CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

The findings of the case history proforma can be summarized as follows. Delinquents and nondelinquents and their families were radically differentiated on a number of environmental variables.

The two groups differed significantly insofar as breadwinners in their families and the nature of employment of these breadwinners. Among the families of nondelinquents the main breadwinners were mostly fathers, while a sizable number of delinquents' families had son or sons working too. Odd jobs were held significantly more frequently by delinquents' families, while more skilled workers and public servants came from nondelinquents' families.

As far as history of emotional and physical problems of the parents of delinquents and nondelinquents, some remarkable differences were noted. Delinquents' fathers were significantly more alcoholic than nondelinquents' fathers. Delinquents' fathers had also more incidence of physical ailments of some sort than nondelinquents' fathers. Mothers of both groups, however, could not be differentiated except for emotional problems; and more delinquents' mothers had emotional problems than nondelinquents' mothers.

Eight different qualities of family life were investigated.
Delinquents tended to show significantly less respect for their families than nondelinquents. On the other hand, families of non-delinquents were found to be generally more ambitious (to improve their status or that of their children) than their counterparts. The relationship between parents of nondelinquents was much better than delinquents' parents. And the supervision of children was found to be better in the homes in which the nondelinquents grew up. Delinquent boys tended to feel that their parents cared less about their (boy's) welfare and recreational activities.

More delinquents than nondelinquents felt that their parents were hostile, indifferent, and unsympathetic towards them. Disciplinary measures taken by delinquents' parents were harsher and more frequently used than nondelinquents' parents.

In terms of their attitudes toward their school, far more delinquents than nondelinquents tended to dislike their school for one reason or another. Delinquent boys were reported to have misbehaved in school at an earlier age than nondelinquent boys. And the incidence of misbehavior in school among delinquent boys was significantly higher than nondelinquent boys. Insignificant differences were noted, however, between experimental and control groups on the following personality characteristics: sensitivity, daydreaming, unsociability, easy discouragement, bashfulness, suspicious behavior, and depression.

Another situation where sharp differences between delinquents and nondelinquents were noted was the community. Majority of delinquents left their homes once or more than once because of their delinquencies.
Far more delinquents than nondelinquents tended to participate in adventurous activities, e.g., stealing, truancy, picking pockets, drinking, etc., etc. More delinquents than nondelinquents went to see movies as frequently as seven or more times a week. A significantly large number of delinquents preferred distant places and river banks as their favorite play places, whereas more nondelinquents chose their own homes as their favorite play places. Delinquents had fewer friends than nondelinquents; and far more delinquents than nondelinquents had delinquents as their companions. Delinquents in contrast to nondelinquents tended to have friends who were older in age than they were.

The results of the analysis of the Rorschach records can be briefly summarized by saying that 26 of the 28 major Rorschach scoring categories yielded insignificant differences. The average number of Rorschach responses (Rs') for the delinquent group was found to be 13.56 and for the nondelinquent group 14.04.

Summing up the findings of the study, insofar as they involve differences between delinquents and nondelinquents, it can be said that compared with nondelinquents, delinquents' environmental conditions (family, home, health of parents and their attitudes and practices, school, community, and companions) were found to be non-conducive and inadequate. On the other hand, the two groups could not be differentiated on the basis of their personality characteristics, as revealed by their Rorschach records.

The results of the study support the previously mentioned
hypothesis that a person's behavior is a function of environmental conditions and that the behavior is shaped and maintained by its consequences. Since most previous studies have concentrated on the role of psychodynamic theory and its relation to the etiology of delinquency, they have tended to overlook the empirical validity of the theory itself. That is one of the reasons why these researches have not produced any consistent results. The present study, however, by not following any particular theoretical model of personality, distinguishes itself in two ways. First, the data have been interpreted as objectively as possible. Secondly, an alternative approach to study delinquency and other undesirable behavior has been offered.

The findings of the present study and their interpretation are meaningful if viewed quite apart from a Freudian interpretation and are viewed from the point of view of learning theory (operant conditioning) and functional analysis of behavior. We believe the findings presented in the study are not in conflict with such an approach to personality assessment. We also believe that the results of the study clearly demonstrate the need for conducting further research into various aspects of delinquency by identifying significant features of behavior and of environment. Whilst not claiming that this has been exhaustively done in the present study, at least an effort has been made in this particular direction. In fact, the present study was merely an exploratory endeavor, but one that has the virtue of being objective and reproducible.