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Abstract

A Study of the Possible Relationship Between and Among Reading Failure and Selected Personality Variables with Severity of Criminality

Jodene Glad

Discrete personality dimensions and reading level were compared to the length of sentence for 99 adjudicated adult male felons who were among the first to enter Indian Springs Correctional Center near Las Vegas, Nevada. Personality dimensions were measured by the California Test of Personality, 1953 Revision, Adult. To measure reading, the Adult Ability Learning Examination was used. A paired stepwise multiple R was used to consider any relationship between reading and each personality dimension, in turn, with length of sentence as a measure of criminality. The results of the statistical analysis of reading and selected personality variables failed to show a significant association with length of sentence as a measure of severity of criminality, supporting the null hypothesis. As documented, a number of correlation coefficients as shown to be significantly different from zero, as shown by their statistical significance. Although the indicators of correlation were significant, the association between reading level and personality factors with length of sentence was low. For example, the highest association was only 13% for the variable reading and the variable Social Skills, with
the variable length of sentence. As reading and each personality variable, in turn, were compared with length of sentence, a consistent positive correlation was revealed. As the length of sentence increased, reading and each personality score increased. It is apparent, contrary to popular belief, that within the confines of this study reading failure and personality adjustment were not significantly associated with length of sentence as a measure of severity of criminality.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Tables</th>
<th>iv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgments</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chapter

1. **Introduction** ........................................ 1
   - Need ...................................................... 1
   - Purpose of the Study ................................... 4
   - Definitions ............................................. 4
   - Hypothesis ............................................... 5
   - Overview of the Study ................................... 6

2. **Review of Literature** ............................ 7
   - Personalities of High and Low Achieving Students ...... 8
   - No Difference ............................................ 9
   - A Difference ............................................. 10
   - The Etiology of School Failure:
     - Reading or Personality ................................ 17
   - Feelings About Failure .................................. 22
   - Failure, Frustration and Aggression ....................... 23
   - Failure, Leading to Guilt
     and/or Shame ........................................... 25
   - Poor Readers/Antisocial Children ........................ 27
   - Poor Readers/Delinquent Children ........................ 29
   - Delinquency Prediction ................................... 31
   - From Poor Reading to Delinquency ........................ 32
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Reading Improvement</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy and Adult Male Felons</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Notes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Methodology</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE), form A level II</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Test of Personality (CTP), 1953 Revision, Adult</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Level</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Criminality</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Notes</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Results of the Study</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Further Study</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The Adult Ability Learning Examination (ABLE) Level II, Test 2: Reading</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. California Test of Personality (CTP), 1953 Revision, Adult</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Total Adjustment and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Personal Adjustment and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Social Adjustment and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Self Reliance and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Personal Worth and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Personal Freedom and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Feeling of Belonging and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Withdrawing Tendencies and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Nervous Symptoms and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vi
Table

10. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Social Standards and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence ........................................ 67

11. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Social Skills and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence ........................................ 68

12. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Antisocial Tendencies and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence ........................................ 69

13. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Family Relations and Reading, with Length of Sentence ........................................ 70

14. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Occupational Relations and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence ........................................ 71

15. Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Community Relations and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence ........................................ 72

16. Summary of Pearson r, from a Paired Stepwise Multiple R, for Reading and each Personality Variable, in turn, with Length of Sentence ........................................ 74
Acknowledgments

I wish to thank many people who helped in many ways towards the completion of this work. My committee chairman, Dr. Mark Beals, was always my mentor. Thanks to Dr. John Van Vactor who patiently showed me many facts of the scientific approach, even at the end of an already very long day. I am grateful to Dr. Judith Dettre for her interest and constructive criticism. Dr. Joseph McCullough is appreciated for his steady support throughout the sometimes difficult trip through academia.

Mrs. Donna Cimmino of the Psychological Corporation gave me permission to xerox the Adult Ability Examination for use in this study. This helped me to use the test of my choice, as Indian Springs Correctional Center began to admit adjudicated felons.

This study was made possible through the approval of Mr. Hardison, Mr. Marsing and Dr. Stewart. To Mr. Marsing and Bill Donat and the staff at Indian Springs Correctional Center, thank you for your help whenever I needed it and your welcome. To the inmate staff, thank you for your very professional help. To the inmate subjects and inmate staff, thank you for making me feel welcome in your home.

To Nancy Master and the staff of the UNLV Library, thank you for lending your expertise and care to this project. At the UNLV Computer Center, Mark and Sam helped me at very crucial points in my research.
Diane, secretary for Special Education, and Amy, Registrar Clerk for the Graduate College, were never too busy to answer procedural questions.

Joyce Peters lent her expert secretarial skill to this manuscript.

Most of all, I am indebted to my family for their help and patience: my daughter Laura who had yet another word; Katherine who cheerfully read numbers with me when she would really rather be someplace else; to Douglas for a look at other worlds outside of this dissertation; finally, most especially to my husband Richard, who throughout this sometimes arduous project gave me his unconditional love which was expressed in so many ways.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Need

Since 1876, after Lombroso (1976) linked severe criminal acts with illiteracy, much has been written about both factors (Ross, 1977).

Failure in school subjects, particularly reading, often acts as a deterrent to healthy personality integration (Eagan, 1970). The California Test of Personality was found by Callaway, Jerrolds and Tisdale (1972) to be a useful tool when they discriminated the personality adjustment of poor readers to that of good readers. The personality adjustment of the better readers was found to be significantly better than that of the poor readers. Poor personality integration may, in turn, lead to behavioral disturbances in some individuals (Zinkes & Gottlieb, 1978; Zinkes, Gottlieb and Zinkes, 1979). When these disturbances are serious enough, the individual may be placed in the prison system.

Within the prison system, the personality adjustment of the nonreader may differ from the personality adjustment of the reader. A significant failure, such as reading, can lead to shame (Erikson, 1970), which may affect a person's self concept and personality adjustment. Guilt, however,
accompanies a more defined moral transgression (Piers and Singer, 1971). Most criminals then, except for those with a defined psychopathic personality, might be expected to evidence guilt (Kelly, 1982).

Personality adjustment is a very complex matter. Different individuals may react differently to life experiences. Even though shame and guilt accompany failure and moral transgressions respectively, it would seem that shame and/or guilt can affect personality adjustment in different ways. There are some persons who suffer a personality disruption from shame, while others actually may benefit from the experience and develop faith, pride, certainty and initiative; yet, some experience guilt because of a sense of the impurity of the human condition (Erikson, 1963). When a person is able to understand and cope with feelings of guilt, then a state of total personality adjustment can be reached (Eagen, 1970).

If, indeed, personality adjustment is different in each individual, no matter what the intervening events, then a particular psychological moment such as reading failure should not affect all personalities in the same manner. Bringham (1968) found significant differences between personality dimensions of literate and illiterate adjudicated male felons when portions of the Rorschach "W" were used. Functional illiteracy versus literacy was found to be associated with impracticality, impulsivity, disorganization, and construction flexibility.

In addition to the hidden causes of personality
adjustment or maladjustment, the reliability of normative patterns is in question. Many tests, such as the California Test of Personality and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, are composed of discrete parts which are quite reliable in their totality, yet the test parts vary in their reliability (Wechsler, 1949 and 1974; Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs, 1953).

Because of the very low reliability of portions of some tests, it is difficult to look at test patterns and describe select populations from them. As noted previously, instruments, such as the California Test of Personality and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, provide normative data for select populations. It is from these normative data that experts, such as Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs (1953), would describe certain patterns of personality dimensions to represent discrete sections of the population, e.g., the nonreader. Van Vactor (1974) however, found that normative test profiles of one group do not differ significantly from the profiles of another group when comparing learning disabled, emotionally disturbed and normal populations on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children.

That particular personality patterns or dimensions are associated with literacy or illiteracy is not generally supported in the literature (Ross, 1977). Conversely, Bringham (1968) found disorganization and field dependence significantly associated with illiterates versus literate adult male felons.
Purpose of the Study

It was the purpose of this study to investigate the discrete personality dimensions and profiles of 99 adjudicated adult male felons and to compare personality factors between literate and illiterate members of the group.

The question posed was, "What, if any, are the interrelationships between and among levels of reading, selected personality dimensions and personality adjustment, social adjustment and total adjustment measure, in turn with severity of criminality?"

Definitions

For purposes of this study:

1. All subjects were adult males eighteen years of age or older.

2. Incarcerated felons were those subjects who are imprisoned at the Nevada State Prison in Indian Springs, Nevada.

3. Reading levels were determined with the use of the adult Ability Learning Examination (ABLE), form A level II.

4. Personality components were determined with the use of the California Test of Personality, form BB.

5. Severity of criminality was determined with the use of the length of current sentencing.
**Hypothesis**

It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male subjects their severity of criminality and individual reading levels were non-interactive, and non-directional relative to personality components, personal adjustment, social adjustment, or total adjustment measures.

**Overview of the Study**

Chapter II contains research related to:

1. The personalities of high and low achieving students.
2. The etiological problem of school failure versus emotional problems.
3. Failure and personality.
4. Failure and antisocial behavior.
5. The association between delinquency and reading.
6. The affects of reading improvement relative to the subject.
7. Literacy and the adult male felon.

Chapter III contains a description of the methodology relevant to this study. The personality profiles and reading levels of 99 adult male felons are compared with length of sentence. Seventeen variables are considered separately for the hypothesis. The variable reading is compared in each stepwise regression to each of the personality variables in turn with length of sentence. The dependent variable, length of sentence, was used as a
measure of severity of criminality. A general hypothesis of no impact of reading level and personality variables on length of sentence was evaluated.

In Chapter IV the results of the statistical analysis of the study are presented.

Chapter V presents a summary, conclusions and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There has been much conjecture concerning the link between reading failure, self concept and criminality. Research, however, has not demonstrated such a relationship.

Ross (1977) reviewed the research completed from 1936 to 1977 and found many shortcomings to include: definitional shortcomings for the specification of delinquency or reading backwardness; operational difficulties such as dubious motivation of offenders during test situations; sampling ambiguities (bias through clinic representation); design flaws (lack of control of socioeconomic variables) and use of retrospective data.

With these preceding limitations in mind, the literature has been reviewed to ascertain if a link has been demonstrated between personality, criminality and reading failure. In order to examine reading failure and criminality, the literature search proceeds from topics closely associated to the problem to the actual problem as the process of failure impacts upon personality, antisocial behaviors and criminality.

First, selected literature about personalities of high and low achieving students was examined. Many researchers
could find no differences between the personalities of high and low academic achievers; while others did find a difference. The two different positions were discussed in turn.

Second, selected studies about the etiological problem of whether or not school failure causes emotional problems, or the converse, were reviewed.

Third, certain theory and research concerning reactions towards failure as it affects the topic were covered. Theory as it concerns the relationship between frustration and manifold forms of aggressive behavior were discussed.

Fourth, selected sources concerning school failure and antisocial behavior were reviewed. Varied descriptions of antisocial behaviors were included.

Fifth, the association between delinquency and reading was reviewed. Results of a three year longitudinal study regarding delinquency prediction were presented. Then selected articles which examined the "drift" into truancy and incorrigibility were examined.

Sixth, a study that examined the affect of reading improvement on delinquent recidivism was reviewed.

Finally, research concerning literacy and the adult male felon was reviewed.

**Personalities of High and Low Achieving Students**

The affect of school failure on personality was found to be a point of conjecture in both theory and empirical research. After a literature search, Azam (1974) found
evidence purporting to support the position that any association between maladjustment and reading failure was rarely "... weighty or reliable ... ."

No Difference

Many researchers could find no differences between high and low academic achievers. For example, Paynter and Blanchard (1929); Gates (1941); Abrams (1971); and Rutter & Yule (1972) could not find a significant relationship between personality and school failure. One of the first studies to examine the relationship between reading and personality was done by Paynter and Blanchard (1929). They studied 167 children in a child guidance clinic in Los Angeles where the children were treated for personality and behavioral problems. Subjects were placed into two groups and matched for intelligence. One group consisted of high achievers, the other of low academic achievers. Data were taken from both groups' case records and compared. Little difference was found between the two groups' personality problems. Paynter and Blanchard felt this was due to the many factors which act to form the personality.

Similarly, Gates (1941) did not find personality maladjustments or tensions in all cases of serious disability or failure. Personality profiles secured by statistical analysis reflected little cause or effect relationship between school failure and personality.

In the Isle of Wight Studies, Rutter, Tizard and Whitmore (1970) found the incidence of reading problems to
be no greater among emotionally disturbed children than among the general population.

Virkunen and Nuutila (1976) examined 54 remedial readers. Twenty-seven of the group had delinquent records and 27 were treated as controls. The sequence of specific reading retardation, lack of success in school, depression, poor self esteem and the need for self assertion by resorting to criminal means and adopting psychopathic defenses was not pronounced among the 54 subjects.

In summary many researchers could find no pronounced differences among readers and nonreaders of diverse populations.

A Difference

While no differences were found by many researchers, others did view the personalities of low achievers versus achievers as different. In 1978 Zinkes, Gottlieb, Marvin and Bond discussed the progression from school failure to poor self concept to antisocial behavior and delinquency. Subsequently (1979) they studied reading factors, personality factors and learning factors among 44 male delinquents. Most of the boys scored at the eighth percentile in overall self concept, supporting the authors' earlier hypotheses.

Although Paynter and Blanchard (1929) could not find a significant difference between the personality problems of readers and nonreaders, they did find several indices that
set the latter apart from the former. Working within a guidance clinic these writers found a marked difference between low achievers and high achievers. The two groups differed in interest and ability in reading, with the highest achieving group evidencing more interest and ability. Results led Paynter and Blanchard to theorize that this indicated reading to be a very important component of school success.

Weinschenk (1971) found maladjustment to be a secondary symptom of severe reading problems as continued injuries to self esteem lead, in many cases, to asocial and/or criminal behavior. Reading failure was linked to emotional problems and resultant asocial problems by certain writers. Other writers, however, concentrated more on the nature of the emotional differences between readers and nonreaders rather than the resultant asocial behaviors alone.

Emotional problems were linked to reading failure by Hardwick (1932); Monroe (1932); Gates (1941); Fabian (1955); Rabinovitch (1962); Gruhn and Krause (1968); Strang (1969); Leeds (1971); Andrews (1971); Abrams (1971); Hunter and Johnson (1971) and Haines (1979). Descriptions of children with reading problems varied from child to child and theorist to theorist.

Monroe (1932) found emotional problems relative to reading to range from mild and easily overcome to severe and persistent. In 1932, Hardwick said:
Whenever an otherwise normal child shows a specific disability, we may safely assume that the problem has an emotional aspect which must be reckoned with in some fashion (p. 425).

In 1941 Gates reported children with reading problems to be withdrawn, prone to daydreaming, overly sensitive and lacking in aggressiveness necessary for effective adaptation to learning situations.

Robinson (1972) believed that reading failure led to frustration and maladjustment. She described three general types of reactions to reading failure by children:

1. Aggression, where the child attacked the environment associated with reading.
2. Withdrawal, where the child looked for satisfaction in other environs, to include childhood associates.
3. A pretense of responsiveness where no feelings were associated with the task.

Fabian (1955) called reading disability an "index of pathology." He described case histories from a public school, a placement agency, an observation unit of a psychiatric hospital, and a child guidance clinic with a special group of deprived children. He found a striking level of severe reading disability among children with familial psychopathology. This factor distinguished the clinic population.

In Queensland Australia, Andrews (1971) measured self concepts of children at different levels of reading competence as determined by the Gap Test of Reading Competence; while the research edition of the Primary Self-Concepts Test was used to
measure self concept. Self-referent adjectives and phrases are used by this measure. Significant differences were found between high and low reading achievement groups. When they were tested with the Primary Self-Concepts Test, better readers saw themselves as nonconforming and independent. They did not see themselves as aggressive or hostile. The test results of the Primary Self-Concepts Test showed that poor readers saw themselves as hostile, aggressive, socially inadequate, and lacking in confidence and personal adequacy.

A behavior rating scale with 28 behaviors was completed by the children's parents. When Hunter and Johnson (1971) compared the completed scales of 20 boys with dyslexia to 20 boys without the problem, those with a reading disability were found to be less confident than boys without reading problems.

Callaway, Jerrolds and Tisdale (1972) examined personality factors of 158 children referred to the University of Georgia Reading Clinic. The California Test of Personality was used to measure personality factors. Personality factors were compared in a stepwise regression to three different measures of reading. The measures of reading were the Grey Oral Reading Test, the Informal Reading Inventory of the University of Georgia and the reading expectancy score for each child. The formula for the reading expectancy score was \( RE = IQ \times \text{years in school} + 1.0 \) (Bond & Tinker, 1967). Family Relations, Community Relations and School Relations were the subtests of the California Test of Personality,
which were found to be significant most often when related to reading and reading expectancy scores.

Frease (1972) extrapolated the data from 25 non-delinquent second year high school boys. Extrapolation was done as the non-delinquents were compared to 100 delinquent second year high school boys. The chi square method of analysis could then be used to compare the groups. He examined each group with a self concept index, developed by Frease. In response to the index the students were asked to rate their abilities in several academic areas. In response to the index, the respondent evaluated himself on a continuum for the variables studious/non-studious and smart/dumb. He was also asked if he would be remembered as a good student, or as a little less capable than other students. Frease compared self concept versus grade point average and found them to be positively related. As the grade point average increased, the score from the self concept index increased, and as the grade point average decreased, so did the score from the self concept index. Next, he compared the academic self concept with the number of delinquent friends. The number of delinquent friends was defined by Frease to be the answer to the question "My friends could have gotten in lots of trouble with the police for some of the stuff they pull" (Frease, 1972, p. 141). He found youngsters with a low academic self concept reported many of their friends to be involved in a delinquent life style.

McGurk, Bolton and Smith (1978) administered the
Hostility and Directions of Hostility Questionnaire, the Psychological Screening Inventory and the Sixteen Personality Factor to 315 detainees at H.M. Detention Centre, Medomsley, Durham, England. The non-recidivists received significantly higher reading and arithmetic scores, although their I.Q. was very similar to the recidivists. This latter group reflected higher extrapunitive hostility, projected hostility and direction of hostility scores on the testing instruments. Sixty retainees were unable to complete the examination because their reading scores were less than 10 years. When they were studied, a positive relationship was found between recidivism and illiteracy.

Offord, Poushinsky and Sullivan (1978) tested 79 probates in Ottawa, Canada. The group was divided into primary and secondary groups. In the former, antisocial behavior was not linked to poor school records. The latter group was composed of students with antisocial occurrences after the establishment of poor school performance. This group showed a lower socio-economic level and were more likely to have been on welfare; families were less likely to be intact; mothers of these children were more likely to be in a mental hospital; and more of these children had a history of consistent, frequent depression and general unhappiness. There was no difference between the groups on the frequency of antisocial symptoms except for lying, which occurred more often among the poor readers.

Non-delinquent siblings of probands were tested as to
I.Q. and school achievement when they reached the age of onset for antisocial behavior for the probands. No significant overall difference could be found for poor school performance or I.Q. for these sibling groups. However, the probands with satisfactory school records showed a better overall school performance than their delinquent siblings. Likewise, when the probands with poor school performance were compared with their non-delinquent siblings, their overall school performance was worse. Families were listed by the severity of the probands behaviors; the list was divided, and the academic scores of the most antisocial group was compared to the less antisocial group. There was no difference between groups. There was also no difference between antisocial behaviors of siblings with poor school performance compared with those with good school performance. From this data, the authors thought that poor family environment might lead to antisocial behaviors and poor academic achievement. Additionally, they thought that poor academic achievement may have led to passive behavior by the non-delinquent sibling and aggressive behavior by the delinquent sibling.

Personal data for 24 individuals were collected by Haines (1979) from this data held in the Reading Clinic for a twenty-seven year time span. She investigated the adult status of children who had presented severe underachievement in reading. Subjects were severe underachievers who participated in a reading clinic at the Graduate School of
the University of Pennsylvania. Ages of the children, upon entering the clinic, ranged from 8 years, 6 months to 12 years, 7 months. Immediately following entry, psychiatric evaluations revealed neurotic symptoms in 20 individuals. Additionally, weak egos, lack of self esteem, feelings of inferiority and inadequacy were common traits. As adults the subjects were found to be content with their marriages, families and vocational choices. All of the subjects were concerned about school failure for their children, however. All of the adults reported to Haines "poignant" memories of the frustrating failure in reading.

Finally, Lewis, Shanok, Balla and Bard (1980) examined 59 incarcerated male delinquent readers and nonreaders. Nonreaders, defined as those scoring five years below grade level in reading, exhibited more paranoid ideation, visual hallucinations and illogical processes than did readers.

In summary, many researchers could find little difference between the personalities of high and low academic achievers, while others found differences. Some researchers concentrated on the effects of readers versus nonreaders on asocial behaviors, others concentrated on emotional differences, and still others linked reading failure to emotional problems and resultant asocial behaviors.

The Etiology of School Failure: Reading or Personality?

There are those who associated school failure with reading and personality dimensions. Such an association was somewhat tenuous, however, since certain researchers found
no personality differences when high and low level achievers were studied. When the direction of any obtained association was considered, the matter became even more of an enigma.

The direction of the association between emotional problems and reading problems was important to Rutter, Tizard and Whitmore (1970) and Strang (1969). Strang (1969) observed large numbers of counselors treating children for emotional problems stemming from reading failure. Others, such as Monroe (1932), Haines (1979) and Rutter, Tizard and Whitmore (1970), warned that emotional problems could cause reading problems, or reading problems could cause emotional problems.

From findings of the Isle of Wight study Rutter, Tizard and Whitmore (1970) suggested similar types of tempermental deviance could lead to reading problems and antisocial behaviors. They concluded that direction of the association was a very important although complex multifaceted problem.

King (1975) studied nine homicidal youths. The eight boys and one girl showed marked educational problems in their background. One youngster considered his illiteracy to be his biggest problem and asked for help. All nine expected to be hurt in social situations. Only one youth was psychotic, but most males were confused in their personality orientations and disturbed in their psychosexual development. Alcohol was a serious problem in the homes, leading to mood swings. Abuse was a common occurrence in the homes of these young people. Many times the youngster was singled out as
the abused object, although most of the youths felt their mothers were afraid of them. A majority of the homes was intact at the time of the crimes and had remained intact for most of the children's lives.

Strang (1969), Monroe (1932), Azam (1974), Rutter, Tizard and Whitmore (1970), Reid (1972), and Haines (1979) reported many etiological dynamics as they considered the problems of reading and psychological factors.

In her book Strang (1969) pointed to the importance of considering the relationship between the counselor and the teacher of reading. Monroe (1932) could not determine whether poor behavior caused poor reading or poor reading caused poor behavior. Yet, in the Isle of Wight Studies, Rutter, Tizard and Whitmore (1970) found no difference in the incidence of learning problems among emotionally disturbed children when they were compared to the general population.

Reid (1972) thought that there was a possibility that emotional disturbance could emanate from school failure. Nevertheless, it was difficult to discern a chronology of events concerning reading failure and emotional disturbance.

In a survey of the literature, Azam (1974) found a relationship between reading failure and maladjustment. He stated that reading failure can cause maladjustment and maladjustment can cause reading failure. He could not find a clear-cut relationship between reading failure and maladjustment, as the evidence to support the association
was rarely wholly reliable.

In a literature review, Leeds (1971) found poor reading and emotional disturbance often accompanied each other. He found the idea of a link between academic failure and emotional problems was associated by Freud (1960), who advised educators to utilize psychoanalytic precepts. The question of the precedence of reading problems or emotional problems was reported by Abrams (1971) to be an ongoing point of conjecture. The overt and covert role of personality dimension was described by Ephron (1953). Overt threads were remarks made by a client to Ephron which were directly associated with reading failure; with the comment, "I do not read well." Covert or unconscious attitudes encompassed more generalized immature or impulsive emotional reactions.

Other researchers and theorists, including Silberberg and Silberberg (1971), Ewing (1976), Ross (1977), Kelly (1977) and Coleman (1983) saw the process of schooling to be a potential basis for reading and emotional problems.

Institutional expectations were found to be too rigid by Silberberg and Silberberg (1971). They said that if children are compared to each other on standardized tests, then 50% of them must fail. When school systems insist on pupil conformity at any cost, then confrontations are apt to occur (Silberberg and Silberberg, 1974). By assuming that literacy and the traditional forms of scholastic achievement are for everyone, we sentence a substantial number of children to failure and rejection (Ross, 1977, p. 15).
Kvaraceus (1959) agreed with the Silberbergs and Ross when he stated:

... pouring all students into a single academic mold causes many predelinquents to suffer frustration, failure and conflict, which in turn begets aggression that eventuates into patterns of norm violating behavior.

According to Kelly (1980), teachers exhibit a bias when selecting remedial reading students. Many times they select children who once were remedial reading students but since had been determined, by the reading specialist, to read up to grade level. Kelly further called remedial reading a stigmatizing experience which could affect self concept and warned teachers to treat all students as capable.

Attitudes of poor readers and their teachers have been assessed by Ewing (1976). A structured interview was used with pupils and questionnaires were used with teachers. The sample consisted of 118 children from below 8 to over 16 years of age. Results of the study showed that most pupils said that they did not enjoy being labeled as remedial readers. When asked if remedial readers were a pleasure to teach, classroom teachers replied negatively. Remedial teachers, however, enjoyed teaching remedial students. Most teachers were found to be insensitive to a backward reader's feelings of embarrassment associated with the label of remedial reader, as they did not see the label of deficient reader to be a problem.

Coleman (1983) found strong support for the hypothesis that children who remained full-time in regular classrooms
with substantial academic difficulties would suffer low self concepts. The self concepts of children with academic difficulties who were able to join other children with similar difficulties were equivalent to children without handicapping conditions. This led Coleman to believe that self concept was a social phenomenon.

The etiology of school failure is not agreed upon by theorists and researchers. Some thought that the problem began with the expectancies of teachers and school systems. Many said that it was difficult to discern the pre- or post-facto relationship of personality to reading.

Feelings About Failure

There is a body of research and theory which points to school failure as a source of emotional disequalibrium and resultant criminality. Dollard (1939); Kvaraceus (1945); Koval and Polk (1967); Elliot and Voss (1974); Cohen (1966); Abrahamsen (1973) and Zinkes, Gottlieb and Bond (1979) linked failure to frustration and aggression. Robinson (1972); Piers and Singer (1971) and Eagen (1970) linked failure to shame and guilt. Frease (1972); Thomas (1979); Butkowsky and Willows (1980) linked school failure to a lowered self concept resulting in more school failure. Thomas (1979); Butkowsky and Willows (1980) further linked a lowered self concept to learned helplessness in the academic milieu.

Cohen (1955) warned, however, that status was only achieved in the eyes of one's peers. The levels of aspiration, therefore, were different for each person. What may seem to
be a problem for one person may not be a problem to another. Some may work harder, while others may be convinced that the prize may not be worth the endeavor.

**Failure, Frustration and Aggression**

According to Dollard (1939), psychologists have not agreed on the relationship between frustration and manifold forms of aggressive behavior. Aggression is many times a hallmark of denied aspirations, promises or some other motive. Further, Dollard stated:

> Frustration occurs whenever pleasure-seeking or pain-avoiding behavior is blocked and the strength of aggression is related to the amount of frustration incurred (p. 27).

Dollard continued by stating that there are many frustrations in school, as it offers a constant parade of new tasks, new words and new skills to be acquired. Low educational achievement in itself is not frustrating, as many children show by their tenacity in resisting it. A poor education was thought to be most frustrating at the adult level. It is at this level that it becomes an interference to goal responses, such as low income, inferior social status or other conditions.

Cohen (1966) agreed with Dollard when he observed that the strength of aggression was related to the strength of needs, impulses or wishes which are thwarted.

In 1961, Kvaraceus stated that reading ability must be taken into consideration as a potential factor closely related to the delinquency problem. Following ongoing
research in 1964 he interpreted delinquency in terms of Dollard's theory that frustration leads to aggression. Sabatino (1973) agreed when he said, "This is borne out in the delinquent because he has less tolerance for frustration" (p. 29). Karpas (1964) said, "Whenever imbalance occurs, the personality suffers, when adjustment is no longer in harmony with society then misconduct or delinquency becomes apparent (p. 249)."

School failure has been said to cause frustration and consequent delinquencies according to Elliot and Voss, (1974); Koval and Polk, (1967); and Kvarceus, (1945).

In his studies in Chattanooga and Hamilton Counties in Tennessee, Dzik (1966) found that the most common denominator among juvenile delinquents was that of the low achieving student. He compared the records of two groups who were charged with offenses in Juvenile Court. Ninety-one percent of a group of 350 children to come before the court in 1949 were retarded in reading. The group to appear in 1969 contained a 94% level of reading retardation.

Bettelheim (1965) wrote about success-seeking for the learner and non-learner. He described failure as insidious. According to Bettelheim, the more failure a child experiences and the further behind he gets, the more a child defies adults, then the greater the possibility he will become delinquent.

A lowered self concept due to school frustration could result in behavioral problems which could eventuate into
delinquency (Zinkus, Gottlieb and Zinkus, 1979). Both the teacher and the failing pupil could interpret school failure as a direct reflection of self. Both could then become frustrated. The teacher might resent the perceived cause of failure, the child. The child, conversely, might resent the perceived cause of failure, the teacher, and attack social systems such as the society and the school.

Many thought that feelings of frustration associated with failure lead to antisocial behaviors which could eventuate in delinquency. Others thought that feelings associated with failure were complicated by shame and/or guilt.

Failure, Leading to Guilt and/or Shame

It would seem that guilt and/or shame can affect personality adjustment in different ways. There are persons who suffer a personality disruption from shame, while others may benefit from the experience and develop faith, pride, certainty and initiative (Erickson, 1963). Certain persons experience guilt because of a sense of the impurity of the human condition. This happens during the early stages of life when frustrated wishes lead to guilt (Erickson, 1963).

Eagen discussed the relationship of failure to existential guilt and/or shame. When a man is unable to fulfill his potential by allowing too many possibilities to slip by, he experiences existential guilt. Shame differs from existential guilt in that it is an acute emotional experience rather than simply a realization of unfilled
potentiality.

According to Eagen, shame represents a failure to be. It is pervasive, as anxiety is pervasive; its focus is not a separate act, but rather a revelation of the entire self. Guilt feelings are associated with wrongdoing. Shame is the more profound feeling of weakness or inadequacy. In a similar vein, Piers and Singer (1971) see guilt accompanying a transgression, while shame follows failure.

Failure to learn is seen to trigger unorganized emotional responses which inhibit learning and further inhibit motivation, perserverance and concentration (Robinson, 1972). When failure leads to a feeling of anxiety, shame may result.

Butkowsky and Willows (1980) studied seventy-two 5th grade boys from an initial sample of 123. Three groups of 24 each were identified as good, average and poor readers respectively. There was no significant difference between the groups relative to age and I.Q. During the experimental procedure the examiner did not know the child's reading level. Measures used by the examiner were an anagram measure solvable at all reading levels and a five line drawing. One half of the subjects experienced repeated failure on both days of testing, spaced one week apart. Each child in the failure group received three solvable puzzles at the end of the two sessions, so that failure from the experimental experience would not carry over into the next experience.
The expectancy scores for the poor readers decreased with lowered ability. Poor readers were less likely to see themselves as personally responsible for their success, and more likely to blame their failures on a lack of personal competence. They also were more reactive to the failure experience, losing more confidence in their ability to attain future success than average or good readers. Good readers showed confidence of success during the reading task. They, along with average readers, showed higher expectancies for the task.

Whether it is called shame and/or guilt or learned helplessness, failure was seen to affect a person's feelings about self. Antisocial behaviors are seen by many as a reaction to failure.

**Poor Readers/Antisocial Children**

It is very difficult to describe antisocial behavior, as the definition of antisocial behavior differs from teacher to teacher and school to school (Hewett and Taylor, 1980). This problem is further compounded when delinquency is added to the picture, as the definition of delinquency differs from state to state (Comptroller General of the U.S., 1977).

As a result of his survey of the literature Ross (1977) concluded that a relationship between school failure and antisocial behavior had not been adequately demonstrated.

He found research shortcomings to include definitional problems of delinquency and reading disability, operational problems such as a lack of standardized measures for the
offender, and reading, as well as motivational problems of offenders taking tests. He questioned the representativeness of samples through highly selected clinical samples. Ross also saw failure to control for institutional effects or socioeconomic variables and a reliance on retrospective information to be research problems.


A long-term investigation of adolescents in a medium-sized county in the Pacific Northwest was conducted by Polk (1975). Twenty-five percent of a random sample of all male sophomores in the county were chosen. Grade point averages and delinquency reports from the juvenile court system were noted for each student. A one hour interview with each student was also conducted.
Later, the same group was studied as adults. In retrospect, for the academically unsuccessful, the level of delinquent involvement varied with the amount of participation in the delinquent teenage culture. If there had been little involvement, there was a low level of delinquency. Conversely, if the involvement was high, the level of delinquency also was high, with 46% of this group becoming juvenile delinquents. Adults with three or more years of college and high educational success had low levels of criminality; 75% were not involved in the juvenile justice system.

There are many problems inherent in reports of the association between poor readers and antisocial behaviors. In spite of this, the association appears many times throughout the literature. It is difficult to discern differences between antisocial and delinquent behaviors.

**Poor Readers/Delinquent Children**

An association between delinquency and poor reading appears with considerable frequency throughout the literature.

One of the early researcher teams to note the relationship were Fendrick and Bond (1936). They studied male delinquents who were committed to the House of Refuge at Randall's Island, New York City. The subjects of their study were ages 14 to 19. Ninety percent of the 26 boys were considered to be school failures. One hundred eighty-seven of the boys from the 6th grade to the 11th grade
participated in the study. The boys presented a disparity of 5 years and 9 months between chronological and reading ages. According to Fendrick and Bond, this represented a serious reading failure.

Gagne (1977) completed a review of empirical research concerning the education of juvenile delinquents. She found reading problems to be associated with delinquency. Some researchers (Elliot & Voss, 1974; Koval & Polk, 1967 and Kvaraceus, 1945) saw delinquency to be a reaction against school failure. Glueck & Glueck (1950) saw reading retardation as a beginning to the sequence reading failure, truancy and delinquency. Critchley (1968), however, did not see the pattern of reading failure, truancy and delinquency, even though he did see the association of reading difficulties and delinquency.

A survey of delinquent boys on active status at the Treatment Clinic of Manhattan Childrens Court, New York, was carried out by Roman (1957). Subjects were between the ages of 13 and 16, with a reading retardation of at least two years. Eighty-four of the cases presented reading retardation in conjunction with personality disorders. Subsequently, Dzik (1966); Kessler (1966); Tarnopol (1970); and Segal (1973) noted that the most frequent common denominator among juvenile delinquents was the inability to read.

Jerse and Fakouri (1978) compared academic profiles of 108 delinquents with a control group of non-delinquents.
Subjects were matched according to sex, grades and school. Non-delinquent children showed significantly higher grades for reading and arithmetic; they also reflected higher I.Q.'s than delinquent children.

The type of association between delinquency or the reasons for association are not clear. Kvaraceus (1961) tried to make the association a clear one when he devised a scale to predict delinquency.

**Delinquency Prediction**

In an effort to validate a revised form of the Kvaraceus Delinquency Proneness Scale (Non-Verbal Form) (KD Scale), Kvaraceus (1961) did a three year longitudinal study. As a part of the study he tested revisions of the picture items on the KD Scale. The instrument was designed to discriminate between delinquent and non-delinquent boys and girls and junior high school students, to include slow learners, nonreaders and mentally retarded individuals.

Subjects included 289 boys and 277 girls in regular classes at Fall River Junior High School, 309 adjudicated delinquent boys and 281 adjudicated girls. All minor and major norm violations were noted by field workers, principals, teachers, police, counselors and court officials. The categories to be reported by them included:

- $0 =$ subjects with no offense;
- $1 =$ subjects with only minor school offenses;
- $2 =$ subjects with community and school offenses but no legal action;
3 = subjects who were engaged in serious and persistent norm violations where no official action had been taken (p. 431).

The instrument failed to discriminate delinquents from non-delinquents and could not be considered to be a functional tool. However, all female subjects were differentiated on all but one picture on the KD Scale, while males could not be differentiated on six of the items. Poor readers (scoring in the lowest quartile of every grade) had the lowest behavior ratings and the highest delinquency proneness, as measured by the Kvaraceus Juvenile Delinquency Prediction Scale - non-verbal.

Duke (1976) saw part of the problem of the association between delinquency and poor readers to be one of evaluation instruments, as he stressed the need for developing tests for both middle class and lower class children, and also stressed the fact that there is no practical or valid test for delinquency prediction. This feature was also validated by Kvaraceus (1961). Delinquent behaviors could not be adequately predicted.

From Poor Reading to Delinquency

As early as 1932, Monroe had suggested that a long standing problem such as reading failure may cause a child to "drift" into truancy and incorrigibility. Dzik (1968) agreed when he discovered that lack of success in the classroom can lead to decreasing motivation, frustration
and a hatred for school. Eventually, he noted, this leads to truancy and brushes with the law. Academically failing juvenile delinquents were observed by Kvaraceus (1944), Money (1966) and Kerr (1973) to view school as an aversive situation to be rejected in favor of antisocial success.

In the Isle of Wight studies, the number of absences for good readers and poor readers were the same. Rutter, Tizard and Whitmore (1970) found truancy not to be significantly associated with poor readers. Conversely, Critchley (1968) warned that: the progression of depravity from dyslexia through truancy to delinquency remains unproven. Even though there are more delinquents with reading problems it is difficult to directly compare the two groups. In an effort to explain the progression toward delinquency, Critchley (1968) studied 371 boys, with an average age of 14 years, 9 months, in a remand home and classifying center for 12 inner London Boroughs. He found 59% of the male population to be retarded in reading by two or more years. A number of definable factors, such as sexual maturation, enuresis, broken homes, parental divorce, psychotic parents, poor school attendance, poor classroom behavior and attendance at residential schools for the maladjusted, were compared for readers and for retarded readers. None of the factors were found to be statistically significant.

In their studies in Sweden, Virkunen and Nuutila (1967)
found that the severity of reading retardation did not contribute to a propensity for delinquency in reading retarded adolescents between the ages of 15 and 20. From these data they determined that the sequence of specific reading retardation, lack of success in school and poor self concept and the need to resort to criminal defenses was of little significance.

Delinquency and reading difficulties were associated in the literature. A sequence of events leading from reading failure to truancy to delinquency was a theory that could not be agreed upon. In fact, there is no practical or valid test for delinquency prediction. The results of pre-facto studies were varied. Other researchers approached the association between delinquency and reading by post-facto means; that is, "Would an increase in reading ability in delinquents with poor reading abilities produce a decrease in delinquent behaviors"?

**Effects of Reading Improvement**

Certain poor readers that are able (through tutoring) to improve their reading scores show improved personality indices, while others show a decline in recidivism.

The effectiveness of tutorial group versus remedial group versus group therapy in facilitating psychosocial adjustment and correcting some aspects of reading retardation was investigated by Roman (1957). The 21 subjects were adjudicated boys with a range in age from 13 to 16 years of age. All evidenced a reading retardation of two or more
years and an I.Q. between 65 and 95. The subjects were matched for age and intelligence and placed into three groups, all taught by the same person. For Group I, the Group Remedial Reading Program was geared to the correction of an individual's disabilities as disclosed from an oral reading test. Group II received Interview Group Therapy, the aim of which was to improve the mental health of its members. Group III was given Tutorial Group Therapy, described as a form of psychotherapy intended to simultaneously correct reading disabilities and improve mental health.

Subjects in Tutorial Group Therapy were found to evidence greater improvement in psychosocial adjustment as evidenced by the Davidson Rorschach Signs; Intellectual, Social, Emotional and Total adjustment scales of the H.O.W. Behavior Rating Scale, Schedule B; and the rating of adjustment change based on several projective examinations given by a psychologist. Roman believed that the results of the study suggested that retarded readers in a delinquent population exhibited varied emotional problems. Problems found in non-delinquent retarded readers seemed to be evidence of a history of severe social and emotional deprivation and antisocial aggressive behavior. He postulated that the delinquent retarded readers might evidence a greater degree of emotional disturbance than the non-delinquent retarded readers.

The U.S. Department of Labor (1972) examined three
groups. Groups I and II were composed of dyslexics. Group I consisted of young men referred by their probation officers to a work training program. Group II was composed of a group from the Work Study Program. They volunteered to participate in a Continuing Education class at City College for students with reading disorders. Group III included readers and nonreaders from a high school correctional facility. All dyslexics received help with the Gillingham Stillman approach until the trainees were ready for more individualized materials.

After three years of reading and job training all groups showed a significant improvement in self concept, as shown by their comments. Before and after the three year program, Group III was given the Jessness Inventory List. Before the work training program members of both the dyslexic and non-dyslexic portions of the group showed poor self concepts, passive self concepts, hostility towards authority and passive escapism. The dyslexics showed immature behavior, while the non-dyslexics exhibited feelings of anger, undue self concern and rule violating behaviors.

After the three year work training program, the Jessness Inventory List was again administered to both groups. The dyslexics were less immature and the non-dyslexics were less angry. Both groups improved their self concepts, were less hostile and exhibited less passive escapism. After participating in the work program (with a reading program for the dyslexics) both groups exhibited personality scores
that were very close to the average scores of non-delinquents.

In the fall of 1973 Dr. Jordan (1974) and his staff selected 80 subjects (ages 11 to 16) from a group of more than 100. They were screened by the Jordan Written Screening Test as a part of the intake process at the Youth Bureau offices in Norman and Moore, Oklahoma. Subjects who manifested learning problems were chosen for the project. During the examination with the Jordan Written Screening Test each child was asked to spell simple words, the days of the week and months of the year. The children were also asked to copy graphic shapes.

The group was divided into a control and a study group. Both groups were tested using the Wechsler Intelligence Scale appropriate for their age level, the Bender Gestalt Drawing Test, House-Tree-Person Test, Rorshach, and for some subjects, the Benton Visual Retention Test and the Minnesota Perceptual Diagnostic Test. The Benton Visual Retention Test was used to further examine visual memory, while the Minnesota Perceptual Diagnostic Test was used when neurotic tendencies were suspected. Classroom performance was evaluated by the Jordan Oral Screening Test, spelling lists from the Metropolitan Achievement Test battery, the Malcomesius Specific Language Disability Test or the Slingerland Screening Tests for Identifying Children with Specific Language Disability. The Keystone Visual Survey Tests and the Spache Binocular Reading Test were administered, while hearing was measured with a variety of audiological tests. Extensive neurological and EEG testing was done by a neurologist. A comprehensive
questionnaire was employed to determine family background. Reasons for referral to juvenile authorities were noted. Certain results of the Jordan study which relate to this study were presented.

Seventy-one percent of the subjects were from broken homes. The average decoding level (measured by the Jordan Oral Screening Test) of females was 1.2 years below grade level, while the decoding level of males was 1.4 years below grade level. Psychological assessment revealed a poor self image, lack of self confidence, intense anxiety and a negative self-fulfilling prophecy.

All subjects in the control group were tutored for six months by undergraduates at the University of Oklahoma in Norman. Fifty-three percent of the control group made average achievement in school during the first three months of tutoring (compared to 2.5% of the control group). During the second three month period 45% of the underachievers made average grades in the classroom.

The rate of recidivism dropped dramatically for this group. Within the group recidivism was still higher for the 11 year old all male group, with a 75% increase after tutoring. All other age groups showed a decrease in recidivism. The 12 year old all male group showed a 33% decrease. The 13 year old males showed a 77% decrease, while the 13 year old females showed a 100% decrease in recidivism. Fourteen year old males showed a 71% decrease in recidivism, while females showed a 73% decrease. The 15 year old
all male group showed an 89% decrease in recidivism. Males and females in the 16 year old group showed 100% decrease in recidivism.

Antisocial behaviors or feelings were associated with poor reading. In most groups, as reading scores increased, self concept or antisocial behaviors decreased. Eleven year old males, however, experienced an increase in recidivism, with an improvement in reading. The effect of poor reading and reading improvement was different for children when compared to teenagers. Although antisocial acts and antisocial feelings decreased among two different groups, there may also be a difference in antisocial acts and feelings. There may also be a difference between the relationship between antisocial delinquent and felonious actions.

**Literacy and Adult Male Felons**

In 1955, Cohen warned that the delinquent group subculture should not be extrapolated to adult criminality. Bringham (1968) studied 50 adult male felons between 20 and 40 years of age, 25 of which were literate. He tested his subjects with the Rorshach "W" and compared results of the literates and illiterates. Functional illiteracy versus literacy was found to be associated with impracticality, impulsivity, disorganization, and construction flexibility.

Relationships between neuropsychological functioning, learning deficits and violent behavior among inmates at the California Medical Facility and Northern Reception Center at
Vacaville were studied by Bryant (1982). All subjects were given subtests from the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, the Wide Range Achievement Test and the Luria Nebraska Neuropsychological Battery. Violent subjects were those who repeated felony crimes against persons. More violent inmates under 30 were found to exhibit significantly poorer academic skills and more neuropsychological deficits. The neuropsychological functioning was deficit in the posterior tertiary zone. This zone enables the individual to execute goal-directed activity, create, plan, organize and connect higher cortical centers to lower diencephalic and thalamic structures. The violent inmates under the age of 30 were thought by Bryant to be impaired due to an early onset of drug abuse.

In one study, adult male felons showed personality differences to be impracticality, impulsivity, disorganization and construction flexibility. In another study, adults showed more crimes against persons, poor academic skills and neuropsychological deficits. The early onset of drug abuse, however, was thought by Bryant to exacerbate the problem. Certain personality differences and antisocial behaviors were linked to the illiterate adult. The cause of the association was, however, very complex.

**Summary**

It is difficult to link reading failure to self concept and criminality. Different behaviors are considered asocial by different persons. There is no universally accepted test
score for reading failure. Also, there are no established tests which can successfully predict criminality. Research linking reading failure, self concept and criminality has attacked the problem from many different aspects. Fabian (1955) and Abrams (1971) described a reading disability to be a manifestation of underlying neurotic factors of the youngster or his family. Strang (1969) and McMichael (1979) saw reading and social problems to be a difficult problem leading to the almost unanswerable question—which came first, asocial behavior or the reading problem?

Others suggested that reading failure was a source of embarrassment to the remedial reader, that teachers were not sensitive to the remedial reader's embarrassment, nor did they like to teach him, further compounding the problem. Reading failure by the young child, however, did not alienate him from his peers unless it was accompanied by asocial behavior (McMichael, 1979). This aspect further exacerbated the problem of linking reading failure with self concept and antisocial behavior.

Studies of juvenile delinquents, behavior problems in school, and children on probation presented a varied mix of significant and insignificant findings. It was suggested in certain studies that reading and school failure lead to behavioral or antisocial problems, others suggested that education was at fault for insisting that children be placed in situations where failure was almost assured. Still others suggested that each child should have an equal opportunity to
learn. If an equal opportunity was not assured then the frustration of always being on the lower track or non-college-prep track of education would cause frustrations. It was also found, however, that special placement did not cause frustrations. Others could find that tests and teachers did not address the poverty stricken individual. Still others suggested that societal values played a major part in the life of the nonreader. If the society of the child did not value reading, then the child would not value it, or be frustrated by poor reading. Still others thought the poor reader would seek an antisocial or delinquent society if he could not attain school expectations.

Personality problems which included antisocial behaviors and reading failure were found to be associated in many studies of children and adolescents. The association could not, however, be transposed from group to group because of definitional shortcomings of delinquency or reading backwardness and the dubious motivation of offender populations during testing situations. Definitional shortcomings, or differences of antisocial and/or delinquent behaviors, or reading backwardness make transposing research results to other groups a dangerous undertaking.

The child or adolescent may indeed reject reading as a part of a rejection of society as a whole for the society which has caused him the pain of failure. He may use the antisocial or delinquent gang to reaffirm self worth. The extrapolation of the antisocial behaviors of childhood and
adolescence (Cohen, 1955) is at best a risky project. The complicated intervening events which lead some individuals towards felonious behaviors has not been proven because of the very complex and delicate interaction between the organism and the environment.

In spite of the complexity of the problem, however, the threads between personality adjustment and literacy among children and adults with and without criminal records exist. For example, Callaway, Jerrolds and Tisdale (1972) discovered a relationship, using the California Test of Personality, between success in reading and personality adjustment among children. In 1972, the U.S. Department of Labor found the personalities of dyslexic adult probands to change with an improvement in reading and job training. The personality variables of impracticality, impulsivity and disorganization were detected by Bringham (1968) to be associated with the illiterate rather than literate adult male felon. Bryant (1982) observed the most violent of criminals to exhibit low academic skills and neuropsychological deficits. Personality factors were associated to illiteracy in the adult male felon by Bringham (1968). The U.S. Department of Labor's (1972) study related reading improvement to positive personality changes among probands. Bryant's (1982) study linked lower academic skills to severity of criminality. In the literature, the direction of the association between poor reading, personality and the severity of criminality among children and adolescents is in question. A study of the
adult male felon found poor reading associated with certain personality factors. Another study related poor academic skills to the most severe of crimes. The association between poor reading, certain personality dimensions and severity of criminality remains unfounded. Further research is needed in this area.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODODOLOGY

This chapter contains a description of the subjects and the way they were chosen, in addition to a description of the tests, the basis for their choice and the method of administration. The variables, hypotheses, and statistical treatment are presented.

Subjects

Subjects (Ss) in this study were drawn from the initial group of adjudicated adult felons to enter the reception center at the Southern Desert Correctional Center located thirty-two miles north of Las Vegas, Nevada.

Inmates who were too violent to be tested, had contagious diseases, or were non-English speakers were not considered for this study.

The remainder of the Ss were taken in order as they entered the center and moved through the prescribed intake process. One hundred five inmates (Ss) were tested. Six Ss were dropped from the study. Two were transferred to another institution before the data base was completed. Four were under the age of 18 and thus did not meet the adult criteria for this study. The remaining 99 Ss participated in this study.
Instruments

Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE), form A level II

The ABLE (Karlsen, Madden and Gardner, 1967) is a group test designed to measure the educational achievement of adults in vocabulary, reading, spelling and arithmetic. The reading portion was used for purposes of this study.

The reading portion of the untimed examination consists of twelve multiple choice (close type) questions which measure reading comprehension; each question has three possible choices. Content emphasis is on the everyday life of adults. This instrument was used to establish the reading level of adults, with its grade scores extracted from data supplied by the Stanford Achievement Test. The test manual includes data on reliability and validity which will be included in Appendix A. The test was recommended by Hieronymus (1978). Judd Henson, in his position of head of the test department for Addison Wesley, recommended the instrument for the purposes of this study.2

California Test of Personality (CTP), 1953 Revision, Adult

The CTP (Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs, 1953) was designed to identify and reveal intangible personality dimensions. Each of the 15 components assessed by this instrument were used as variables. Callaway, Jerrolds and Tisdale (1972) established empirical evidence for the California Test of Personality as a measure which can be used to discriminate between good and poor readers. The test was chosen from the empirical evidence of Callaway, Jerrolds and Tisdale (1972).
Information concerning administration, validity and reliability appear in Appendix B.

**Procedures**

During reception at Indian Springs, new inmates are kept apart from the existing population during initial physical and psychological screening. Under the supervision of prison personnel, the ABLE and CTP were given each Friday by this examiner (E). These evaluations began as soon as routine daily institutional matters were complete. Testing began with the ABLE at 9:00 A.M., following standardized procedures. After lunch and countdown (when the prisoners returned to their quarters to answer a roll call), the CPT was read to all Ss as a group. Before the Ss were given procedures for marking the examination's answer sheet, they were told they could ask to have a question reread by E as many times as necessary. If the Ss were unsure what the question meant, E would interpret it. The Ss were told to think of how they felt about themselves and others before they entered a correctional center for this term.

**Variables**

Seventeen variables were considered separately for the hypothesis.

**Reading Level**

Reading Level as measured by the ABLE (level II) was used as a measure of literacy. Level II of the ABLE
measures grade levels 3 to 9. Those individuals receiving a score of 3 might in actuality read at grade level 3 or lower. Individuals with a 9 score actually may read at grade level 9 or higher. By using the paired stepwise multiple R, reading was considered with personality variables, in turn, as measured by the California Test of Personality-Adult, with severity of criminality.

**Personality**

The personality components used the complete test score or Total Adjustment for that variable. All of the individual scores of the test were then divided into a Personality Adjustment score and a Social Adjustment score, which were subsequently used as variables. Those components which were a part of the Personal Adjustment score were: Self Reliance, Sense of Personal Freedom, Feeling of Belonging, Withdrawing Tendencies and Nervous Symptoms. The Social Adjustment score is composed of Social Standards, Social Skills, Antisocial Tendencies, Family Relations, Occupational Relations and Community Relations. Each of the 15 Personality variables are listed:
1. Total Adjustment;
2. Personal Adjustment;
3. Social Adjustment;
4. Self Reliance;
5. Sense of Personal Worth;
6. Sense of Personal Freedom;
7. Feeling of Belonging;
8. Withdrawing Tendencies;
9. Nervous Symptoms;
10. Social Standards;
11. Social Skills;
12. Antisocial Tendencies;
13. Family Relations;
14. School Relations;
15. Community Relations.

Severity of Criminality

The length of current sentencing was used as a measure of the severity of criminal tendencies. The dependent variable, length of sentence, was used as a measure of severity of criminality. A general hypothesis of no impact of reading level and personality variables on length of sentence was evaluated.

Hypotheses

This study was an empirical investigation to determine, whether reading and personality variables, in turn, impact upon length of sentence for adjudicated
adult male felons. The hypotheses were stated and reported at levels significantly different from zero as reported in the Statistics Program for the Social Sciences (1970).

The general hypothesis was that the recorded criminal activities as evidenced by length of sentence and reading level were non-directional and non-interactive relative to personality components, personality adjustment, social adjustment or total adjustment measures. The assumption which underlies this hypothesis was that the reported research linking the influence of reading on personality and criminality was inconsistent. Each individual research hypothesis tested each personality variable:

V1  It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons total adjustment and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

V2  It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons personal adjustment and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

V3  It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons social adjustment and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

V4  It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons self reliance and reading level had no
impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

V5 It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons sense of personal worth and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

V6 It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons sense of personal freedom and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

V7 It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons feeling of belonging and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

V8 It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons withdrawing tendencies and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

V9 It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons nervous symptoms and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

V10 It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons social standards and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.
It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons social skills and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons antisocial tendencies and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons family relations and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons occupation relations and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing.

It was hypothesized that for incarcerated adult male felons community relations and reading level had no impact singularly and collectively upon length of sentencing. Each specific hypothesis will be considered as V1 - V15 in the tables in Chapter IV.

Analysis

The variable reading and each personality variable were compared with length of sentence using a paired stepwise regression. As the personality variable total adjustment and reading were considered, the general hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of probability.
Second, Table 16, p. 74 contains a summary of Pearson r from a paired stepwise multiple R presented to those readers who wish to see the variables as they were considered for entry into the paired stepwise multiple R.
Reference Notes

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This study investigated the effects of reading level and personality with length of sentence, as a measure of severity of criminality. The Adult Ability Learning Examination, Level II, was used to measure reading. Personality variables were measured by the California Test of Personality-Adult. The length of sentence was the current length of sentence for adult male felons. The adult male felons (subjects) were tested during the incarceration process (for current sentences) at Indian Springs Correctional Center near Las Vegas, Nevada.

Seventeen variables were considered separately for the hypothesis. Reading and personality were considered using a paired stepwise multiple R, with severity of criminality. The personality components used the complete test score or Total Adjustment for that variable. All of the individual scores of the test were then divided into a Personality Adjustment score and Social Adjustment score which were subsequently used as variables. Those components which were a part of the Personal Adjustment score were: Self Reliance; Sense of Personal Freedom; Feeling of Belonging; Withdrawing Tendencies and Nervous Symptoms. The Social Adjustment score is composed of Social Standards, Social Skills,
Antisocial Tendencies, Family Relations, Occupation Relations and Community Relations. Each of the components were also mentioned as a part of Personal and Social Adjustment, used as variables. The dependent variable length of sentence was used as a measure of severity of criminality.

The general hypothesis of no impact for reading level and personality variables, in turn, with length of sentencing was evaluated. Tables 1 through 15, pp. 58-72, summarize the paired stepwise multiple R (SPSS, 1970) used to evaluate each of the 15 research hypotheses, V1 - V15 in Chapter III, pp. 51-53. The results of these analyses were used to support or refute the general hypothesis.

As a part of the computation of a paired stepwise multiple R, reading and each personality variable are computed using a Pearson r. For the reader who wishes to compare the Pearson r with the multiple R of reading and each personality variable, the computations will be included in Table 16, p. 74.
The obtained multiple R for the personality variable, Total Adjustment and the variable reading, with length of sentence showed a positive direction that was not significant. See Table 1 below. Therefore, the first specific (V1) and the general null hypothesis was accepted.

TABLE 1

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Total Adjustment and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2382</td>
<td>.0567</td>
<td>2.8868</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a multiple R, the consideration for the personality variable, Personal Adjustment and the variable reading, with length of sentence showed a negative direction that was not significant. See Table 2 below. Therefore, the second specific (V2) null hypothesis was accepted.

### TABLE 2

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Personal Adjustment and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2288</td>
<td>.0523</td>
<td>2.6516</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When a multiple R was used to consider the personality variable, Social Adjustment and the variable reading, with length of sentence the association was in a positive direction that was not significant. See Table 3 below. Therefore, the third specific (V3) null hypothesis was accepted.

### TABLE 3

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Social Adjustment and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2292</td>
<td>.0526</td>
<td>2.6636</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The obtained multiple R for the personality variable, Self Reliance and the variable reading, with length of sentence showed a significant positive direction. See Table 4 below. Therefore, the fourth specific (V4) null hypothesis was rejected.

TABLE 4

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Self Reliance and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.3355</td>
<td>.1126</td>
<td>6.0897</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a multiple R, the personality variable, Personal Worth, and the variable reading, with length of sentence showed a nonsignificant positive relationship. See Table 5 below. Therefore, the fifth specific (V5) null hypothesis was accepted.

**TABLE 5**

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Personal Worth and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2176</td>
<td>.0473</td>
<td>2.3852</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When a multiple R was used to consider the personality variable, Personal Freedom and the variable reading, with length of sentence the association yielded a nonsignificant positive association. See Table 6 below. Therefore, the sixth specific (V6) null hypothesis was accepted.

### Table 6

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Personal Freedom and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1453</td>
<td>0.0211</td>
<td>1.0358</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feeling of Belonging and reading, with length of sentence were significant in a positive direction when a multiple R was used for statistical consideration. See Table 7 below. Therefore, the seventh specific (V7) null hypothesis was accepted.

TABLE 7

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Feeling of Belonging and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2482</td>
<td>.0616</td>
<td>3.1502</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The collective consideration of the personality variable, Withdrawing Tendencies, and the variable reading, with length of sentence demonstrated a nonsignificant association in a positive direction. See Table 8 below. Therefore, the eighth specific (V8) null hypothesis was accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.1763</td>
<td>.0311</td>
<td>1.5390</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Withdrawing Tendencies and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence
Nervous symptoms and reading with length of sentence, were not significant in a positive direction when a multiple R was used for statistical consideration. See Table 9 below. Therefore, the ninth specific (V9) null hypothesis was accepted.

TABLE 9

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Nervous Symptoms and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.1780</td>
<td>.0317</td>
<td>1.5709</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The obtained multiple R for the personality variable, Social Standards, and the variable reading, with length of sentence demonstrated a positive direction that was not significant. See Table 10 below. Therefore, the tenth specific (V10) null hypothesis was accepted.

TABLE 10

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Social Standards and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.1470</td>
<td>.0216</td>
<td>1.0603</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a multiple R, the consideration for the personality variable, Social Skills, and the variable reading, with length of sentence showed a significant positive relationship. See Table 11 below. Therefore, the individual eleventh (Vll) null hypothesis was rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Social Skills and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multiple R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When a multiple R was used to consider the personality variable, Antisocial Tendencies, and the variable reading, with length of sentence, the association was in a positive direction, although not significant. See Table 12 below. Therefore, the twelfth specific (V12) null hypothesis was accepted.

### TABLE 12

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Antisocial Tendencies and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.1490</td>
<td>.0222</td>
<td>1.0893</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When a multiple R was obtained for the personality variable, Family Relations, and the variable reading, with length of sentence, the association was in a positive direction, that was not significant. See Table 13 below. Therefore, the specific thirteenth (V13) null hypothesis was accepted.

**TABLE 13**

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Family Relations and Reading, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.1463</td>
<td>.0214</td>
<td>1.0502</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using a multiple R, the consideration of the personality variable, Occupational Relations, and the variable reading, with length of sentence demonstrated a relationship in a positive direction that was not significant. See Table 14 below. Therefore, the specific fourteenth (V14) null hypothesis was accepted.

**TABLE 14**

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Occupational Relations and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2052</td>
<td>.0421</td>
<td>2.1098</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When a multiple R was obtained for the personality variable, Community Relations, and the variable reading, with length of sentence, the association was not significant in a positive direction. See Table 15 below. Therefore, the specific fifteenth (V15) null hypothesis was accepted.

### TABLE 15

Summary of Multiple Regression for Step Variables, Community Relations and Reading Level, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2050</td>
<td>.0420</td>
<td>2.1052</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 16, p. 74, a summary of Pearson $r$ from the paired stepwise multiple $R$, for Reading and each personality variable, in turn, with length of sentence was summarized. Since these obtained statistics do not answer the hypotheses presented in this study, they will not be described except for the variable reading and Feeling of Belonging. Reading is described because it is paired with each personality variable in turn. When the variable reading was compared with length of sentence, the association of $0.1433$, although not significant, was positive with length of sentence. Feeling of Belonging with an association of $-0.1652$ was not significant until it was paired with the variable reading.
TABLE 16

Summary of Pearson $r$, from a Paired Stepwise Multiple $R$, for Reading and each Personality Variable, in turn, with Length of Sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Multiple $R$</th>
<th>$r$ Square</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Level</td>
<td>.1433</td>
<td>.0205</td>
<td>2.0328</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjustment</td>
<td>-.1267</td>
<td>.1605</td>
<td>1.5819</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Adjustment</td>
<td>-.1208</td>
<td>.0146</td>
<td>1.4360</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Adjustment</td>
<td>-.1160</td>
<td>.0135</td>
<td>1.3226</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Reliance</td>
<td>-.2538</td>
<td>.0644</td>
<td>6.6769</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Worth</td>
<td>-.1178</td>
<td>.0139</td>
<td>1.3638</td>
<td>.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Freedom</td>
<td>.0284</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>.0787</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of Belonging</td>
<td>-.1652</td>
<td>.0273</td>
<td>2.7217</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawing Tendencies</td>
<td>-.0569</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.3149</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous Symptoms</td>
<td>-.0719</td>
<td>.0052</td>
<td>.5045</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Standards</td>
<td>.0748</td>
<td>.0056</td>
<td>.5460</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Skills</td>
<td>-.3158</td>
<td>.0997</td>
<td>10.7438</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial Tendencies</td>
<td>.0146</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0205</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Relations</td>
<td>-.0385</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.1141</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Relations</td>
<td>-.1097</td>
<td>.0120</td>
<td>1.1813</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>-.1185</td>
<td>.0140</td>
<td>1.3812</td>
<td>.243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

The results of the statistical analysis of reading and selected personality variables failed to show a significant association with length of sentence as a measure of severity of criminality, supporting the null hypothesis. As documented, a number of correlation coefficients was shown to be significantly different from zero, as shown by their statistical significance. Although the indicators of correlation were significant, the association between reading level and personality factors with length of sentence was low. For example, the highest association was only 13% for the variable reading and the variable Social Skills, with the variable length of sentence.

As reading and each personality variable, in turn, were compared with length of sentence, a consistent positive correlation was revealed. As the length of sentence increased, reading and each personality score increased.

It is apparent, contrary to popular belief, that within the confines of this study reading failure and personality adjustment were not significantly associated with length of sentence as a measure of severity of criminality.

Three specific null hypotheses were not rejected. (See Chapter 3, pp. 51-53.) Social Skills (V11) and Reading were associated with length of sentence at .3658 with a significance at .001. Self Reliance (V4) and Reading were significant at .003 with an association of .3355. Feeling of Belonging (V7) and Reading revealed a .047 level
of significance for an association of .2482. The remainder of the specific hypotheses were not significant. When the Total personality variable and reading were compared with length of sentence, the association of .2381 failed to reach significance at the .061 level of probability. Therefore, the general null hypotheses (see Chapter 3, p. 51) was not rejected.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the discrete personality dimensions and profiles of 99 adjudicated adult male felons and to compare personality factors between literate and illiterate members of the group.

The question posed was, "What, if any, are the inter-relationships between and among levels of reading, selected personality dimensions and personality adjustment, social adjustment and total adjustment measures with severity of criminality?"

It was hypothesized that, for incarcerated adult male subjects, their recorded criminal activities and individual reading levels were non-interactive, and non-directional relative to personality traits, social adjustment, or total adjustment measures.

Ninety-nine subjects for the study were drawn from some of the first adjudicated adult felons to enter the reception center at the Southern Desert Correctional Center located thirty-two miles north of Las Vegas, Nevada. Each subject in the study responded to the Adult Basic Learning Examination, form A level II and the California Test of Personality,
The Adult Ability Learning Examination, Level II was used to measure reading levels. Personality variables were measured by the California Test of Personality-Adult. The degree of criminality was determined by the current length of sentence for the adult felons tested.

The variables as measured by the California Test of Personality-Adult used the complete test score or Total Adjustment for that variable. All of the individual scores of the test were then divided into a Personality Adjustment score and a Social Adjustment score, which were subsequently used as variables. Those subtests which are a part of the Personal Adjustment score were Self Reliance, Sense of Personal Freedom, Feeling of Belonging, Withdrawing Tendencies and Nervous Symptoms. The Social Adjustment score is composed of Social Standards, Social Skills, Anti-social Tendencies, Family Relations, Occupation Relations and Community Relations. Each of the subtests, as well as Total, Personal and Social Adjustment, were considered variables.

Variables in this study were considered to be statistically significant when they reached the .05 level of significance. Social Skills and Self Reliance were both significant, singularly and collectively with reading level associated with length of sentence, when tested with a paired forward stepwise regression. A Feeling of Belonging was significant when compared collectively with Reading Level
versus length of sentence in a paired stepwise regression.

The variables that did not reach significance singularly versus length of sentence were Reading Level, Family Relations, Social Standards, Sense of Personal Worth, Nervous Symptoms, Antisocial Tendencies, Community Relations, Sense of Personal Freedom, Feeling of Belonging, Occupation Relations, Withdrawing Tendencies, Total Adjustment and Personal Adjustment. Variables that did not reach significance collectively with reading level versus length of sentence were Family Relations, Social Standards, Sense of Personal Worth, Nervous Symptoms, Antisocial Tendencies, Community Relations, Sense of Personal Freedom, Occupation Relations, Withdrawing Tendencies, Total Adjustment and Personal Adjustment.

Conclusions

In this study reading level was not found to be statistically significant as a predictor of length of sentence. Yet, there was a consistent positive correlation with length of sentence -- the longer the sentence, the higher the reading level. Contrary to popular belief, reading failure was not associated with severity of criminality. The factor, Social Standards, is not generally thought to increase with criminality or length of sentence; however, in this study the factor increased. This association, although not significant, could point to a need to study knowledge about moral values as a significant deterrent to crime. The variable Antisocial Tendencies,
although not significant, was in the positive direction, as expected.

The highest personality variable associated with severity of criminality was Social Skills. The association was so low that it could not be considered to be a predictor in a practical sense. That is, the association of personality variables with length of sentence was an individual matter. This is contrary to popular belief. Many would link personality dimensions to severity of criminality.

In this study, reading was not a predictor of length of sentence. In the literature, however, adults who had reported reading failure as children reported the experience to be an aversive one which they still remembered. Adults who had reading problems and were able through tutoring to increase their reading scores reported an increase in self concept. Proband children who were able to increase their reading scores through tutoring experienced lower recidivism than those who were not tutored. The subject seems to be complicated by sociological factors which should be considered for each individual. This study points to the importance of considering each individual in light of personality, social and reading factors apart from a grouping or labeling process. There is no personality pattern linked to reading failure with severity of criminality.
Recommendations for Further Study

Completion of this study leads the writer to suggest that:

1. The results of values education be studied. Although not significant, the factor Social Standards was positively associated to criminality. Is the knowledge of social standards a deterrent to criminality?

2. The further testing of felons with severe reading problems be undertaken. The ABLE (level II) did not discriminate among those individuals who had a score below grade level 3.

3. The further testing of felons with high reading scores be undertaken. There was a positive association, although not significant, between high reading scores and severity of criminality. The ABLE (level II) did not discriminate among those individuals who had a score above level 9.

4. Sociological factors suspected of contributing to felonious behaviors be examined: impact of family, e.g., physical abuse, need for mental health services, and marital discord; peer pressure; and similar variables.

5. An extensive population of incarcerated felons reflecting a variety of criminal acts be studied relative to personality structure to better understand if there really is a personality profile indicative of a specific criminal act.
6. Whenever available, personality scores of the adult felon be compared with his childhood personality scores. Such dynamics change with chronological growth of the individual (Thorpe, Clark and Tiegs, 1953).
APPENDIX A
THE ADULT ABILITY LEARNING EXAMINATION (ABLE) LEVEL II
TEST 2: READING

The ABLE is a power test designed to measure educational achievement among adults. The relative strengths and weaknesses of the individual is measured in each of several academic areas.

Since the reading portion of the test was used for purposes of this study, that portion will be discussed. The reading portion of the examination consists of multiple choice close type items including options in paragraph form with a running text.

The ABLE was standardized initially by 3 groups:

1. The School Group consisted of 1000 pupils in each grade from 2-7.

2. The Jobs Corps Group consisted of 800 young men whose educational experience was of concern.

3. The Hartford-New Haven Group was composed of 450 adults enrolled in basic education.

Scoring

The raw scores of the ABLE are converted to grade level scores by the use of a table. School children were the norming group for the grade scores.

Validity

Test correlations for the ABLE tests and the Stanford
Achievement Tests were provided with the School Group and the Job Corps Group. The School Group was .56, while the Job Corps Group was .58.

**Reliability**

The split half (odd-even) reliability coefficients were corrected by the Spearman-Brown Formula for the School Group (grade 6 and 7), the Job Corps Group and the Hartford-New Haven Groups. For the School Group, grade 6 was .90 and grade 7 was .91. Reliability for the Job Corps and the Hartford-New Haven group was .94.
APPENDIX B
CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY (CTP)
ADULT, 1953 REVISION

The CTP was designed to reveal the status of certain intangible factors of feeling, thinking, and action in social and personality adjustment.

The test consists of six components of personal adjustment and six components of social adjustment which are answered by a yes or no response. The components and the personality, social and total score yield 15 scores as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self Reliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sense of Personal Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Withdrawing Tendencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CTP - Adult was standardized on 3,133 adults in industry and adult education programs in Florida, Tennessee, Illinois, Montana, Utah and California. The adults constituted a normal distribution of mental ability. The population was 85% caucasian, with the remainder Mexican, Negro and other minority groups.
**Scoring**

The California Test of Personality/Adult raw scores are converted into percentile scores by use of a table in the manual. The percentile scores are derived from the percentile ranks which are based on the norms of 3,133 adults in industry in Florida, Illinois, Tennessee, Utah, Montana, and California.

**Validity**

Tables in the manual show a positive phi coefficient for each item and the test score.

**Reliability**

Predictive reliability may be low for a test such as the California Test of Personality because of the change in modes of behavior with experience. A Kuder-Richardson was used to compute the coefficients of Reliability for the subsections and totals of the examination. The r ranged from .82 for Social Skills to .97 for Total Adjustment.
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