of this system.

Seeman's (1959) appraisal of the meaning of alienation permits at least two points of contiguity between that concept and Merton's theory of anomie. In discussing the normlessness component in alienation he defines Merton's anomic individual as one who holds the belief that "socially unapproved behaviors are required to achieve given goals." (p. 788). This can be tested with the retardate by observing the adaptive types with whom he prefers to interact. Also, in clarifying the dimension of isolation in the alienation concept, Seeman likens the alienated individual in this sense to one who assigns low reward value to goals or beliefs that are typically highly valued in the given society. This can be tested with the retardate in two ways:

- a. Quantitatively in the number of his interactive selections as compared with those of nonretardates.

- b. Qualitatively by the proportions of members of low and high social position and reputation whom he selects as friends (and, reciprocally, by those who choose him).

As may already have been deduced, the hypotheses which will be formulated as a result of the broad directions given above will be tested by means of the individual's "role set"¹ as well as by means of his own responses.

Staff attitudes will also be analyzed, mainly to determine the presence of any differential which may operate between staff and nonretardates in the ways in which they perceive the social position, adjustment and interactive behavior of the retarded group.

Summary of Relationship Between Theory and Hypotheses

The way in which anomie will be utilized, then, is to assist in the formulation of hypotheses which will both confirm the theoretically predicted social structure in an institution for delinquents and determine the pattern of the retardate's functioning or dysfunctioning in this

¹Merton defines "role set" as "the set of persons with whom an individual is in sustained interaction in this role" (Witmer and Kotinsky, P. 47-8), and further, as "the complex relationships of individuals in any one role to those involved in a series of connected roles." (p. 50). It includes all significant reference groups and individuals, and requires definitions of these roles as well as that of the individual being observed.

system. We will want to know if, in fact, the delinquents achieve homeostasis in their social interactions once within the institution or whether they continue to be as socially disintegrated as they were in the community. It will be important, also, to determine what personality characteristics and reputations are socially sanctioned by the members of this society and whether these values are those held in common with the staff, (representing society-at-large).

As for the retardate, our construct would lead us to predict him to manifest retreatist behavior, or at least to have failed as an innovator, and to be perceived as withdrawn by the peer group. But, we will keep in mind that his behavior in a delinquent subsociety may be quite different from that in the public school classroom. Accordingly, we will be interested in how he compares with the nonretardate in all three facets of reputation which we are measuring, but especially that of aggression. We will want to know if he holds the same values as the rest of the members (conformist), or whether he differs in this respect (ritualist or retreatist). This can be evaluated by analyzing the data on "aggression," which will be assumed to be a value of the delinquent subculture. The social position of the retardate will, of course, be a central interest of ours and if it is demonstrated that he holds both low social position (rejection) and low reputation, it

will be considered an indication that he is an alienated member of the institutional social system who is denied access to the success-goals of the delinquent subculture. If true, it will confirm our prediction that the retardate is an anomic individual in an otherwise homeostatic social structure for whom the institution represents a source of trauma rather than treatment.

Summary of Related Research

This chapter reviewed the literature on social adjustment as related to intelligence, personality, social setting, and leadership. The research concerning deviancy, especially that related to the retardate and the delinquent, was studied and the concept of anomie as it related to this study was investigated and discussed. Constructs were formulated out of which hypotheses to be tested will be developed.

Introduction

The
and will
will be
population
relations
testing w
study des
design an

Hypotheses

Sev
stated co
H. There
and a
Set a) 2

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

Introduction

This chapter will state the hypotheses to be tested and will outline the general methods and procedures which will be utilized to test them. The research setting, study population and instrumentation will be described and the relationship of the latter to the field of sociometric testing will be briefly discussed. A rationale for the study design will be presented and the methodology for the design and analysis will be detailed.

Hypotheses to be Tested

Seven major hypotheses have been formulated and are stated below in the research form:

H₁ There is a positive relationship between intelligence and social position.

Sub a) operationalized: The retardate will receive proportionately fewer social choice ratings than the nonretardate.

confirmation: Phi (r_{ϕ}) coefficient analysis with intelligence categories dichotomized into retardate and nonretardate proportions and social choice ratings dichotomized at the median.

Sub b) operationalized: Among retardates, the lower the IQ, the lower will be the social position.

confirmation: Phi (r_ϕ) coefficient analysis with retardate IQ dichotomized into low and high and social position dichotomized into low and high.

Sub c) operationalized: Retardates will receive proportionately fewer social choice ratings than non-retardates of the same reputation (as assigned by peers).

confirmation: Phi (r_ϕ) coefficient analysis with frequency of choice dichotomized at the median and intelligence categories dichotomized into retardate and nonretardate proportions. This will be done for each reputation category in which there are retardates.

H₂ There is a positive association between reciprocal choice and similarity in intelligence.¹

Sub a) operationalized: Retardates as a group will tend to be reciprocated in friendship choices by other retardates proportionately more often than by nonretardates as a group.

confirmation: Comparison of percentages of potential reciprocal social choices made between and within intelligence groups.

Sub b) operationalized: Nonretardates as a group will tend to be reciprocated by other nonretardates proportionately more often than by retardates as a group.

confirmation: Comparison of percentages of potential reciprocal social choices made between and within intelligence groups.

Sub c) operationalized: Proportionately more retardates will receive scores below the median in total reciprocal social choices than will nonretardates.

¹In a sense, if H₂ is true, then H₁ will logically follow, given the distribution of IQ in the institution population. However, if H₂ is not true, H₁ might still be true and is therefore worthy of investigation.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with intelligence categories dichotomized into retardate and non-retardate proportions and reciprocal choice scores dichotomized at the median.

H₃ There is an association between intelligence and behavioral adjustment in the institution.

Sub a) operationalized: Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive ratings above the median on the factor of aggression as measured by staff.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with intelligence dichotomized into retardate and nonretardate proportions and aggression dichotomized at the median for staff ratings.

Sub b) operationalized: Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive ratings below the median on the factor of aggression as measured by peers.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with intelligence dichotomized into retardate and nonretardate proportions and aggression dichotomized at the median for peer ratings.

Sub c) operationalized: Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive ratings above the medians in withdrawal as measured by both the staff and peer ratings.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with intelligence dichotomized into retardate and nonretardate proportions and withdrawal dichotomized at the medians for both the staff and peer ratings.

Sub d) operationalized: Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive ratings below the medians in acceptance as measured by both the staff and peer ratings.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with intelligence dichotomized into retardate and non-retardate proportions and acceptance dichotomized at the medians for both the staff and peer ratings.

H₄ There is an association between social position and adjustment mode which varies with the adjustment factor and the rater role.

Sub a) operationalized: Acceptance will be directly associated with social position as measured by both staff and peers so that those rated high in the one will be rated high in the other and vice versa.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with acceptance scores dichotomized at the median and social position scores by quartiles for peers and dichotomized at the median for staff.

Sub b) operationalized: Aggression will be directly associated with social position as measured by peers and inversely associated as measured by staff.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with aggression scores dichotomized at the median and social position scores by quartiles for peers and dichotomized at the median for staff.

Sub c) operationalized: Withdrawal will be inversely associated with social position as measured by both staff and peers so that those rated high in the one will be rated low in the other and vice versa.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with withdrawal scores dichotomized at the median and social position scores by quartiles for peers and dichotomized at the median for staff.

H₅ There is an association between social position and reputation in the institution which is differentially perceived in accordance with rater role.

Sub a) operationalized: The components of reputation will be ordered by staff so that those in the lowest social position will tend to be assigned to the low acceptance-high aggression-high withdrawal category, and those in the highest social position to the high acceptance-low aggression-low withdrawal category.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with social position dichotomized into the lowest and highest quartiles and reputation dichotomized into the lowest and highest categories in the model predicted for staff ratings.

- Sub b) operationalized: The components of reputation will be ordered by peers so that those in the lowest social position will tend to be assigned to the low acceptance-low aggression-high withdrawal category and those in the highest social position to the high acceptance-high aggression-low withdrawal category.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with social position dichotomized into the lowest and highest quartiles and reputation dichotomized into the lowest and highest categories in the model predicted for peer ratings.

H₆ There is a positive association between reputation and intelligence in the institution.

- Sub a) operationalized: Proportionately more nonretardates than retardates will be assigned above the median reputation category and proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will be assigned below the median reputation category as rated by staff.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with reputation dichotomized into low and high and intelligence dichotomized into retardate and nonretardate.

- Sub b) operationalized: Proportionately more nonretardates than retardates will be assigned above the median reputation category and proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will be assigned below the median reputation category as rated by peers.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with reputation dichotomized into low and high and intelligence dichotomized into retardate and nonretardate.

H₇ There is a positive association between low intelligence and anomie in the delinquent social structure of the institution.

Sub a) operationalized: Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive a combination of social position and reputation scores below the median.

confirmation: Chi square (X^2) test with intelligence dichotomized into retardate and nonretardate proportions and anomie dichotomized into low and high. Cells will consist of the proportions of each intelligence category having social position and reputation scores both of which fall either below or above their respective medians.

Sub b) operationalized: Proportionately more nonretardates than retardates will receive a combination of social position and reputation scores above the median.

confirmation: Same as H_7 (a)

Research Setting

The study will be conducted at the Lansing, Michigan Boys Training School, an institution for some four hundred boys between the ages of twelve and seventeen, adjudicated delinquent and committed for an indefinite period. The facility, administered under the auspices of the Michigan Social Welfare Department, consists of groups of brick buildings representing the domiciling, educational, vocational, recreational, and administrative units of the school. These are located on a plot in a residential area in the center of the city. There are from twenty-five to thirty-five boys domiciled to a living unit and the assignments are made roughly on the basis of age and physical development.

Population

The study population will consist of all the boys committed to and in residence at the training school who are available to complete the questionnaire at the time it is given. Of the approximately four hundred wards, it can be expected that about fifty will meet the criteria for inclusion in the experimental group. This is a higher incidence of retardation than would be found in a normally distributed population but is not excessive for a delinquent group.¹

General Procedures

The Lewis Sociometric Scale (see Appendix B) will be administered to all cottages in which there are members of the research group. The questions will be read to each group to avoid introduction of reading competency bias and the cottage manager in charge of the group will respond to the same questions with the exception of question No. 10, which will be eliminated for staff members.²

¹See Appendix A, No. 6.

²While children are shown to be good judges of social positions of peers, studies of adults, with few exceptions (Gronlund, 1959), report they are much less reliable in rating children's social positions accurately (Bonney, 1947; Hunter, 1957; Myers, 1961; Slobetz, 1950; Stern, 1963; Stouffer, 1956). Evidently adult perceptions of children's popularity are influenced considerably by their own expectations for children's social behavior.

Instrumentation

The measurement of adjustment comes within the purview of what are known as Reputation Tests.¹ Bredemeyer (1954, p. 144) points out that the concept of reputation can serve as a link between the social structure and the culture of the group. "Interrelationships between position measures and reputation measures. . . .may provide important clues to the content of a group's culture." (p. 127). This is precisely an objective of this study--to correlate sociometric position with reputation as a means of determining what values are commonly held by a "pure" delinquent subculture, the institution. Reputation tests fall into two general categories: those which measure the individual as subject ("which person are you most nearly like?") and those which measure the individual as object ("which members of the group are like this?"). The object approach is particularly suitable for our needs because it allows for the determination of "actual or sanctioned norms. . . .the operating norms" (p. 130). "The object approach," Bredemeyer points out, "is more likely to get at operating norms [because] it minimizes the distortion created by the pressure to express 'proper' attitudes," (p. 130). This determination involves observing the traits which are attributed to each individual and then correlating this reputation with his sociometric

¹See Riley et al. (1954), Chap. 6 for a discussion of these tests.

status. The assumption is that high status is conferred on those traits which hold positive group sanction and low status is assigned to those who display negatively sanctioned qualities. The indirectness with which this is accomplished should secure more confidence in the obtained data than that elicited from a respondent's statement of what he thinks he, himself, should feel concerning approval or disapproval of a trait.

The Lewis Sociometric Scale (1950) was selected for this study for several reasons:

1. It provides an "object" measure of reputation (adjustment).
2. It conveniently and parsimoniously determines adjustment categories of interest to this investigation (acceptance, aggression, withdrawal).
3. It locates the individual in the group (social position).
4. It is a validated instrument with established reliability.
5. The validation was done on a group somewhat similar to the present study group.
6. It is easily administered.

The instrument has the further attribute of providing a combination of three indices for each trait which it measures, offering opportunity for multiple confirmation of a perceived characteristic in an individual as object. It was originally devised as a screening test for identifying

socio-emotional maladjusted school children. It was validated on a group of elementary school children and its test-retest reliability was reported as .98 for social acceptability, .82 for aggressive maladjustment and .72 for social isolation. Intercorrelation of test items show all three adjustment categories to be independent measures of behavioral style. Its construct validation, high reliability and demonstrated independence of adjustment pattern measures are considered to make it a highly acceptable instrument for this particular study. The test is reproduced in Appendix B.

Sociometric tests in general, while not free of measurement problems,¹ have been found to be valid predictors of social status and reputation. Ausubel and Schiff (1952) report high correlations at all grade levels between measures of actual and predicted sociometric status (p. 125) and children's perceptions were found to be quite reliable.²

Design of the Study

Rationale for the Design

We have defined "reputation" for the purposes of this study as consisting of three types of adjustment:

¹See Appendix A, No. 7.

²They also found that age affects predictability such that:

- a) ability of students to predict increases with age
- b) ability of teachers to predict decreases as age of pupils increases.

acceptance by others, withdrawal from others, or mal-aggression toward others. The relative importance that people assign to a particular reputation as determined by friendship choices, should be an indicator of people's valuing systems. Therefore, since friendship choices determine social position, the valuing systems of groups can be determined by analyzing the patterns of reputation types associated both with those to whom they assign high social position and those from whom they withhold high social position by non-choice.

That people in different roles have different value systems is borne out by the sociometric research relating to teacher and peer attitudes towards retardates discussed in Chapter II. Also established by many studies cited in the literature, (such as Johnson's, 1950) is the fact that values will vary according to the characteristics of the person being rated. Again, retardates were found to be assigned to low social position because of behavioral characteristics which were not in keeping with social norms. What we are postulating at this point, then, is that the structure of the elements of reputation will vary according to the role of the rater and the characteristics of the social object being rated.

In society in general, high social position of adolescents is ascribed to those who are non-malaggressive (low in aggression), normally gregarious (low in withdrawal),

and well accepted (high in acceptance). This is documented in Chapter II. The lowest social position is assigned to those who are highly malaggressive, highly withdrawn, and low in acceptance. If this holds true, we should be able to make predictions about the value system of the delinquent society in general in regard to possible deviations from social norms (represented in this study by staff ratings on the assumption that the staff generally conforms to social norms and values). Further, we should also be able to predict the social position of the retardates in this system and to determine whether the position, if different from nonretardates, is a result of the lower intellectual competency per se (eg: if retardates are found to hold low social position, that this position would bear no relation to reputation) or due to the social characteristics associated with lower intellectual functioning (which in this study are being predicted as reputation for withdrawal and/or aggressiveness).

Study Design

This approach lends itself to a facetized experimental design¹ in which the variables of reputation type

¹For a detailed explanation of facet theory and its application to sociological research, see Louis Guttman, "A Structural Theory for Intergroup Beliefs and Action," American Sociological Review (June, 1959), 24:318-328.

can be arranged into components of reputation, each with dichotomized elements as follows:

Figure 1.--Variables of reputation components.

	<u>Reputation Facets</u>		
	Acceptance (a)	Aggression (b)	Withdrawal (c)
	low (a_1)	high (b_1)	high (c_1)
Reputation Elements	high (a_2)	low (b_2)	low (c_2)

For each facet we have two elements, a high and a low. These elements combine into components of reputation such that each component has one element of each facet and the various combinations of elements can be exhausted. The way society typically views those of low social position is represented by the reputation component:

$a_1 b_1 c_1$ = low acceptance, high aggression, high withdrawal (In an institution, this is often the moody, suspicious, defensive type who interacts aggressively).

Those of high social position are associated with the component:

$a_2 b_2 c_2$ = high acceptance, low aggression, low withdrawal (In an institution this is the boy who is chosen often for activities, is outgoing, friendly and

works cooperatively.) Not only are these polar social status types determined by this model but it is further postulated that the ordering along the whole continuum of social position can be predicted by a logical patterning of elements into reputation components, which, for a normal population, would be arranged in the following value ranking:

Figure 2.--Hypothesized relation of social position to reputation in a normal population.

Social Position		Reputation Component ^a		
1.	Low	a_1	b_1	c_1
2.	Low-medium.	a_1	b_1	c_2
		a_1	b_2	c_1
		* a_2	b_1	c_1
3.	Medium-high	a_1	b_2	c_2
		a_2	b_1	c_2
		* a_2	b_2	c_1
4.	High.	a_2	b_2	c_2

^aIn the division of each facet into its elements, all of the subscripts 1 have been assigned so that they represent the least socially acceptable in the group and subscripts 2 the most socially acceptable. Therefore it is possible, by varying the subscripts within each component, to rank the components from a low social position extreme (with all subscripts 1) to a high social position extreme (all subscripts 2).

*These components exist theoretically but not practically, due to the nature of the questions asked, and will be eliminated from further consideration.

Since we are making the assumption that the staff represent society in general, we should be able to predict that the staff will order the residents according to the arrangement in Figure 2, and that this ordering illustrates the relative value of reputations in society.

With respect to the delinquent peer group, we hold that a different value system will prevail, such that the elements of aggression will be reversed and the following rank order of reputation components, as determined by social position scores, will be assigned:

Figure 3.--Hypothesized relation of social position to reputation in a delinquent population as ranked by delinquents.

Social Position		Reputation Component
1.	Low.	$a_1 b_2 c_1$
2.	Low-medium	$a_1 b_2 c_2$
		$a_1 b_1 c_1$
		$*a_2 b_2 c_1$
3.	Medium-high	$a_1 b_1 c_2$
		$a_2 b_2 c_2$
		$*a_2 b_1 c_1$
4.	High	$a_2 b_1 c_2$

*These components exist theoretically but not practically, due to the nature of the questions asked, and will be eliminated from further consideration.

In summary, the difference between the values of a delinquent social system and the society of the adult world can be represented by the social statuses given to behavior types as follows:

Figure 4.--Hypothesized relation of social position to reputation in a delinquent population as ranked by staff and peers.

Social Position	Staff Ranking Behavior	Delinquent Ranking Behavior
Low	**nonaccepted-aggressive-noninteractor	nonaccepted-nonaggressive-noninteractor
Middle	nonaccepted-aggressive-interactor	nonaccepted-nonaggressive-interactor
	nonaccepted-nonaggressive-noninteractor	**nonaccepted-aggressive-noninteractor
	nonaccepted-nonaggressive-interactor	nonaccepted-aggressive-interactor
	accepted-aggressive-interactor	accepted-nonaggressive-interactor
High	accepted-nonaggressive-interactor	accepted-aggressive-interactor

**This apparent semantic contradiction is recognized by psychologists and institutional workers, among others, as a recognizable type with the characteristics of general social isolation, accompanied by intense underlying hostility which is overtly manifested when unable to cope with social situations.

The above facetization will be utilized to exhaust all the combinations of reputation components in testing

them against the other research variable--social position, and the independent variable--intelligence.

A second part of the design will involve the pairing of all the individual personality factors in all possible combinations with social position and intelligence.

Finally, social position and reputation will be combined into measures of anomie and tested for association with intelligence.

Summary

A statement of the hypotheses to be tested was presented in this chapter in research and operationalized forms, and the method of confirmation stated in each case. The research setting, study population, and instrumentation were described and discussed, and the study design was justified and detailed.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter will present a description of the statistical conditions under which the analysis was made, the results of the analysis, and an interpretation of the results.

Statistical Rationale

The measurement of the social interactions and personality factors of any group of human beings presents too complex a task for the researcher ever to feel confident concerning his knowledge of the parameters involved. The nature of the particular group in this experiment was such, however, as to leave little doubt that the data should be treated nonparametrically, since the social and psychological trauma attending their common delinquent backgrounds would, most surely, bias the distribution of the group's social and personality characteristics. Accordingly, it was decided that nonparametric techniques offered the more conservative, and therefore, preferred approach, no matter how much information had to be sacrificed which might have been obtainable from the data by more sophisticated statistical methods.

Statistics Employed and Procedures Utilized

The statistics chosen to be employed were the chi square (X^2) and the phi coefficient (ϕ). Chi square appeared adequate to test all but one of the hypotheses which were generally concerned with determining the dependence of personality characteristic and social status observations of a population on the variable of intelligence, for the following reasons:

- a. the chi square distribution is based on the assumption that the observed frequency will be equal to the expected or theoretical frequency (in which case $X^2 = 0$).
- b. X^2 is a measure of association whose test of significance provides a test of the null hypothesis that two variables under study are independent.

The single exception was in the first hypothesis which dealt with intelligence and social position. For this test we chose the phi coefficient (ϕ), a statistic related to the chi square and often applied where two variables, obviously not discontinuous, are studied as though they were (Ferguson, 1959). Because both intelligence and social position are continuous variables which, for convenience in observing deviations from hypothetical expectations are treated as discrete, and because we represented the two categories of each variable by two point-values, the resultant model was amenable to test by a four-fold point correlation, the phi coefficient (r_ϕ), bearing the relationship to chi square, $r_\phi = \sqrt{\frac{X^2}{N}}$.

Where the expected frequencies were small, and in all cases where there was only one degree of freedom, Yates' correction for continuity:

$$X^2 = \frac{N(|AD-BC|-N/2)^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(A+C)(B+D)}$$

was applied as a conservative move to guard against type I error¹ by bring the observed and expected values closer together and decreasing the value of X^2 .

In testing the hypotheses, the median was used to determine the upper and lower categories, rather than the mean, essentially for two reasons:

1. Each cottage group reported only on its own members and an overall institutional mean would have been misleading.
2. The relatively large number of subjects who received no score on one or more of the measurements would have depressed the mean beyond usefulness.

The statistical procedures employed in the analysis were in accordance with the contingency table program utilized with the C.D.C.#3600 computer at Michigan State University.²

It was arbitrarily decided that data testing results would be considered significant whenever the probability of a Type I error did not exceed .05, or, in other words,

¹Type I error is the error of rejecting the null hypothesis when, in fact, it should be accepted.

²F. M. Sim and M. J. Beech, Analysis of Contingency Tables (Act II) for the C.D.C. 3600, MSU CISSR Technical Report No. 4 (January 27, 1964).

whenever there was no greater than .05 probability of the results occurring by chance when the null hypothesis was true.

Subjects

A total of 365 subjects were available for the study in 13 cottage groups. Of this number 326 were nonretarded and 39 retarded.¹ The retardates were further categorized into "high" and "low" groups by dichotomizing as near the IQ median as possible. Because of the skewed IQ distribution it was realized that this dichotomy did not serve to identify intelligence groups with radically different behavioral characteristics and performance levels, but only "upper" and "lower" retardate groups within which only the grossest of the effects of low intelligence could be expected to be manifested. The retardate IQ's ranged from 63-79 with a mean of (\bar{x}) of 74.34 and standard deviation (s) of 3.85. There were 15 white, 2 Mexican and 22 Negroes in the experimental group and their ages ranged from 13 to 17 with a mean (\bar{x}) of 15.58. The mean continuous stay in the institution at the time of the test was 5.00 months and the range was from 1-13 months. These data are tabulated in Table 2.

¹This is close to the percentage predicted in footnote No. 6, Appendix A and supports the incidence research of Lichtenstein and Brown (in Metfessel and Lovell, 1942), Glueck and Glueck (1934), Kvaraceus (1945), and others.

TABLE 2.--Retardate variables of possible influence on social position, reputation and adjustment.

Group	IQ Level	Racial-Ethnic Gp.		Age			Recidivist		Months in Institution Continuously					Previous Environment				
		W	N Mex.	13-14	15-16	17+	Yes	No	1-4	5-8	9-12	13+	Rural	Urban				
Upper	78-79	5	4	1	0	6	4	1	9	5	4	0	1	1	9			
	75-77	4	7	1	2	6	4	1	11	7	3	2	0	0	12			
Subtotals		9	11	2	2	12	8	2	20	12	7	2	1	1	21			
\bar{x}		15.95						6.38										
Lower	72-74	4	7	0	3	5	3	2	9	6	4	1	0	3	8			
	69-71	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	3			
	66-68	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1			
	63-65	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1			
Subtotals		6	11	0	6	7	4	4	13	9	6	2	0	4	13			
\bar{x}		15.13						4.85										
TOTALS		3.85	15	22	2	8	19	12	6	33	21	13	4	1	5	34		
\bar{x}		70.34						15.58									5.00	
s		3.85																

Examination of Table 2 shows that the within-groups difference in mean age was negligible, and since the mean age of the total institution population was 15.20 at the time of admission, it can be assumed that the variable of age should have had little between-groups effect either.

The retardates were fairly evenly divided racially so that this factor should not have influenced results to any appreciable extent and the distribution was in about the same proportion as that of the institution as a whole.

In terms of length-of-stay at the time of the experiment, there was an approximate difference between the retardate and institutional means of .5 months, the retardates being the less senior group. This is not considered significant.

Format of the Analysis

The general approach in meeting the objectives of the study was to set up certain broad hypotheses based on our main concerns, and to give them directionality obtained from the literature, even though there may have existed doubts as to the representativeness of this evidence in the experimental situation. It was felt that, in the absence of empirical evidence to the contrary, the literature should provide the reference points from which the study could then depart. From these broad directions, specific operational statements were evolved which, when tested, would offer evidence in support or refutation of the main

hypotheses, and thus give probability statements concerning our study questions. In such a format, data which tests in favor of the null hypothesis becomes as valuable as that which verifies the research notion.

Intelligence and Social Position

The literature is clear that a positive relationship exists between intelligence and social position. The research, however, comes largely from studies of the public schools where academic achievement receives positive social sanction and a student can often attain social prestige through the single criterion factor of high academic standing. This may not at all be the case in an institution where academic remediation receives more stress than overall academic achievement, and especially among delinquents who are known to devalue academic knowledge.

Nevertheless, starting with the proposition that a positive relationship exists between intelligence and social position, three subhypotheses were developed. If true, it was reasoned that, not only would retardates fare poorer in social choice but, the more retarded, the greater would be the social rejection. Also, recognizing that one's reputation could affect social choice, a

hypothesis was developed to eliminate the influence of this variable so that intelligence effects could be observed without masking from this intervening variable.

Hypothesis (1a): The retardate will receive proportionately fewer social choice ratings than the nonretardate.

The results of the test of the hypothesis, as reported in Table 3, indicate that the null of no difference in the social choice ratings between retardates and nonretardates is tenable.

TABLE 3.--Analysis of social position as measured by peers in relation to intelligence.

Social Choice	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretardate	Retardate	
High	167	15	182
Low	150	24	174
TOTAL	317	39	356

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = 2.2700, p > .10$$

$$r_{\phi(1df)} = .025.$$

Hypothesis (1b): Among retardates, the lower the IQ the lower will be the social position.



TABLE 4.--Analysis of social position as measured by peers in relation to level of retardation.

Social Position	Retardate Category		Total
	High	Low	
High	12	3	15
Low	11	13	24
TOTAL	23	16	39

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = 3.1535, p. > .05$$

$$r_{\phi}(1df) = .28$$

The evidence presented in Table 4 supports the null of no difference in social choice ratings on the basis of intelligence between high and low retardates. There was, however, a tendency toward social rejection of the more severely retarded while making no discriminations among the less retarded.

Hypothesis (1c): Retardates will receive proportionately fewer social choice ratings than nonretardates of the same reputation. (See Table 5 on page 91.)

The null hypothesis, that the observed frequency of high and low social ratings among retardates and nonretardates in any reputation category would equal the expected frequency, was verified and the independence of intelligence and social choice established.

TABLE 5.--Analysis of social position as measured by peers in relation to intelligence and equated for reputation.

Reputation Category	Social Choice	Intelligence Category		Total	χ^2 (1df)	$r_{\phi}(1df)$	p.
		Nonretardate	Retardate				
1.	High	19	2	21	.1067	.04	>.70
	Low	43	4	47			
	TOTAL	62	6	68			
2.	High	5	0	5	.0278	.03	>.80
	Low	29	3	32			
	Total	34	3	37			
3.	High	10	2	12	.2000	.065	>.50
	Low	30	6	36			
	TOTAL	40	8	48			
4.	High	8	0	8	.4737	.13	>.30
	Low	18	4	22			
	TOTAL	26	4	30			
5.	High	34	2	36	1.6493	.21	>.10
	Low	2	0	2			
	TOTAL	36	2	38			

TABLE 5.---Continued

Reputation Category	Social Choice	Intelligence Category			Total	χ^2 (ldf)	r_{ϕ} (ldf)	p.
		Nonretardate	Retardate					
6.	High	61	7	68	2.8041	.06	>.50	
	Low	9	1	10				
	TOTAL	70	8	78				
*7.	High	34	2	36				
	Low	4	0	4				
	TOTAL	38	2	40				
*8.	High	15	3	18				
	Low	5	3	8				
	TOTAL	20	6	26				

*This category has been eliminated from consideration. See footnotes on pages 78 and 79.

Results of Testing Hypothesis (1)

It would appear from the above results that, regardless of how we viewed intelligence and social position in the institution (whether between retardates and nonretardates, or between upper and lower groups of retardates) there was no significant relationship between these two variables. Even when equated on the intervening variable of reputation, social choice appeared to be independent of intelligence. There is an inference from the data, however, that the more severely retarded are rejected socially while no discrimination seems to be made among the less retarded.

Intelligence and Reciprocal Choice

Previous research gives a strong indication of a positive correlation between the factors of intelligence and reciprocation in friendship choices. In other words, those of like intelligence appear to choose each other as friends in preference to those dissimilar in intellect. Whether or not this is true in delinquency treatment institutions was the question here. If either group tended to cross intellectual lines, it was reasoned that the retardates, due to dependency needs, would be the group to do so.

Hypothesis (2a): Retardates as a group will tend to be reciprocated in friendship choices by other retardates proportionately more often than by nonretardates as a group.

Hypothesis (2b): Nonretardates as a group will tend to be reciprocated by other nonretardates proportionately more often than by retardates as a group.

Analysis of these two hypotheses can be made simultaneously but it is not enough to know merely how many reciprocal choices between and within groups had actually been made. What also must be determined here is the total potential for each group to choose, and be chosen, within and between intelligence groups. Since the choices were made by cottage groups, this had to be determined for each cottage and then the sums of these totals obtained. Then, by dividing the total reciprocal social choices actually made between and within groups, by the total potential reciprocal choices which were available to be made,¹ it became possible to determine whether or not significant differences were present.

TABLE 6.--Percentages of potential reciprocal social choices made between and within intelligence groups.

Chosen	Choosers	
	Nonretardates	Retardates
Nonretardates	.2863	.2948
Retardates	.2566	.3085

¹See Appendix C, Table 31.

Since there was no apparent means for determining expectations here, no chi square was attempted. The raw results indicate that no relationship apparently exists between intelligence and reciprocation in friendship choice.

Hypothesis (2c): Proportionately more retardates will receive scores below the median in total reciprocal social choices than will nonretardates.

Because there were differences in the numbers of persons in cottages, and therefore differences in the potential reciprocity available to the various groups, analysis was done by individual cottage median score in total reciprocal choices, and overall summations were made on the basis of the numbers of retardates and nonretardates who fell above and below their respective cottage medians.

TABLE 7.--Analysis of total reciprocal social choices by cottage as measured by peers in relation to intelligence.

Total Recip- rocal Social Choices	Intelligence		Total
	Nonretardate	Retardate	
High	156	17	173
Low	149	18	167
TOTAL	305	35	*340
Median score = 5		$\chi^2_{(1df)} = .0122, p.>.90$	
Modal score = 5			
Overall range = 2-6			

*21 nonretardates and 4 retardates were not available for reciprocal social choice testing.

The findings reveal an almost exact split of both intelligence groups to support the null hypothesis of no difference between the observed and expected frequencies of reciprocal social choices between the two groups. Reciprocal choice is independent of the variable of intelligence.

Results of Testing Hypothesis (2)

The results indicate that there was no association between the intelligences of the groups and their reciprocal friendship selections, and thus, the null hypotheses were supported. In each case the choosing group selected from its own members a slightly greater percentage of friends than from the other group but not to a significant degree. As can be seen in Table 6, the greatest social affinity was within the retardate group itself, followed by retardates for nonretardates, nonretardates within their own group, and lastly, nonretardates for retardates. All in all, it would appear that retardates are "friendlier," or else more dependent, than nonretardates, especially when it comes to making friendship selections from a group dissimilar in intelligence. The findings in analysis of total reciprocal social choice scores reveal that this variable is independent of intelligence.

Intelligence and Behavioral Adjustment

There is reason to believe, from the literature, that there is a positive correlation between intelligence and behavioral adjustment. Even those studies which indicate that the retardate makes an adequate work adjustment, find these persons to have a higher rate of involvement in difficulties with the law enforcement agencies of the community than do intellectually normal persons.¹

The situation in the social system of the institution for delinquents, however, is different than that of the community-at-large (although perhaps not for the neighborhoods from which they come), since the delinquent subculture is presumed to value aggressive behavior and to give status to those who are proficient in making it utilitarian. An assumption was made here that staff members, not identifying retardates as individuals with limited capacities to understand and follow directions, (and therefore misinterpreting their poor responses as hostile, or nonconforming, responses), would tend to label this behavior as aggressive. Their peers, however, being generally higher, intellectually, would tend to dominate

¹ Although some of the strength of the evidence is reduced when the fact is considered that most of the community's retardates are found in low socioeconomic neighborhoods where the rate of police contact is generally higher anyway than in more economically privileged neighborhoods.

them and assume leadership roles, thereby tending to consign them to follower positions. These peers, therefore, would tend to see them as less aggressive. Because of their impaired functioning, and especially because of their presumed lesser ability to communicate, it was reasoned that both staff and peers would tend to see the retardate as more withdrawn than his more intellectually well endowed compeers, and less acceptable in social activities.

Hypothesis (3a): Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive ratings above the median on the facet of aggression as measured by staff.

TABLE 8.--Analysis of the facet of aggression as measured by staff in relation to intelligence.

Aggression	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretardates	Retardates	
High	149	21	170
Low	157	13	170
TOTAL	306	34	340

Median score = 0

Overall range = 0-3 (max. possible)

Retardate range = 0-3

$\chi^2_{(1df)} = 1.6013, p. > .20$

The results show that staff measures of aggression are independent of intelligence and the null hypothesis is supported. The direction of the data, however, was in line with the research hypothesis.

Hypothesis (3b): Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive ratings below the median on the facet of aggression as measured by peers.

TABLE 9.--Analysis of the facet of aggression as measured by peers in relation to intelligence.

Aggression	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretardate	Retardate	
High	156	26	182
Low	170	13	183
TOTAL	326	39	365

Median score = 9
 Overall range = 0-73
 Retardate range = 0-40
 $\chi^2_{(1df)} = 4.2080, p < .05$

The results indicate that peer measures of aggression are dependent on intelligence but the research hypothesis is not tenable because the data was in the direction opposite to that of the research hypothesis.

Hypothesis (3c): Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive ratings above the medians in withdrawal as measured by both the individual staff and peer ratings.

TABLE 10.--Analysis of the facet of withdrawal as measured by peers in relation to intelligence.

Withdrawal	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretardates	Retardates	
High	160	22	182
Low	166	17	183
TOTAL	326	39	365

Median score = 5
 Overall range = 0-74
 Retardate range = 0-26
 $\chi^2_{(1df)} = .4842, p. > .30$

TABLE 11.--Analysis of the facet of withdrawal as measured by staff in relation to intelligence.

Withdrawal	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretardate	Retardate	
High	154	16	170
Low	152	18	170
TOTAL	306	34	340

Median score = 0
 Overall range = 0-3 (max. possible)
 Retardate range = 0-3
 $\chi^2_{(1df)} = .0327, p. > .80$

In both tests of hypothesis (3c), the facet of withdrawal was found to be independent of intelligence and although slightly inclined toward the research hypothesis, this could be due to chance. The null of independence is verified.

Hypothesis (3d): Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive ratings below the median in acceptance as measured by both the individual staff and peer ratings.

TABLE 12.--Analysis of the facet of acceptance as measured by peers in relation to intelligence.

Acceptance	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretardates	Retardates	
High	164	18	182
Low	162	21	183
TOTAL	326	39	365

Median score = 10

Overall range = 0-68

Retardate range = 0-47

$\chi^2_{(1df)} = .1029, p. > .70$

TABLE 13.--Analysis of the facet of acceptance as measured by staff in relation to intelligence.

Acceptance	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretardates	Retardates	
High	155	15	170
Low	151	19	170
TOTAL	306	34	340

Median score = 0

Overall range = 0-3 (max. possible)

Retardate range = 0-3

$\chi^2_{(1df)} = .2941, p. > .50$

Results of Testing Hypothesis (3)

The results of the analysis of aggression as measured by staff inclines toward the research hypothesis but not at the level of significance, while that of peers shows to be similar to that of staff and significant at the .05 level, but the directionality was opposite to that stated for this hypothesis. This tells us that the retardates are seen by their peers to be a more aggressive group. Neither the staff nor peer ratings show any association between intelligence and withdrawal tendencies nor between intelligence and social acceptability.

Social Position and Adjustment Mode

There are many studies in Chapter II to show that personality factors affect social choice. Some reveal

personality traits to be the variable most significantly related to social status. Low status children have been shown to be more malaggressive than high status children and personality deviancy, (such as self-isolation), has been demonstrated to be inversely related to social position. In this next analysis, the personality characteristics of acceptance, malaggression, and withdrawal will be tested against social position.

Our review of the research impels us to assume that acceptance scores will affect the social position scores directly for both staff and peer evaluations, while withdrawal scores will affect social position inversely. Aggression scores, however, will be perceived differently by the two rating groups. Peers will view it favorably and assign those individuals with high aggression to high social position, while staff will view it as a negative characteristic and assign low status to those perceived as manifesting aggression.

Hypothesis (4a): Acceptance will be directly associated with social position as measured by both staff and peers so that those rated high in the one will be rated high in the other and vice versa.

The analysis shows acceptance to be directly associated with social position as measured by both staff and peers. There was less than a .001 probability that the null was correct in the staff data and less than a .001 probability of the null hypothesis being correct in the peer data. The research hypothesis is therefore accepted.

TABLE 14.--Analysis of the facet of acceptance as measured by peers in relation to social position.

Acceptance	Social Quartile				Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
High	85	51	27	19	182
Low	6	40	65	72	183
TOTAL	91	91	92	91	365

$$\chi^2_{(3df)} = 118.7755, p.<.001$$

TABLE 15.--Analysis of the facet of acceptance as measured by staff in relation to social position.

Acceptance	Social Position		Total
	High	Low	
High	118	67	185
Low	64	116	180
TOTAL	182	183	365

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = 2796.09, p.<.001$$

Hypothesis (4b): Aggression will be directly associated with social position as measured by peers and inversely associated as measured by staff.

TABLE 16.--Analysis of the facet of aggression as measured by peers in relation to social position.

Aggression	Social Quartile				Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
High	44	51	48	39	182
Low	47	40	44	52	183
TOTAL	91	91	92	91	365

$$\chi^2_{(3df)} = 3.4694, p. > .30$$

TABLE 17.--Analysis of the facet of aggression as measured by staff in relation to social position.

Aggression	Social Position		Total
	High	Low	
High	97	81	178
Low	85	102	187
TOTAL	182	183	365

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = 2.6301, p. > .10$$

The variables of aggression and social position are revealed to be independent in both staff and peer evaluations. The null hypothesis is considered tenable.

Hypothesis (4c): Withdrawal will be inversely associated with social position as measured by both staff and peers so that those rated high in the one will be rated low in the other and vice versa.

TABLE 18.--Analysis of the facet of withdrawal as measured by peers in relation to social position.

Withdrawal	Social Quartile				Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
High	19	46	59	58	182
Low	72	45	33	33	183
TOTAL	91	91	92	91	365

$$\chi^2_{(3df)} = 45.9184, p. < .001$$

TABLE 19.--Analysis of the facet of withdrawal as measured by staff in relation to social position.

Withdrawal	Social Position		Total
	High	Low	
High	99	92	191
Low	83	91	174
TOTAL	182	183	365

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = 3.3404, p. > .05$$

There was no association between withdrawal and social position demonstrated in the staff data. The peer evaluation shows a measure of inverse association between withdrawal and social position significant at the .001 level. The research hypothesis is partially verified.

Results of Testing Hypothesis (4)

Acceptance appears to be highly associated with social position. Both staff and peers show the same tendencies, the peer data being especially significant in that they reveal a consistent increase in the high acceptance category as the social position increases and an equally consistent increase in the low acceptance category as the social position decreases, quartile by quartile.

Aggression appears to have little effect on social position in either staff or peer evaluations.

In withdrawal, the peer evaluations show a significant inverse association with social position while the staff data show a slight tendency to favor the more withdrawn with higher social position, although not to a significant degree.

Social Position and Reputation¹

We have previously defined reputation as a combination of personality characteristics, as opposed to adjustment mode which describes the person's behavior in relation to a specific overriding personality factor in an individual's makeup. Analysis of reputation in relation to social position is intended to determine mainly whether or not a differential actually exists between the people-valuing

¹See Appendix C for Table 32 showing overall frequency relationship of Reputation, Social Position and Intelligence

system of the community-at-large (as represented by staff ratings) and that of the delinquent subculture. A further determination is whether or not this difference is in accordance with the predicted models for each group.

Since delinquents are known to place high value on aggression, it is reasonable to assume that they will accord higher social status to members of their group whom they feel possess this characteristic to a marked degree, and lower status to those whom they see as bereft of this personality ingredient. Likewise, since the law abiding members of society generally abhor malaggression, they should assign this quality to those in low social position much more frequently than they do to those in high social status. This valuing difference, if it exists at all, should be most apparent in a comparison between the highest and lowest reputation categories and between the highest and lowest social position quartiles. The rationale behind this assumption is that in both the community's and the delinquent's social systems, people who are found to be both highly acceptable and outgoing (i.e. not aloof or withdrawn) are given higher social position. It is only on the factor of aggression that the two systems are oppositional. At first glance, one may wonder why, since aggression is the only variable assumed to be perceived differentially between the two social systems, this factor is not examined individually. A more careful analysis of

the problem, however, reveals that this would not produce meaningful results since social position is not the product of a single personality criterion but of all one's personality variables--of which we have selected three of the most influential and combined them into a "reputation."

Hypothesis (5a): The components of reputation will be ordered by staff so that those in the lowest social position will tend to be assigned to the low acceptance-high aggression-high withdrawal category, and those in the highest social position to the high acceptance-low aggression-low withdrawal category.

TABLE 20.--*Analysis of reputation as measured by staff in relation to social position.

Social Position	Reputation Category		Total
	Highest	Lowest	
Upper Quartile	18	10	28
Lower Quartile	3	3	6
TOTAL	21	13	34

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = .0067, p. > .95$$

*The reputation hierarchy here is in the model predicted for a normal population (see Figures 2 and 4, pp. 78 and 80).

Since the highest and lowest reputation categories were both represented more strongly in the upper social position quartile than in the lower one, the null of independence between the variables of reputation and social position would have to be considered tenable.

However, when we look at the data for all social position quartiles, a different picture emerges:

TABLE 21.--*Analysis of Reputation as Measured by staff in relation to the entire range of social position.

Reputation Category	Social Quartile				Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
Highest	18	15	9	3	45
Lowest	10	3	6	3	22
TOTAL	28	18	15	6	67

$$\chi^2_{(3df)} = 3.4562, p > .05$$

*The reputation hierarchy here is in the model predicted for a normal population (see Figures 2 and 4, pp. 78-80).

Now we see a general pattern to the data such that, as social position increases, the frequency count in the highest reputation category increases. For a perfect correlation there should also have been a corresponding decrease in the lowest reputation category but, while this did not occur to the same degree, nevertheless, a nearly significant association between the two variables was established.

Hypothesis (5b): The components of reputation will be ordered by peers so that those in the lowest social position will tend to be assigned to the low acceptance-low aggression-high withdrawal category and those in the highest social position to the high acceptance-high aggression-low withdrawal category.

TABLE 22.--*Analysis of reputation as measured by peers
in relation to social position.

Social Position	Reputation Category		Total
	Highest	Lowest	
Upper Quartile	38	3	41
Lower Quartile	2	23	25
TOTAL	40	26	66

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = 43.1677, p < .001$$

*The reputation hierarchy here is in the model predicted for delinquents (see Figures 3 and 4, pp. 79 and 80.

The results show a very significant association between peer measures of reputation and the social positions of the individuals to whom they assign them. The research hypothesis is strongly supported with less than a probability of .001 that this result would occur by chance when the null is true.

If our assumptions concerning the value system of the delinquent are valid, this same relationship should exist throughout the whole range of social positions and reputations. An examination of Table 23 reveals almost precisely the predicted pattern, as the frequencies in the extreme reputation categories can be seen to vary directly with the change in social position (with one slight exception), while the middle categories remain fairly constant.

This same consistency of association is present within each quartile (again with one exception) so that the frequency varies directly in the top two social quartiles and inversely in the bottom quartiles.

TABLE 23.--Relationship of reputation to social position throughout the ranges as measured by peers.

Reputation Category	Social Quartile			
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Highest	38	30	8	2
Average of the middle categories	9	7	10	12
Lowest	3	18	24	23

Testing just the highest and lowest reputations through all four quartiles for independence we find the following:

TABLE 24.--*Analysis of reputation as measured by peers in relation to the entire range of social position.

Reputation Category	Social Quartile				Total
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	
Highest	38	30	8	2	78
Lowest	3	18	24	23	68
TOTAL	41	48	32	25	146

$$\chi^2 = 57.4940, p < .001$$

*The reputation hierarchy here is in the model predicted for delinquents (see Figure 3 and 4, pp. 79 and 80).

Thus we see a probability of less than one chance in one thousand that these two variables could be independent and the research hypothesis is accepted.

Results of Testing Hypothesis (5)

The results of this analysis offer strong support that a differential does, indeed, exist between staff and peers in the reputations on which they place social value and that the orderings of these reputations follow the general patterns predicted for them.

Reputation and Intelligence

We have seen previously that there appears to be a close and positive correlation between the hierarchy of personality variable combinations to which a group subscribes, and the degree to which they place social value on people. Further, these hierarchies apparently vary with the social statuses and roles of the membership which constitute the group doing the evaluating. We have also had previous evidence in this experiment that there is no significant relationship between intelligence and social position in the study group when equated for reputation.

But to what extent is reputation influenced by intelligence irrespective of social position? In other words, is intelligence also part of the total input which people consider when assigning other people a reputation

label? Also, is this factor utilized differently by delinquents than by others? Hypothesis (6) is designed to treat these questions.

Hypothesis (6a and b): Proportionately more non-retardates than retardates will be assigned above the median reputation category and proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will be placed below the median reputation category as rated by both staff and peer groups separately.

TABLE 25.--Analysis of reputation as measured by staff in relation to intelligence.

Reputation	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretarded	Retarded	
High	63	12	75
Low	102	14	116
TOTAL	165	26	191

$$x^2_{(1df)} = .9583, p. > .80$$

TABLE 26.--Analysis of reputation as measured by peers in relation to intelligence.

Reputation	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretarded	Retarded	
High	132	14	146
Low	136	17	153
TOTAL	268	31	299

$$x^2_{(1df)} = .0585, p. > .80$$

Both the tests showed reputation to be quite independent of intelligence. The null hypotheses are supported.

Results of Testing Hypothesis (6)

There appears to be no discrimination between intelligence groups by either staff or peers in assigning subjects to high and low reputation categories. The peer data shows an almost even split in cell frequencies, for almost a complete absence of relationship, while the staff showed an inclination toward loading of nonretardates in the low reputation components cell, while not discriminating among the retardates.

Even when only the lowest and highest reputation categories are considered (in order to bring out any association possibly screened out by the middle categories), the data for peers remains essentially split as seen below:

TABLE 27.--Analysis of the highest and lowest reputation categories as measured by peers in relation to intelligence.

Reputation Category	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretarded	Retarded	
Highest	70	8	78
Lowest	62	6	68
TOTAL	132	14	146

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = .0316, p. > .80$$

Similarly, the staff data shows little tendency toward influence on reputation by the intelligence variable.

TABLE 28.--Analysis of the highest and lowest reputation categories as measured by staff in relation to intelligence.

Reputation Category	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretarded	Retarded	
Highest	52	6	58
Lowest	28	2	30
TOTAL	80	8	88

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = .0316, p. > .80$$

Intelligence and Anomie

The last pages of Chapter II outline our concerns with anomie from the standpoints of both the delinquent in general and the delinquent-retardate in particular, and suggests possible approaches to investigating these interests. Our primary interest lies in the retardate and his relative alienation from, or integration with, the peer social system, but we are also concerned with his nonretarded compeers.

We have already postulated that the delinquent achieves homeostasis in his delinquent subculture within the institution after having experienced alienation in the community. The question then becomes, "Is the retardate also assimilated into this eunomic institutional social order, or is he rejected by his fellow delinquents as intellectually unworthy of membership?" By selecting

those whose social position and reputation scores were both above their medians and comparing them with those whose scores were both below their medians, for their proportions of retardates and nonretardates, it should be possible to determine an answer to this question (at least in accordance with our definition of anomie).

Hypothesis (7a and b): Proportionately more retardates than nonretardates will receive a combination of social position and reputation scores below the median and conversely, proportionately more nonretardates than retardates will receive a combination of social position and reputation scores above the median.

TABLE 29.--Analysis of anomie as measured by peers in relation to intelligence.

Anomie	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretarded	Retarded	
Low	99	8	107
High	112	14	126
TOTAL	211	22	233

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = .5194, p. > .30$$

Results of Testing Hypothesis (7)

The evidence above appears to support the null of no difference among intelligence groups in the degree to which they are alienated from the main group. A slight lean toward the more highly anomic in both groups, however,

is noted. Even at the extremes of reputation and social position this appears to be true, although an interesting reversal in directionality takes place, as seen below:

TABLE 30.--Analysis of anomie by highest and lowest reputations and social position quartiles as measured by peers in relation to intelligence.

Anomie	Intelligence Category		Total
	Nonretarded	Retarded	
Lowest	33	5	38
Highest	21	2	23
TOTAL	54	7	61

$$\chi^2_{(1df)} = .0133, p. > .90$$

This table shows that in a comparison of the extremes of social position and reputation we find more of each intelligence group in the best integrated category and the null still is found to be tenable.

Summary of the Analysis

In this chapter an attempt was made to describe the plan for examining the data and each hypothesis was first discussed in its various ramifications and then tested by means of the tests of the subhypotheses. Results were obtained in all cases and interpretations of the results

to the extent necessary were made. In some cases supplementary data was presented and analyzed as the main analysis required.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of the Study

The purposes of the study were stated to be:

1. To ascertain the social position of the educable mental retardate in the delinquency treatment facility
2. To investigate his behavioral adjustment, and
3. To study the nature of the social valuing system of a delinquent society, especially as it differs from that of the community-at-large.

In addition, anomie as a theory to explain delinquent-retardate deviant behavior was to be operationalized and tested.

A sociometric instrument and design were employed to gather and test the data derived from the responses of a population of institutionalized delinquents of both normal and inferior intelligence, along with a small sample of staff responses. Seven groups of hypotheses were developed and the main hypotheses were tested indirectly by means of the subhypotheses.

The design of the study consisted mainly of two parts:

- a. A pairing of the research variables in all possible combinations to test for independence.

- b. A combining of the personality variables into reputation components and exhausting all the alternatives in a facetized design to test against the other main research variables of intelligence and social position.

This design resulted in a seven section analysis involving intelligence and social position, intelligence and reciprocal choice, social position and adjustment, adjustment and intelligence, reputation and social position, reputation and intelligence, and intelligence and anomie. It is felt that all of the objectives of the study have been met in this analysis.

Conclusions

Before presenting the conclusions, a word of caution concerning inferences from the data should be made. Since X^2 is mainly a measure of independence between nominal variables, it cannot be assumed that rejection of the null of independence establishes a cause-and-effect relationship. At best we can only state whether or not there appears to be some measure of association, and unless we transform the results into a correlation by some means such as r_ϕ , we can say little concerning relationships.

1. Intelligence and Social Position

Unlike the preponderance of studies involving these variables, intelligence appeared to exert little, if any, influence on the social position of the delinquents in the institution. Even when the experiment was controlled for certain personality variables (i.e., reputation) no

significant relationship was established. There was an indication that the more severely retarded were viewed differentially and rejected but this was not at the level of significance.

Conclusion: There is no relationship between intelligence and social position and the research hypothesis is therefore rejected.

2. Intelligence and Reciprocal Choice

There was no significant evidence that intelligence was a factor in the reciprocal friendships established between residents. The retardates, however, appeared to be "friendlier," choosing friends both from within their own ranks and from the nonretardate group to a proportionately greater degree than did their more intellectually well endowed peers. In fact, they selected friends from their opposite numbers in a greater percentage of the potential cases than the nonretardates did of their own nonretarded membership.

Conclusion: The hypothesized positive association between reciprocal choice and similarity in intelligence was not verified.

3. Intelligence and Behavioral Adjustment

No evidence was presented to show an association between intelligence (at any of the three levels) and social acceptability by either staff or peer evaluations.

In aggression, although the directionality was as predicted, the staff data did not show a significant association of this variable with intelligence. The peer data, however, showed a definite inverse association between aggression and intelligence, significant at the .05 level and opposite to the research hypothesis.

The data on withdrawal for both staff and peers shows this variable to be independent of intelligence.

Conclusion: The hypothesis of an association between intelligence and adjustment is supported in part and rejected in the main. There appears to be an inverse association of aggression with intelligence.

4. Adjustment and Social Position

A very significant positive association between acceptance and social position by both staff and peer responses was established. The data for both staff and peers was significant at the .001 level.

There was no support for the research hypothesis of association between social position and aggression. A slight tendency for the social position to vary directly with the degree of aggression was noted.

The peer data showed the social position to vary inversely with the degree of withdrawal and to be significant at the .001 level. Curiously, the staff favored the

more withdrawn with higher social position, but not significantly so.

Of the three personality facets, acceptability was the most significantly associated with social position and may be considered the social position predictor in reputation. Withdrawal is also an important facet in peer evaluations of social position and in inverse association. Surprisingly, aggression was not found to be an important influence in either staff or peer evaluations.

Conclusion: The hypothesis of association between behavioral adjustment and social position was partially verified. The predicted associations between acceptance and social position, and withdrawal and social position, were supported (acceptance by both rating groups and withdrawal by peers only). The hypothesis concerning aggression was rejected.

5. Reputation and Social Position

A very significant association between reputation and social position was apparent in the peer data and one almost at the level of significance was found in the staff data. The hypothesized peer social valuing model was almost exactly reproduced by the actual evaluations. A difference between the people-valuing models for staff and peers was established.

Conclusion: The hypothesis of association between social position and reputation and the predicted differential between staff and peer valuing systems were supported.

6. Reputation and Intelligence

No significant influence of intelligence on reputation was found in either staff or peer data. Even when the experiment was extended out to the extremes of reputation components to increase sensitivity to intelligence effects, the data failed to produce significant results.

Conclusion: The research hypothesis of a direct association between reputation and intelligence was rejected.

7. Intelligence and Anomie

There was no significant difference between intelligence groups in their proneness toward an anomic relationship in the subculture. The data showed only slight evidence of inclination toward the hypothesis in that a greater proportion of retardates than nonretardates fell below the median but this could be due to chance. It is noteworthy that a greater proportion of both groups fell into the highly anomic category. It is only in a comparison of the extremes of reputation and social position that the frequency balance turns in favor of the integrated delinquents, but even here it favored both intelligence

groups and supported the null of independence between these two variables.

Conclusion: The research hypothesis that the retardate would be more anomic was not found tenable.

General Study Conclusions

1. Intelligence is apparently not a factor in the study group's determination of the social positions of their peers and the retardates did not suffer status loss by reason of their intellectual impairment.
2. Intelligence was a factor in the behavioral adjustment of the institutionalized delinquents in this study only in that the retardates appeared to be more mal-aggressive.
3. Social acceptability was the predictor variable in determining social position of this group of institutionalized delinquents and aggressiveness appeared to have little influence on social status.
4. A differential appeared to exist between these institutionalized delinquents and the staff who supervised them in the hierarchy of reputations in their respective social value systems. Staff placed highest value on those who were perceived to be accepted-nonaggressive-interactors while the delinquents valued the accepted-aggressive-interactors above all others. At the bottom of the social ladder, in this group of institutionalized delinquents, was the nonaccepted-nonaggressive-noninteractor.
5. This study neither supported nor refuted the assumption that the delinquent social system is eunomic even though a somewhat greater proportion were shown to be alienates.
6. The retardate in this study was apparently no more anomic than his nonretarded compeers.
7. The retardate in this experiment definitely was not an isolate.

CHAPTER VI

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Implications of the Study

Introduction

As suggested in the preceding chapter, with a statistic such as chi square, the outcomes of application of this test must be treated conservatively. Drawing inferences from data obtained by assigning groups with similar characteristics to categories, and then comparing the categories, leaves considerable latitude for spurious associations to attain the "respectability" of cause-and-effect relationships from "scientific" methodology. For instance, it is entirely possible that, because of the relatively small group, all of the high retardates in this experiment may have been brown eyed and all of the low retardates blue eyed, but it would be capricious on our part to impute causality to this observation with any personality differential existing between these two groups. 1

It is for this reason that the experiment attempted to exhaust all the possible combinations of variables involved, in order to gather maximum evidence concerning social position and adjustment as they are influenced by intelligence.

As a result, it is with the confidence borne of conservative treatment and restraint that the following implications are discussed, keeping mindful of our earlier imposed limitation that the nature of our data and methodology do not allow for generalization to the universe of training schools for delinquents.

Intelligence and Social Position

The inference from the study is very clear regarding the influence of intelligence on social position. Delinquents in the training school under study simply did not discriminate in friendship selections on the basis of the intellectual capacities of their compeers. The implications of this finding, should future replications offer confirmation, could have a profound effect on the policies governing transfer of residents between training schools serving delinquents and those serving the mentally retarded. What is implied is that no social sanctions are invoked in the training school against inmates as a result of their lower intellectual functioning. What discriminations do show up appear to be associated with the social malaggression attending the intellectual retardation, as a function of low impulse control, rather than from the intellectual difference per se. Since social labeling was not found to exist, the study indicates that, to the extent that this institution is representative of most, training schools for resocialization of

delinquents are a suitable medium for rehabilitation of retarded delinquents, provided they plan for and meet their special social and academic needs. In fact, by comparison with studies done in the heterogeneously grouped classrooms of the public school, the training school offers a particularly well suited milieu for the retardates need to find social acceptance and social success. Another factor in the institution's favor is the relatively greater opportunities afforded its members to accrue social prestige through activities associated more with performance than with cognition.

The potential danger included in the finding of no differences in the social positions of the normal and retarded subjects in the study, lies in the possibility that the existence of members with special academic needs (i.e. the retardates) among the institutional population is simply not recognized (in much the same way that public schools appear to ignore their social needs), and that these unique needs will therefore not be provided for. Perhaps, the public school and the institution can learn from each other in creating an atmosphere conducive to both social and academic gains to insure the retardate opportunity to function optimally in the community.

Intelligence and Reciprocal Choice

Perhaps the most significant implication to be derived from this area of the study is the realization

that retardates may have something to offer society as well as needs to be met.

While no significant results were obtained to establish that retardates differed materially in reciprocal social relationships, as a group they tended to seek friends among all members of the population to a greater degree than did the control group. Perhaps this is due to a lack of social sophistication but, if so, this quality should be reinforced and supported by our educational institutions to make mutual trust and confidence in our fellow men an integral social characteristic of our society. That the retardates possessed this quality to a greater degree, is evidence, perhaps, that not all the desirable personality factors in human beings are positively correlated with intelligence. The honesty, authenticity, generosity, selflessness, and true love of living things, often observed among mentally retarded and deficient children, (although not measured in this study) ought to be preserved or inculcated in all our children as they grow to maturity.

Intelligence and Behavioral Adjustment

Of the three measures of adjustment--acceptability, aggression and withdrawal--it was only in aggression that a significant difference was obtained. That the retardate tends to be more malaggressive appears to be undeniable,

but it should be emphasized that this in no way imputes a relationship between low intelligence per se and this undesirable facet of personality. Rather, it is more likely the product of social conditioning and frustration, attending the retardation as a result of persistent failure to compete successfully in the intellectual "track meet" which characterizes the daily school routines of all children in our society. This confirmation of studies done in the public schools may be an indicator that institutions are as prone as other educational systems to placing unrealistic expectations for behavioral conformity on retardates. The fact that he tended to choose more friends than did the nonretardate is evidence that the retardate is not antisocial.

The retardate, then, is not dominated by his peers, as it was postulated he would be, and does not withdraw and alienate himself from the group; nor was he found to be any more or less acceptable to the members of his society than were the subjects with normal intellect.

This finding implies that we must continue to seek ways to provide the stimulation of intellectually heterogeneous interactions among our children while reducing the competitive aspects of these relationships. The retardate might, under these conditions, have less need to act out

hostilely and could utilize his demonstrated ability to be an acceptable outgoing member of his social group.

Adjustment and Social Position

The results indicated a very strong positive association between acceptance and social position, a somewhat less intense negative association between the tendency to withdraw and social position, and no significant association (although some positive tendencies existed) between aggression and social position. The implications of these findings are of considerable importance.

First of all, it confirms the writings of Merton¹ concerning the normalcy of the delinquent value system, as well as the hypotheses of this study concerning the delinquent's viewing of acceptability and withdrawal. Secondly, it refutes the literature in general, and the hypothesis in this study in particular, concerning the delinquent's attitude toward aggressiveness. Social acceptability and social isolation are as prime factors in the delinquents' people-valuing system as they are in society in general, and aggressiveness appears to be much less important than is commonly assumed. The tendency for the staff to associate withdrawal positively with social position supports the well-documented observation

¹See page 55.

of teachers that they tend to equate self-isolation with conformity and reward it with social approval, when it should be treated with as much concern as malaggression and hyperactivity. It also confirms the many researchers¹ who found children to be more reliable than adults in judging peer social position.

The main implication of this section, however, lies in the finding that delinquents, while slightly inclined to value aggression in their friends, generally demonstrate the same culturally induced attitudes toward peer personality factors taken individually, as do typical children. This indicates that treatment programs for delinquents need not deviate markedly from the social adjustment approaches used with typical children in effecting their resocialization. Identification figures for delinquents to use as models, for instance, can be the same historical and contemporary heroes as are held up to typical children as mirror images for maturity (save, perhaps, for the addition of outstanding members of the minority groups so heavily represented among delinquents).

Reputation and Social Position

The strongest evidence produced in this study was in the finding that the predicted hierarchies of reputations by both peers and staff were confirmed by the data.

¹See page 71.

Social position was associated with reputation to a marked degree and a definite differential between staff and peers in reputation orderings was noted. While the delinquents gave social approval to the acceptable-aggressive-interactor, the staff sanctioned the acceptable-nonaggressive-interactor. It would appear that the delinquents are more reality oriented than staff in selecting as their social ideal, the reputation component best suited for the violent world in which the delinquent must exist.

Reputation and Intelligence

Since the retardate was seen to differ from the control group in displaying a greater degree of aggression, and since the aggressive, outgoing delinquent enjoyed the greatest peer social approval of all the various reputations, it is not surprising that the retardate was found to be associated as often with high reputations as were his mentally better endowed compeers. Equipped in this way, the retardate should be able to function as well as the others in this subculture. Perhaps all that is needed is for treatment programs for this type youngster to emphasize impulse control in order to keep aggression within manageable limits.

Intelligence and Anomie

The retardate was found to be no more anomic than the nonretardates in the study. This implies that, unlike



his alienated position in society, the retardate achieves homeostasis within the institutional social system. The fact that the delinquents tended to consign more of their members to the anomic category than to a socially integrated status merely indicates the general reliability of their appraisals. Added support is seen in the finding that both intelligence groups appeared in approximate proportions among the most and least anomic.

It would appear, then, that in the inmate social system, value is placed not on where one lives, nor on who one's parents are, nor on what clothing one wears (since all wear essentially the same) nor on how intelligent one is (since this can be a negative value in the institution under subtle staff pressure to conform to rather rigid behavioral expectations), but on what one can do. Thus, the borderline defective who can physically assert himself, either legitimately through athletics or illegitimately through fighting, can win the subservience, and often the friendship, of his peers.

Recommendations

1. The study shows the mentally retarded boy able to compete on even terms for social position in the training school for delinquents. This outcome, coupled with the intellectual challenge

and stimulation of heterogeneous groupings, would dictate a recommendation that delinquent retardates continue to be placed in these facilities.

2. It is recommended that staff development programs in residential treatment centers for delinquents emphasize the need to create an institutional atmosphere in which student leadership can accede from desirable social qualities rather than from such undesirable personality manifestations as malaggression and hostile acting out. This leadership in the informal system of the inmates must be recognized and rewarded by the formal system of the staff.
3. More efficient means of individualization of treatment should be developed through prescription programming to insure structured opportunity for goal achievement by socially prescribed means. This should reduce movement toward an anomic behavioral style in the community and produce a more socially conforming adaptive mode.
4. Treatment programming for delinquents should take cognizance of the difference between their social valuing and that of greater society. Staff members should be chosen with the greatest care to present identification figures in the

form of young, vigorous males who epitomize acceptable social values, but who have the contemporary social awareness and aggressiveness to gain the respect, admiration, and loyalty of their charges. Liaison between a nearby community and the treatment center must be established so that program activities can reach out and involve social interactions with community institutions (i.e., church, school, YMCA, etc.) which can provide appropriate peer models. With saturation from these sources and the saliency created by an accepting and empathic staff, a shift in delinquent social valuing toward congruence with the values of the community should be attained.

Problems for Further Study

1. Gain further evidence concerning the relative anomia of delinquents in the following way: Operationalize Merton's paradigm of anomie in a sociometric instrument which will identify each of the five types of social adaptation he defines, and establish the social position of each type in both a training school and a public school setting for comparison purposes.
2. Study the effects of institutional size and the nature of its program on delinquency

treatment as follows: Identify, by sociometric means, malaggressive and cooperative members in the following types of institutions: a large, custody-oriented training school for delinquent boys; a large, residential institution for delinquent boys which utilizes an activity program as the treatment agent; a large, residential institution for disturbed children with a coeducational program; a small residential facility featuring an intensive, individualized, social casework approach; a small psychiatrically oriented residential institution. Determine the differences which may exist among these institutions in the relative social statuses of the two types of membership, as measured by both staff and peers.

3. Investigate the influences of leadership type and school climate on changes in delinquent social values by the following means: Within one institution for delinquents, randomly assign a sample of new arrivals to domiciling units organized and administered along one of two lines, either autocratic or democratic. Sociometrically identify "hostile" and "friendly" members within both groups and establish their relative social standings in the groups at two

chronological stages: one month and six months after entering the program. Compare the two groups at both periods of time for changes in attitude toward peers.

4. Further study the relationship between low intelligence and certain personality characteristics and social position as follows: Make a detailed analysis, utilizing available casework materials and staff evaluations, to assess and classify the personality variables of a selected sample of institutionalized delinquents who score below 70 on an intelligence test. Establish their social positions in an intellectually heterogeneous group by sociometric means. Factor analyze the resulting data for differential influence of intellectual impairment and personality variables on social position.
5. Investigate the effects on social position of the nature of the program activities by the following means: Do a replication of the present study, utilizing only those delinquents who score either above 100 or below 75 on an intelligence test. Equate for length of time in residence. Redesign the sociometric instrument to provide for social rejections as well as social choices by both staff and peers. Gather the data in two contrasting environments within

the institution; academic (classroom) and social (cottage). Compare the results from these two areas.

6. Make further investigation into the facet of aggression in its relation to the social position of delinquents in a delinquent social system.

Summary of the Investigation

This investigation was primarily concerned with the social status of the mental retardate in an institution for delinquents. He was found to be as popular a member of the institutional social system, to enjoy as high a reputation, and to be as relatively free of anomia (within the institution) as was his more intellectually typical cottage mate. He exhibited a significantly greater malaggression, but was still as acceptable, and no more withdrawing, than was the nonretardate.

Assuming that it could meet his other needs, the main implication of these findings was that the institution was a socially suitable milieu for the retarded delinquent's treatment.

In the secondary order of inquiries, acceptability and gregariousness (low withdrawal) were established as of the same importance to a delinquent's social position as they appear to be among more typical children, while

aggression was found not to be a significant factor in delinquent popularity. In the valuing of reputations, however, delinquents demonstrated their preference for a different ordering than did the staff who supervised them and gave highest status to the acceptable and aggressive interactor.

It is our belief that the study revealed some evidence that the delinquent may see his compeers as estranged and alienated and that, while his attitude toward clusters of personality traits in other people is apparently different from the staff who supervised him, his reactions to these personality characteristics taken individually is quite typical and conforming. Other than the differential in reputation valuing, there was little in the investigation to indicate innovation style of behavior in the Merton sense. The retardate also failed to live up to expectations, showing none of the retreatist or ritualistic life style that had been predicted for him. In the confines of the institution at least, the retarded delinquent is quite conforming and integrated socially.

Ways must be sought to assist this youth to the same social integration level in the community that he has secured within the residential institution. To put the problem in Trippe's (1960) words:

Social cooperation with value attached to individual pursuits, performance in line with ability, freedom from anxiety, and social as well as economic security for all, are goals which need to be actively sought.

While delinquency and mental retardation are shown by incidence figures to be associated with our lowest socioeconomic class more than with any other, the social problems which they create beset the whole of society and involve us all in their solutions. We must insure that as our present socioeconomic class system is altered by the "War on Poverty" to produce the "Great Society," we do not give rise to an intellectual caste.

"There is a destiny that makes us brothers:
None goes his way alone,
All that we send into the lives of others
Comes back into our own."

. . . Edwin Markham

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1 . Ainsworth, S. H. An exploratory study of educational, social and emotional factors in the education of mentally retarded children in georgia public schools. Athens: University of Georgia, 1959.
- 2 . Albee, G. W., and Pascal, G. R. "A study of competitive behavior in mental defectives," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1951, 55:567-581.
- 3 . Alexander, T. and Alexander, M. "A study of personality and social status," Child Development, September, 1952, 23:207-213.
- 4 . Almack, J. C. "The influence of intelligence on the selection of associates," School and Society, November 4, 1922, 16:529-530.
- 5 . Ausubel, D. P., and Schiff, H. M. "A preliminary study of developmental trends in socioempathy: accuracy of perception of own and others' socio-metric status," Child Development, 1952, 23:111-128.
- 6 . Baldwin, W. K. "The social position of mentally handicapped children in the regular classes in the public school," Excep. Child, 1958, 25:106-108, 112.
- 7 . Baller, W. R. "A study of the present social status of a group of adults who, when they were in the elementary schools, were classified as mentally deficient," Genet. Psychol. Monog., 1936, 18:165-244.
- 8 . Barbe, W. B. "Peer relationships of children of different intelligence levels," School and Society, August 21, 1954, 80:60-62.
- 9 . Becker, H. S. Outsiders, studies in the sociology of deviance. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.
- 10 . _____. The other side: perspectives on deviance. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- 11 . Bijou, S. W. "The special problem of motivation in the academic learning of the retarded child," Excep. Child. 1952, 19:103-104, 120.

12. Blatt, B. "The physical personality and academic status of children who are mentally retarded attending special classes as compared with children who are mentally retarded attending regular classes," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, March, 1958, 62:810-818.
13. Bobroff, A. "Economic adjustment of 121 adults formerly students in classes for the mental retardates," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1956, 60:525-535.
14. Bolduc, T. E. "Social value-need patterns in mental retardates." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Pennsylvania State, 1959.
15. Bonney, M. E. "Personality traits of socially successful and socially unsuccessful children," Journal of Educational Psychology, November, 1943, 34:449-472.
16. _____. "Sociometric study of agreement between teacher judgments and student choices: in regard to the numbers of friends possessed by high school students," Sociometry, 1947, 10:133-146.
17. Bowman, P. "The defective delinquent," American Journal of Psychiatry, 1957, 114:147-151.
18. Bredemeyer, H. C. Toby, Marcia L., and Riley, Matilda W., Chapter VI, "Reputation," in Riley, Matilda W., Riley, J. W. Jr., and Toby J. Sociological Studies in Scale Analysis. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1954.
19. Bronfenbrenner, U. "A constant frame of reference for sociometric research: Part II, experiment and inference," Sociometry, 1944, 7:40-75.
20. _____. "The measurement of sociometric status: structure and development," Sociom. Monogr. New York: Beacon House, 1945, No. 6.
21. Brown, D. "Factors affecting social acceptance of high school students," The School Review, 1954, 62:151-155.
22. Caditz, Sylvan B. "Effect of a training school experience on the personality of delinquent boys," Journal of Consult. Psychol., December, 1959, 23:501-509.

23. Capobianco, R. J., and Cole, Dorothy A. "Social behavior of mentally retarded children," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1960, 64:638-651.
24. Cassidy, Viola M., and Phelps, H. R. Postschool Adjustment of Slow Learning Children: A Study of Persons Previously Enrolled in Special Classes in Ohio. Columbus: Bureau of Special and Adult Education, Ohio State University, 1955.
25. Cassidy, Viola, and Stanton, Jeannette E. An Investigation of Factors Involved in the Educational Placement of Mentally Retarded Children. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1959.
26. Channing, Alice. Employment of Mentally Deficient Boys and Girls. Children's Bureau Pub. No. 210. Washington D. C.: U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1932.
27. Charles, D.C. "Ability and accomplishment of persons earlier judged mentally deficient," Genet. Psychol. Monogr., 1953, 47:3-71.
28. Clark, A. D. B. "A symposium: the social adjustment of the mentally deficient.--I. recent english research," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1957, 62:295-299.
29. Cloward, R. A. "Illegitimate means, anomie, and deviant behavior," American Sociol. Rev., April, 1959, 24:164-176.
30. _____. "Social control and anomie: A study of a prison community." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1959.
31. Collmann, R. D., and Newlyn, D. "Employment success of educationally subnormal ex-pupils in England," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1956, 60: 733-743.
32. _____. "Employment success of mentally dull and intellectually normal ex-pupils in England," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1957, 61: 484-490.
33. Cromwell, R. L. "Selected aspects of personality development in mentally retarded children," Excep. Child., 1961, 28:44-51.

34. Dahlke, H. O. "Determinants of sociometric relations among children in the elementary school," Sociometry, 1953, 16:327-338.
35. Davidson, Helen H., and Lang, G. "Children's perception of their teachers' feelings toward them related to self-perception, school achievement, and behavior," Journal of Exp. Educ., 1960, 29:107-118.
36. Davis, P. "Emotional problems of the retarded child," Training School Bulletin, 1951, 48:50-56.
37. Dexter, L. A. "A social theory of mental deficiency," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, March, 1958, 62:920-928.
38. _____. "On the politics and sociology of stupidity in our society," in Becker, H. S. The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
39. Dinger, J. C. "Post-school adjustment of former educable retarded pupils," Excep. Child., March, 1961, 7:353-360.
40. Doll, E. "Understanding and acceptance," Excep. Child., 1952, 19:105-106.
41. Dunnington, Margaret. "Behavioral differences of sociometric status groups in a nursery," Child Development, 1957, 28:103-111.
42. Durkheim, E. Suicide. Glencoe, Illinois The Free Press, 1951.
43. Elenbogen, M. L. "A comparative study of some aspects of academic and social adjustment of two groups of mentally retarded children in special classes and in regular grades," Dissertation Abstract, 1957, 17:2496.
44. English, H. B., and English, Ava C. A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytic Terms. New York: Longmans, Green, 1958.
45. Erikson, Kai T. "Notes on the sociology of deviance," in Becker, H. S. The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

11

46. Foale, Martha. "The special difficulties of the high grade mental defective adolescent," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1956, 60:867-877.
47. Furfey, P. H. "Some factors influencing the selection of boys' chums," Journal of Applied Psychol., March, 1927, 11:47-51.
48. Gardner, W. I., and Nisonger, H. W. "A manual on program development in mental retardation," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, Vol. 66, Supplement No. 4. Willimantic, Conn.: American Association on Mental Deficiency, 1962.
49. Getzels, J. W., and Jackson, P. W. "The teacher's personality and characteristics," in Gage, N. L. (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.
50. Glueck, S. and Eleanor. One Thousand Juvenile Delinquents: Their Treatment by Court and Clinic. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Press, 1934.
51. Golding, W. Lord of the Flies. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.
52. Grace, H. A. and Booth, Nancy Lou. "Is the gifted child a social isolate?" Peabody J. Educ., 1958, 35:195-196.
53. Grann, L. R. "The relationship between academic achievement of pupils and the social structure of the classroom," Rural Sociol., March, 1956, 21: 179-180.
54. Gronlund, N. E. "The accuracy of teachers' judgments concerning the sociometric status of sixth-grade pupils," Sociometry Monogr., 1951, No. 25.
55. _____. "Relationship between the sociometric status of pupils and teachers' preferences for or against having them in class," Sociometry, 1953, 16: 142-150.
56. _____. "The relative ability of homeroom teachers and special subject teachers to judge the social acceptability of pre-adolescent pupils," Journal of Educ. Res., 1955, 48:381-391.

1

57. _____. "The general ability to judge sociometric status: elementary student teachers' sociometric perceptions of classmates and pupils," Journal of Educ. Psychol., 1956, 47:147-157.
58. _____. Sociometry in the classroom. New York: Harper, 1959.
59. Grossman, B., and Wrighter, J. "The relationship between selection-rejection, intelligence, social status, and personality amongst sixth grade children," Sociometry, December, 1958, 11:346-355.
60. Guertin, W. H., Rabin, A. I., Frank, G. H., and Ladd, C. E. "Research with the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for adults: 1955-60," Psychological Bulletin, January, 1962, 59:1-26.
61. Guttman, L. "A structural theory for intergroup beliefs and action," American Sociological Review, June, 1959, 24:318-328.
62. Hays, W. "Mental level and friend selection among institutionalized defective girls," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, July, 1951, 56:198-203.
63. Hsia, Jui-Ching. A Study of Sociability of Elementary School Children. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.
64. Hunter, E. C. "Changes in teachers' attitudes toward children's behavior over the last thirty years," Ment. Hyg. N. Y., 1957, 41:3-11.
65. Itoga, K. and Tanaka, M. "A study of the prognosis of social adjustment of the feeble minded," Japanese Journal of Educ. Psychol., 1956, 3:204-213, in Psychol. Abs., 1958, 32:4313.
66. Jennings, H. H. Leadership and isolation. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950.
67. Johnson, G. O. "A study of the social position of mentally handicapped children in the regular grades," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, July, 1950, 55:60-89.

68. _____. A Comparative Study of the Personal and Social Adjustment of Mentally Handicapped Children Placed in Special Classes With Mentally Handicapped Children Who Remain in Regular Classes. Syracuse: Syracuse University Research Institute, Office of Research in Special Education and Rehabilitation, 1961.
69. _____. "Special education for the mentally handicapped--a paradox," Excep. Child., October, 1962, 29:62-69.
70. _____. and Kirk S. "Are mentally handicapped children segregated in the regular grades?" Excep. Child., December, 1950, 17:65-68, 87-88.
71. Jordan, A. M. "Social traits of mentally handicapped children," in Thurstone, T. G. An Evaluation of Educating Mentally Handicapped Children in Special Classes and in Regular Classes. Chapel Hill: School of Education, University of North Carolina, 1959.
72. _____. "Peer acceptance of mentally handicapped," Research Relating to Mentally Retarded Children, No. 1, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1960.
73. Jordan, T. E., and DeCharms, R. "The achievement motive in normal and mentally retarded children," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1959, 64: 457-466.
74. Kennedy, Ruby J. The Social Adjustment of Morons in a Connecticut City. Hartford (Mansfield-Southbury): Social Service Department, 1948.
75. Kinney, Elva Elma. "Study of peer group social acceptability at the fifth grade level in a public school," Journal of Ed. Res., September, 1953, 47:57-64.
76. Kolstoe, O. P. "An examination of some characteristics which discriminate between employed and not-employed mentally retarded males," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, November, 1961, 66:472-482.
77. Kvaraceus, W. C. Juvenile Delinquency and the School. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y.: World Book Co., 1945.

78. _____. "Acceptance, rejection and exceptionality," Excep. Child., 1956, 22:328-331.
79. _____. "Some cultural aspects of delinquency," Federal Probation, March, 1959, 23:8-12.
80. _____. "Alienated youth here and abroad," Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1963, 45:87-90.
81. Lapp, Esther R. "A study of the social adjustment of slow-learning children who were assigned part-time to regular classes," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, September, 1957, 62:254-262.
82. Laughlin, F. The Peer Status of Sixth and Seventh Grade Children. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1954.
83. Lewis, W. W. Jr. "The construct validation of a reputation test." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Geo. Peabody College for Teachers, 1959.
84. Lichtenstein, M., and Brown, A. W. "Intelligence and achievement of children in a delinquency area," Journal of Juv. Res., 1938, 22:1-25.
85. Lippitt, R. "An experimental study of the effect of democratic and authoritarian group atmospheres. studies in topological and vector psychology," University of Iowa Stud. Child Welf., 1940, 16:43-195.
86. Littell, W. M. "The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children: review of a decade of research," Psychol. Bulletin, 1960, 57:132-156.
87. Lucito, L. J. "A comparison of the independence-conformity behavior of intellectually bright and dull children," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois, 1959.
88. MacIver, R. M. The Ramparts We Guard. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950.
89. Mackie, R., Williams, H., and Dunn, L. Teachers of Children Who Are Mentally Retarded. U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, No. 3, 1957.
90. Martin, Frances. "Personality development and social adjustment of mentally retarded children," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, September, 1941, 46:94-101.

91. McCandless, B. R., Castaneda, A., and Palermo, D. S. "Anxiety in children and social status," Child Develop., 1956, 27:385-391.
92. McClelland, D. C. The Achieving Society. Princeton: D. VanNostrand, 1961.
93. Merton, R. Social Theory and Social Structure. 2nd ed. revised. Glencoe Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.
94. Metfessel, M. and Lovell, Constance. "Recent " literature on individual correlates of crime," Psychol. Bulletin, March, 1942, 39:133-164.
95. Miller, R. V. "Social status and socioempathic differences among mentally superior, mentally typical and mentally retarded children," Excep. Child., December, 1956, 23:114-119.
96. Moreno, J. L. Who Shall Survive: A New Approach to the Problem of Human Relationships. (revised). New York: Beacon House, 1952.
97. Mullen, Frances A., and Itkin, W. Achievement and Adjustment of Educable Mentally Handicapped Children in Special Classes and in Regular Grades. Chicago: Chicago Board of Education and Department of Public Instruction of the State of Illinois, 1961.
98. Myers, R. K. "Teachers' judgment of social success and sociometric scores," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1961, 65:462-466.
99. Newcomb, T. M. The Acquaintance Process. New York: Holt, 1961.
100. Newman, J. R. and Loos, F. M. "Differences between verbal and performance IQ's with mentally defective children on the Wechsler Intelligence Scales for children," Journal of Consult. Psychol., 1955, 19:16.
101. O'Conner, N. "Defectives working in the community," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1954, 59:173-180.
102. Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J. and Tannenbaum, P. H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1957.

103. Palk, B. E. "Relationship between classroom climate and pupil behavior with educable retardates," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Geo. Peabody College for Teachers, 1962.
104. Peckham, R. A. "Problems in job adjustment of the mentally retarded," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1951, 56:448-453.
105. Peterson, L. and Smith, L. L. "The post-school adjustment of educable mentally retarded adults in comparison with that of adults of normal intelligence," Excep. Child., 1960, 26:404-408.
106. Phelps, H. R. "Post-school adjustment of mentally retarded children in selected Ohio cities," Excep. Child., November, 1956, 23:58-62, 91.
107. Pope, B. "Prestige values in contrasting socio-economic groups of children," Psychiat., 1953, 16:381-385.
108. Porter, R. B., and Milazzo, T. C. "A comparison of mentally retarded adults," Excep. Child., 1958, 24:410-412.
109. Reynolds, M. C., and Stunkard, C. L. A Comparative Study of Day Class vs. Institutionalized Educable Retardates. Minneapolis: University of Minn., 1960.
110. Riesman, D. The Lonely Crowd. 2nd ed. revised. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.
111. Riley, Matilda W., Riley, J. W. Jr., and Toby, J. Sociological Studies in Scale Analysis. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1954.
112. Rogers, V. M. "What teachers should know about automation," N.E.A. Journal, October, 1963, 52:50-52, 69.
113. Rotman, D. B. "Alcoholism and crime," Federal Probation. September, 1947, 11:31-33.
114. Seashore, H. G., Wesman, A., and Doppelt, J. "The standardization of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children," Journal of Consult. Psychol., 1950, 14:99-110.

115. _____. "Differences between verbal and performance IQ's on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children," Journal of Consult. Psychol., 1951, 15:62-67.
116. Seeman, M. "On the meaning of alienation," American Sociological Review, 1959, 24:783-791.
117. Shulman, H. "Intelligence and delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, March-April, 1951, 41:763-781.
118. Sim, F. M., and Beech, M. J. Analysis of Contingency Table (Act II) for the C.D.C. 3600. MSU CISSR Technical Report No. 4, January 27, 1964.
119. Sloan, W., and Schneider, B. "A study of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children with mental defectives," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1951, 55:573-575.
120. Slobetz, F. "Elementary teachers' reactions to school situations," Journal of Educ. Res., 1950, 44:81-90.
121. Spector, S. I. "Climate and social acceptability," Journal of Educ. Sociol., 1953, 27:108-114.
122. Stacey, C. L., and Levin, Janice. "Correlation analysis of scores of subnormal subjects on the Stanford-Binet and Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1951, 55:590-597.
123. Stern, G. G. Chapter IX, "Measuring noncognitive variables in research on teaching," in Gage, N. L. Handbook of Research in Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1963.
124. Stevenson, H. W., and Knights, R. M. "The effectiveness of social reinforcement after brief and extended institutionalization," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, January, 1962, 66:589-594.
125. Stouffer, G. A. W. "The attitudes of secondary school teachers towards certain behavior problems of children," Sch. Rev., 1956, 64:358-362.
126. Sutherland, J. S., et al. "A sociometric study of institutionalized mental defectives," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, October, 1954, 59:266-271.

127. Tenenbaum, S. "The teacher, the middle class, the lower class," Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1963, 45:82-86.
128. Thorpe, J. G. "An investigation into some correlates of sociometric status within school classes," Sociometry, 1955, 18:49-61.
129. Thurstone, Thelma G. An Evaluation of Educating Mentally Handicapped Children in Special Classes and in Regular Grades. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1959.
130. Tizard, J. "The effects of different types of supervision on the behaviour of mental defectives in a sheltered workshop," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, July, 1953, 58:143-161.
131. _____. and O'Conner, N. The Social Problem of Mental Deficiency, New York: Pergamon Press, 1956.
132. Trent, R. D. "The relationship of anxiety to popularity and rejection among institutionalized delinquent boys," Child Development, 1957, 28:379-384.
133. Trippe, M. "The social psychology of exceptional children: Part II in terms of factors in society," Excep. Child., November, 1959, 26:137-140, December, 1959, 26:171-175, 188, January, 1960, 26:243-247.
134. Turner, Mildred W. "A comparison of the social status of mentally retarded children enrolled in special classes." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1958.
135. Waisanew, F. B. "Some theoretical convergencies in the social psychology of alienation," Eighth InterAmerican Congress of Psychology, Mar del Plata, Argentina, April, 1963.
136. Walker, G. H. "Social and emotional problems of the mentally retarded child," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1950, 55:132-138.
137. Wallin, J. E. Wallace. The Education of Mentally Handicapped Children. New York: Harper Bros., 1955.

138. Washburne, C., and Heil, L. M. "What characteristics of teachers affect children's growth?" Sch. Rev., 1960, 68:420-428.
139. Weber, Hilda. "The borderline defective delinquent," Brit. Journal of Delinq., 1953, 3:173-184.
140. Wechsler, D. The Measurement and Appraisal of Adult Intelligence. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Co., 1958.
141. Westwell, A. E. "The defective delinquent," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1951, 56: 283-289.
142. Wilson, Mamie L. T. A Comparative Study of the Speech Responses and Social Ages of Two Selected Groups of Educable Mental Retardates. Grambling: Grambling College of Louisiana, 1960.
143. Witmer, L., and Kotinsky, R. (ed.) New Perspectives for Research on Juvenile Delinquency. Children's Bureau Pub. No. 356. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, 1956.
144. Wolfenstein, M. Children's Humor, A Psychological Analysis. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1954.

APPENDIX A
LENGTHY FOOTNOTES

1. Both the WISC and WAIS were designed so that $PIQ - VIQ = 0$. Investigations have revealed, however, that differences within a certain range can be expected as a result of measurement errors and test insensitivities. In the WAIS, for example, it has been determined that a difference in excess of 25 points would have to be obtained before reaching the level of statistical significance (Guertin et al., 1962). The general assumption underlying full scale scores is that the "g" factor in intelligence (See Wechsler, 1958, p.12) operates equally throughout the subtests to provide an homogeneity of variance. When deviations greater than those determined as nonsignificant for a particular test occur, the assumption of equality of means among subtest scores can no longer obtain. When this is the case, it is reasonable to assume that the instrument is differentially measuring the individual's intellectual functioning. The source of this differential is of interest to us. Also, an analysis of how this differential operates is very germane to this definition, especially as it would affect the verbal and performance scale scores of those who are actually retarded. Errors of measurement introduced by the examiner, of course, are one cause of these differences. Variables within the individual himself, such as mental and emotional health, at the time of testing, are another. A particularly significant source of difference lies in the test's insensitivity to variables affecting whole groups of people. There is considerable evidence, for instance, (Newman & Loos, 1955; Sloan & Schneider, 1951; Stacey and Levin, 1951) that the type of mental defective likely to be found in an institution for delinquents (i.e., familial undifferentiated types) obtains significantly higher Performance scores than Verbal on the WISC, although Seashore's (1951) study controvenes this finding. Similarly, Seashore et al. (1950) found that children whose parents had higher occupational statuses obtained higher Verbal than Performance scores. Littell (1960) cites studies which show test insensitivity to southern Negro children, bilingual children, and children of differing socioeconomic status to the extent that the suitability of the WISC for those populations was questioned (p. 146-7). All these variables contribute to an expected mean difference between VIQ and PIQ of something other than zero. In the WISC, for instance, this expected difference has been determined to be 8.07 points (Newman & Loos, 1955). Our main concern, however, is not what is normal but what is deviant, since we are interested only in insuring that our research group will, in fact, contain those actually

retarded and not pseudoretardates whose social competency could bias the data. The question then becomes a two-fold one; how great a difference is needed before we become suspicious of the full scale score as a valid measure and, if directional, in which direction does the differential operate, as a depressant or as an elevator? We have already seen that a difference of over 8.00 IQ points can be expected on the WISC scale scores and that a difference as great as 25.00 points is still nonsignificant on the WAIS. While no overall limit has been established for the major tests to determine deviancy, 20 points is generally accepted by diagnosticians as the maximum range of the confidence interval. As for directionality, we should not be misled by studies which show children in highly verbal environments and those who have attained high degrees of test sophistication to have elevated IQ scores. Remembering that our population will consist largely of low socioeconomic and culturally deprived children, (perhaps some fairly recent southern Negro emigres, or children of parents who have migrated north, a few bilingual children of Mexican-American parentage, with the chance of an Indian boy or two), there is little question in which direction the differentials operate. If we can have confidence in test results with these children at all, it is only by recognizing that the full scale score may be depressed by these social and cultural influences; and that the protocols must be analyzed for more valid indicators of true intellectual potential. Generally, it is the performance scale score which is the truer measure for these children, but for the purposes of this study, we will accept, as the upper confidence limit for full scale IQ 79 (the highest score obtainable to be eligible for inclusion in the research group) a score of 89 for either scale score. Within this range, we can reasonably assume that we are controlling for type I error and that we have included only those who are actually retarded, excluding those who could possibly qualify as pseudoretardates.

2. While it is a fact that a larger proportion of delinquents than nondelinquents are intellectually subnormal, the figure is not significant when compared with the number of those of normal intelligence or above from the same social class and environment. Most male retardate-delinquents are delinquent, not because of criminal tendencies, but because of weakness in the control and executive functions of the personality (i.e., ego-superego), gullibility and poor environment. For much the same reasons--lack of judgment, control,

and protection-- some mentally retarded females become sex offenders. Actually, no more retarded become criminals than would be expected from this milieu, and inconsistencies in the results of studies of community adjustment of retardates are largely due to the variation in the economic periods in which the studies were conducted and to differences in sampling methods (Tizard and O'Connor, 1956). Thus, the relationship of mental retardation to crime lies not in the condition of the defect itself but in the factors associated with it--lack of foresight, insight, judgment and inhibition. (Sutherland's theory of differential association in crime [1947] supports the environmental link between delinquency and retardation, as a result of the retardate's high persuasibility and low social status). By the same token, the typical delinquent is not a retardate but tends to fall within the dull-normal range of intelligence, again largely due to cultural deprivation factors rather than innate intellectual differences between delinquents and nondelinquents.

3. The lack of correlation between the temporal factor and social standing, found also by Jennings (1950), is a phenomenon of an institutionalized delinquent society which lends support to those researchers who see the delinquent as possessing a unique valuing system solidly rooted in the present. The literature documents this firm anchoring in the present through such evidences of delinquent character as proneness to denial of past and resistance to consideration of future consequences of acts. This is not at all unexpected when one considers the inculcated values of the subculture from which most delinquents come. This culture tends to regard deferred rewards with suspicion and embraces an "enjoy now, pay later" philosophy to compensate for its lack of normal access to the success-goals of our society. It is hardly surprising, then, that there is little deference to seniority unless it can be backed up by a more immediately "marketable" quality, such as physical superiority or ability to dominate. In one sense this makes for a very realistic criterion for valuing people, based not on the abstract "who you are" but rather on the concrete "what you can do." What is ignored, of course, (and which eventually leads to the disintegration of a social system value-oriented in this way) is that with the demotion of abstract qualities and characteristics which are not immediately demonstrable, "liquidating," or gratifying, go such vital "frozen assets" as judgment and maturity. The result is often a more

primitive social system, typical of "high risk" neighborhoods and institutions for delinquents. In this system then, to value aggression is to conform to the norm. For a stylized, fictional version of the type of valuing by youngsters, leading to social disintegration and the primitive behavior to which we refer, see William Golding, Lord of the Flies (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959), 192 pp.

4. See Alexander and Alexander (1952) for a similar finding. This study suggests that a symbiotic relationship may exist in which the dependent person receives protection and goal satisfaction while the other reciprocates as a result of his need for an outlet for his aggression. If this is true, then the assumption in the previous footnote, concerning an actual value change in delinquents, as a result of their more primitive social structure, becomes less tenable. Both studies suggest sociometrically testable hypotheses. First, it must be established that the aggressive and withdrawing delinquents do, in fact, mutually reciprocate in social choice. Then, the sociometric results would either confirm the actual value change by demonstrating that the dependent delinquents label as "conforming" those aggressives whom they select as friends, or, on the other hand, confirm Trent's findings by evaluating the aggressives realistically but nevertheless choosing them as friends. Other alternatives, of course, are that both personality types will reject each other or that the dependent delinquents will seek out aggressives as friends, but be unreciprocated.

5. Riesman classifies nonconformists as of two types--anomic or autonomous. The latter, in his definition, are capable of conformity "but are free to choose whether to conform or not," (p. 242), while the former lack this facility. The mentally retarded delinquent, lacking the social and intellectual strength to be autonomous, neatly fits Riesman's definition of the anomic individual. Pushed by social pressure into norm violating behavior, often not completely aware that his means of goal achievement are not socially sanctioned (and sometimes ambivalent concerning the continued pursuit of the but dimly perceived success-goals of our culture) and without a cognitively derived commitment to delinquent norms and values, this youth is not only anomic in relation to the prevailing culture but possibly alienated as well from the delinquent subculture. Where this pattern of delinquent peer relationships does not obtain, it may be because the retarded has developed a physically aggressive style of

social interaction which his peers recognize, respect and fear, and not because he is accepted by them, nor because in him they perceive socially desirable personality traits with which they want to identify. The only other adjustment alternative available to him is to voluntarily reduce his social sphere--to simply leave the field--and, by withdrawing, thus avoid further frustration and rejection. These are premises concerning the adaptive modes of the retardate, central to this study, and will be later formalized into hypotheses and tested.

6. Studies by psychologists, criminologists and demographers do not agree on the incidence of mental deficiency among delinquents (Metfessel & Lovell, 1942; Shulman, 1951). Changes in tests, methods of testing, screening and even attitudes towards mental deficiency as a factor in crime, have resulted in progressive lowering of incidence figures. Our recognition of the influence of such factors as social status and economic difference between delinquent and non-delinquent populations allows us to see more clearly the actual lack of relationship between intelligence and crime. By the same token, because of the much higher prevalence of low socioeconomic status youths in high delinquent-risk populations, we find the incidence of retardation in these areas (IQ's under 70) to be approximately 10% (Lichtenstein & Brown in Metfessel & Lovell, 1942, p. 143). Although Rotman (1947) found only 2-5% of delinquents qualified as mentally retarded, most studies of institutionalized juvenile and adult offenders show higher percentages, ranging from 10.2 to 47.3% (Charles, 1953), the differences attributable to high loadings on such factors as race, bilinguality, etc., in the group used to obtain the figures. Most studies now show about 13% retardation for those children referred to juvenile courts or committed to training schools (Glueck & Glueck, 1934; Kvaraceus, 1945; and others). For a more complete analysis of the relationship between intelligence and delinquency, see Shulman (1951).

7. Bredemeyer (1954) in discussing reputation tests points out that some individuals tend to be more conspicuous than others and for this reason alone can be expected to receive more selections than those who possess the criterion characteristic to an equal degree but who are more obscure. The dimensions of conspicuousness are called "vividness" (being perceived as possessing many attributes irrespective of the number of others who observe this) and "visibility" (being perceived by

many others to possess a particular one or several characteristics) (p. 139). It becomes readily apparent that a highly vivid individual can be rewarded with selection for a certain attribute simply because of the general "halo effect" of his all-around "good-at-everything" reputation and not as a result of his possessing this characteristic to a greater degree than others more obscure. Moreover, vividness and visibility can increase selection for a particular attribute even when they are embodied for negative qualities which make an individual conspicuous. Some investigators control for this factor by limiting their scrutiny to those of like conspicuousness. This study, however, is concerned with the whole continuum of conspicuousness, the obscure and colorless individuals as well as those more vivid and visible and, while keeping mindful of these influences, will not take special cognizance of them in the design.

APPENDIX B

LEWIS SOCIOMETRIC SCALE AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION

1. Lewis Sociometric Scale (Modified)
2. Instructions for Administering the Lewis Sociometric Scale

LEWIS SOCIOMETRIC SCALE (MODIFIED)

1. Which boys are good at starting games and getting things going, the ones who think of interesting things to do?
2. Which boys quarrel and argue a lot?
3. Which are the boys who are too shy to make friends easily?
4. Which boys are good at games; they play them better than most boys?
5. Which boys are bossy; they always try to run things their own way?
6. Which boys are bashful and don't like to recite in class?
7. Which boys are the ones everybody likes; they have lots of friends?
8. Which boys get mad the easiest; they lose their tempers?
9. Which are the boys who stay out of games; they don't play much with the other boys?
10. Who are your best friends?

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTERING THE LEWIS SOCIOMETRIC SCALE

1. Print your last name and then your first name and your number in the spaces provided at the top of the page.
2. I am going to ask you questions, the answers to which are people in this group. Instead of using names, however, use the number which each boy has around his neck.
3. For each question that I ask, there is a line for the answers. The first question will be answered on the line numbered "1," and so on. You will notice that each line is broken into 11 small parts. Each of these spaces is for a number but you do not have to fill them all in for each question. Use only as many as you need to answer the question completely. Your answer, therefore, may be several numbers, one number, or a zero, if you cannot honestly think of anyone who fits the description in the group.

4. Do not leave any numbers out because you think that by mentioning their numbers you may cause your friends to get into trouble. Your answers can neither hurt you nor anyone else, but the answers of all the hundreds of boys who take the test can help us to build a better program at BTS which will help all the boys. It is important, therefore, that you answer each question completely, leaving no numbers out which you feel should be listed. Do not put down numbers, however, just to put something on paper. Use "0" in this case.
5. There are no right answers or wrong answers, only your own opinions.
6. If you are new to the group today, write this at the top of your paper and place a zero on each of ten lines. You will not take the test. If you have been in the group only a week or so, answer only those questions to which you are sure you know the answers.
7. Some of the questions will sound a great deal like other questions. Do not let this bother you and if you find that you are using the same number to answer several of the question, this is all right.
8. Do not discuss your answers with anyone else after the test, and do not look at anyone else's paper during the test.
9. Do not point at anyone or otherwise indicate whose number you are putting down. If you cannot see a number, ask me to have all the boys put their numbers where they can be seen.
10. If I start a question before you have finished the previous one, raise your hand and I will stop and wait for you.

APPENDIX C

MISCELLANEOUS TABLES

- 1 . Table 31.--Total possible reciprocal social choices
by cottage.
- 2 . Table 32.--Reputation and social position by intelligence category as measured by peers.
- 3 . Figure 5.--Comparison of hypothesized and observed orderings of reputations in a delinquent population.

TABLE 31.--Total possible reciprocal social choices by cottage.

Cottage Group	Total Reciprocal Choice Potential		
	By Own IQ Group		By Other IQ Group
	Nonretardate	Retardate	
1	380	20	100
2	462	6	66
3	930	6	93
4	812	2	58
5	930	6	93
6	756	12	124
7	380	12	80
8	992	2	64
9	552	0	24
10	306	6	54
11	506	2	46
12	650	0	26
13	506	20	115
TOTALS	8162	94	943

TABLE 32. --Reputation and social position by intelligence category as measured by peers.

Social Quartile	*IQ Category	**Reputation Categories						Totals
		Low	Medium-Low	Medium-High	High			
1	1	2	2	0	1	29	33	67
	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	6
	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
2	1	17	3	10	7	5	28	70
	2	1	0	2	0	0	2	5
	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotals		21	5	12	8	36	68	150
3	1	22	11	15	10	1	7	66
	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
	3	1	1	2	2	0	0	6
4	1	21	18	15	8	1	2	65
	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	7
	3	1	0	1	1	0	0	3
Subtotals		47	32	36	22	2	10	149
TOTALS		68	37	48	30	38	78	299

* 1 = Normal IQ
 2 = High Retardate
 3 = Low Retardate

**Minus Eliminated Categories ($a_2b_2c_1$) and ($a_2b_1c_1$)

Subjects in Eliminated Categories

Normal IQ	58
High Retardate	3
Low Retardate	<u>5</u>
TOTAL	66

Subjects Used

Normal IQ	268
High Retardate	20
Low Retardate	<u>11</u>
TOTAL	299

FIGURE 5.--Comparison of hypothesized and observed orderings of reputations in a delinquent population.

Order	Reputation Hierarchies	
	Predicted	Observed
1.	$a_2b_1c_2$	$a_2b_1c_2$
	$*a_2b_1c_1$	
2.	$a_2b_2c_2$	$a_2b_2c_2$
		$*a_2b_1c_1$
		$*a_2b_2c_1$
3.	$a_1b_1c_2$	$a_1b_1c_2$
	$*a_2b_2c_1$	
4.	$a_1b_1c_1$	$a_1b_2c_2$
5.	$a_1b_2c_2$	$a_1b_1c_1$
6.	$a_1b_2c_1$	$a_1b_2c_1$

*These reputations were eliminated from consideration as impractical in the development of the study design (See pp. 78-79).

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03175 2003