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Chapter I
Review of Literature

Introduction

The development of social skills is an important aspect of maturation and positive social adjustment. Long-term social adjustment may be dramatically affected by a failure to acquire these skills. Psychologists have historically been interested in juvenile delinquency and have postulated various causal theories to explain the occurrence of delinquency. To date, however, none of these theories has become widely accepted. A recent theoretical focus has centered on the relationship between social skills and juvenile delinquency.

Social Skills

Gresham (1986) conceptualizes social skill as a behavioral construct in that a global entity, social skill, is comprised of a conglomeration of specific categories of social behavior. The behavioral construct (social skill) is linked to observable behavior, which has distinct behavioral referents within specific situations. An alternative view, a trait-oriented approach to social behavior, considers social skill as a
hypothetical construct referring to a global, underlying personality characteristic or response predisposition (McFall, 1982).

In a recent review of the concept of social skills, McFall (1982) describes two approaches to the conceptualization of social skills. The first, a trait model, considers social skill as an underlying, cross-situational response predisposition. The second, a molecular model, views social skill as distinct, situation-specific behaviors with no reference to an underlying personality trait of characteristic. Researchers have described shortcomings inherent to both models. The trait model has been faulted for its nebulous, highly abstract nature and its lack of empirical support (Bellack, 1979; Curran, 1977; Hersen & Bellack, 1977, as cited in Gresham, 1986).

The molecular model, in an attempt to resolve problems inherent to the abstract, unobservable nature of the trait approach, provides operationally defined responses in specific situations. However, this approach is not free of the ambiguity it attempts to remediate. McFall (1982) sites several unresolved issues associated with the molecular model which hamper its clarity. The molecular model does not clarify which behaviors (e.g., head nods, facial grimaces, etc.) are appropriate units
of behavior for measurement. In addition, the model does not resolve the confusion surrounding classification of social situations (e.g., by physical characteristics of the situation or by the participants in the situation). Lastly, the issue of classification and evaluation of outcomes (e.g., short-term versus long-term consequences, "success" versus "failure") remains nebulous. According to McFall (as cited in Gresham, 1986):

"The molecular model is of limited value to investigators who are interested in making behavioral predictions. The model states that the best predictor of a person's future behavior is that person's past behavior in the same situation...To make such a prediction requires little or no special understanding either of human behavior generally, or of the individual subject" (p. 4).

Gresham (1986) suggests that a more useful conceptualization of social skill would fall intermediately on the trait-molecular continuum. To date, no such integration of the two major models of social skill has materialized. This controversy can only be resolved through further theoretical refinement and empirical investigation in the area of social skills, especially that focusing on skills deficits.

Relevant literature makes a clear distinction between social skills and social competence. Social skills refers to specific observable behaviors that an
individual exhibits to perform competently on a task (McFall as cited in Gresham, 1986). Social competence, on the other hand, refers to global judgements on the adequacy of the individual's overall performance (McFall as cited in Gresham, 1986). Judgements as to competence can stem from many different sources, opinions of parents or teachers, comparison to a designated normative sample, or comparison to some specific criteria. Researchers are not in agreement on a precise definition of social competence (Hops & Greenwood, 1981). This lack of definitional agreement is reflected in the heterogeneity of treatment designs and assessment instruments, and most notably in the numerous definitions of social skills and social skills deficits.

Over the past two decades, a number of definitions of social skills have been proposed. Combs and Slaby (1977) define children's social skills as "the ability to interact with others in a given social context in specific ways that are societally acceptable or valued and as they sometimes are personally beneficial, mutually beneficial, or beneficial primarily to others" (p. 162). Other researchers, such as Libet and Lewinsohn (as cited in Gresham, 1986) employ a more operantly based definition, viewing social skills as "the complex ability both to emit behaviors that are positively or negatively
reinforced and not to emit behaviors that are punished or extinguished by others" (p. 6). Yet another definition of social skills focuses on "those responses which, within a given situation, prove effective, or in other words, maximize the probability of producing, maintaining, or enhancing positive effects for the interactor" (p. 6) (Foster & Ritchey as cited in Gresham, 1986).

Combs & Slaby (1977) and Foster and Ritchey (as cited in Gresham, 1986) make references to social skills in relation to benefit to the individual. However, these researchers fail to specify that appropriate social skills should not result in benefit to the individual at the expense or harm of another. Appropriate social skill may be best associated with mutual benefit and/or appropriate compromise (Gibbs, 1987).

Thus, while these various descriptions give a general idea of what constitutes social skills, each incorporates somewhat ambiguous terminology which hampers the operationalization of the concept. It is difficult to ascertain just exactly what is meant by "personally or mutually beneficial", "complex ability", or "positive effects". Hence, it becomes evident that to adequately define social skills, researchers must further refine and operationalize the concept.
While several of the general definitions of social skills center on peer acceptance as a marker for positive skill acquisition (Allen, Benning, & Drummond; Apolloni & Cooke as cited in Hops & Greenwood, 1981), many other researchers have opted for a more behavioral definition (Bellack & Hersen, 1979; Combs & Claby, 1977; Hops, 1983) than those described above. The behavioral definition centers on those situation specific responses that maximize the probability of punishment or extinction contingent upon an individual's social behavior. Deficits or excesses in behaviors are seen as indicative or poor social skill. Associated with conceptualization are measurement approaches focusing on behavioral observations in naturalistic settings and role play of situations. By utilizing this approach, specific antecedents and consequences of particular social behaviors can be identified, specified, and operationalized, thus enhancing both assessment and remediation efforts. However, while the behavioral definition is useful in identifying specific social behaviors, it does not help to clarify whether these behaviors are socially significant or lead to socially important outcomes.

Gresham (as cited in Gresham, 1986) has extended Bandura's (1977) work on performance versus skills of
behavior to a heuristic framework for the area of social skills. Gresham (1986) categorized social skills problems into four major areas: (1) skills deficits, (2) performance deficits, (3) self-control skill deficits, and (4) self-control performance deficits. Distinctions between the four categories revolve around: (a) whether or not the individual knows how to perform the skill being examined and (b) the existence of emotional arousal responses, such as anger and impulsivity.

Following the same rationale for Bandura's (1977) acquisition or learning deficit, a pure social skill deficit implies that the individual does not possess the requisite social skill to interact positively/effectively with others or does not know a critical step in the performance of the necessary skill. Evaluation for a social skills deficit centers on the individual's knowledge or past performance of the skill.

A pure performance deficit implies that the individual has the necessary social skill in his/her repertoire, but for some reason does not perform it at an acceptable or appropriate level. In other words, a performance deficit is a deficiency in the number of times or appropriateness with which a social behavior is emitted. Possible causes for lack of performance may stem from lack of motivation or absence of opportunity.
for performance. However, emotional arousal, such as anxiety, does not constitute a causal factor for a performance deficit. (Gresham [as cited in Gresham, 1986] associates this type of arousal with the two self-control social skill classifications described below.) Assessment of a pure performance deficit centers on whether or not the individual has ever performed the required behavior. Investigators examine whether the deficit occurs in only one setting or if the individual has emitted the behavior in the past.

Self-control social skill deficits involve failure to learn a given social skill because some type of emotional arousal response has precluded the acquisition of the skill. One such prominent emotional arousal response is anxiety. In support of this contention, research on phobias and fears has shown that anxiety can prevent the acquisition of effective coping responses (Bandura as cited in Gresham, 1986). Therefore, social anxiety may serve to prevent adaptive social approach behavior, and in turn, avoidance of positive social initiations may serve to reduce this anxiety.

Impulsivity is another type of emotional arousal response which may hamper the acquisition of social skills. Individuals who are impulsive, e.g., have short response latencies in social situations, tend not to
learn appropriate, adaptive social interaction strategies, because their impulsive style often results in social rejection by others. Thus, the individual is either not exposed to models of more appropriate behaviors, or placed on an extinction schedule for poor social responses. Two key factors contribute to the determination of a self-control skills deficit: (1) the presence of an emotional arousal response, e.g., anxiety, impulsivity, fear, anger, etc.; and (2) the individual not ever knowing or performing the specific skill (Gresham, 1986).

The fourth classification, self-control performance deficits, involve having the specific social skill in the repertoire, but not performing the specific skill due to the same type of emotional arousal responses noted in a self-control skill deficit. Hence, the differentiating factor between the two self-control skill deficits is whether or not the individual has the social skill in his/her repertoire. The determination of a self-control performance deficit is based on the presence of an emotional arousal response and the inconsistent or unisituational performance of the designated skill.

Assessment of Social Skills in Adolescents

There is a great deal of recent literature which focuses on assessment of social skill in children. The
The purpose of such assessment is generally to identify children who may be either currently exhibiting problems or who may be at risk for future manifestation of behavioral difficulties. However, both research and actual assessment measures focusing on the adolescent are scarce. By the time an individual reaches adolescence, it is more likely than not that if there are problems in social skills they have manifested in some form of behavioral difficulty. There is a need for measures with practical utility for change agents in naturalistic, applied settings.

Lowe and Cautela (1978) attempted to construct an assessment device to measure a wide range of interactive variables associated with social skills. The researchers developed the Social Performance Survey Schedule (SPSS) which consists of 50 positive and 50 negative items pertaining to social behaviors. Items were generated by asking college students to list all social traits they utilized in describing their own or others' social behavior. To assess the reliability of the SPSS, 303 undergraduate and graduate psychology students completed the SPSS, rating the frequency of their own social behaviors on a 5-point Likert scale.

Scoring of the SPSS took one of two forms. The first method assumed on an a priori basis that the more
frequently positive social behaviors are emitted and the less frequently negative social behaviors are emitted, the better an individual's social performance. It should be noted that this scoring is based on the authors' definition of optimum social performance and does not take into account the possibly different value judgements of other populations.

The second method of scoring the SPSS attempted to adjust for the value judgements of specific populations which are noted above. The procedure for accomplishing this adjustment involves randomly selecting judges from the population taking the SPSS. Each judge would be asked to indicate the ideal frequency rating for each item and a mean would be taken of all the judges' individual ratings. The absolute difference between respondents' actual item scores and the mean ideal judges' score for each item would be calculated to achieve an adjusted score. However, it should be noted that this method of adjustment may be inappropriate for certain populations. Therefore, the utility of the SPSS for these populations is questionable.

Results of test and retest data indicated that the SPSS is temporally stable and internally consistent. Comparison between the SPSS and the Social Avoidance and
Distress (SAD) scale (Watson & Friend as cited in Lowe and Cautela, 1978), while low in magnitude, provided preliminary evidence for the construct validity of the SPSS and its subscales. Females consistently scored higher than males on all SPSS and subscale comparisons. The researchers site the potential of the SPSS in identification of individuals in need of social skills training. Such individuals might be identified by scores indicating low frequencies of positive social behavior, high frequencies of negative social behavior, or both.

Matson, Rotatori and Helsel (1983) developed a rating scale to measure social skills in children. While the mean age of their sample for self-report data was 11.19 years of age, the range of the sample was 4-18 years of age, thus incorporating a minor number of adolescents. The teacher-report sample consisted of children 4-15 years of age, with a mean age of only 7.19 years, making applicability to adolescents a bit more nebulous.

The researchers' focus was to develop a rating scale for social skills which incorporated an array of verbal and nonverbal behaviors. Emphasis was placed on interpersonal effectiveness without harm to others and providing a situation which maximizes reinforcers and which is situation specific. After reviewing a number of
existing measures which incorporate scales related to children's social skills, including the Child Behavior Profile (Achenbach & Edelbrock as cited in Matson, et al., 1983) and the Behavior Problem Checklist (Quay & Peterson as cited in Matson, et al., 1983), an item pool was constructed for the Matson Evaluation of Social Skills with Youngsters (MESSY).

A factor analysis was conducted on self-report and teacher-report ratings. Factors were obtained for both self- and teacher-report versions. Self-report form factors included appropriate social skill, inappropriate assertiveness, impulsive/recalcitrant, overconfident, jealousy/withdrawal, and miscellaneous items. Teacher-report form factors included inappropriate assertiveness/impulsiveness, appropriate social skills, and miscellaneous items. Significant age X sex differences were found on the self-report factor of inappropriate social behavior, showing boys higher in aggression and other overt inappropriate social behavior. Matson, et al., (1983) concluded that this "multimodel" assessment, utilizing rating scales of a wide range of social behavior, is a promising alternative to operationally-defined behavior ratings and role-play scene tests often utilized with children.
The remaining literature which touches on the assessment of social skills in adolescents focuses on either dating and assertion competence (i.e., Garbin, Robertson & Bernstein, 1986) or heterosocial skills (i.e., Wallander, 1985) in college students. There is little, if any, research which focuses specifically on the junior and senior high school age adolescent. However, a study by Nelson, Hayes, Felton and Jarrett (1985), while focusing on heterosocial skills, does have some relevance to the issue of the effectiveness of different behavioral assessment techniques. These researchers investigated four behavioral assessment techniques: role-play, interview, questionnaire, and self-rating, using a sample of college undergraduates. In general, significantly different ratings of heterosocial skills were derived depending on the type of assessment utilized. Assessment techniques in which the subjects rated themselves, e.g., questionnaires and self-rating, produced poorer ratings of skills than assessment techniques in which experimenters rated the subjects, e.g., interviews and role-playing. The authors concluded that the results from this study imply that self-evaluation as a method of skills assessment is not sensitive to the same behavioral differences discriminated by others. Thus, although self-ratings
scales are often utilized in measuring social skills, they may, in fact, be an inadequate method of assessment.

Social Skills and Juvenile Delinquency

One of the most intriguing applied areas of social skills research has focused on delinquent adolescents. The underlying reasoning is that adolescents become involved in anti-social behavior because they lack the requisite social skills to act otherwise or have no pro-social manner of achieving their desired goals. Deficits in social skills in certain situations are thought to be related to an increasing vulnerability to antisocial behaviors (Hunter & Kelly, 1986). In addition, longitudinal data presented by Serna, Schumaker, Hazel and Sheldon (1986) indicate that the majority of delinquent youths do not "outgrow" their problematic behaviors. Interpersonal skills are of increasing importance during adolescence and early adulthood (Dishion, Loeber, Stotuhamer-Loeber & Patterson, 1984) and there is growing concern centering on the interpersonal incompetence of antisocial adolescents and its long-term effects for these youth as well as society.

Dishion et al. (1984) classify adolescent social skills deficits into two interrelated areas. The first aspect involves the interpersonal interaction style of
the individual which affects his relationship with others, especially peers and parents. An adolescent's interaction style may play an important role in social acceptance. The second aspect focuses on the adolescent's style of interpersonal problem solving. This affects the resolution of social problems, such as conflict with parents, resisting temptation, and response to provocation. There is some empirical evidence to support Dishion, et al's (1984) contention that delinquent adolescents are lacking in both of these areas. Poor interpersonal interactions and nonproductive problem solving can result in poor peer relations and peer rejection, which have been shown to be predictive of latter court-reported delinquency (Roff & Sells; West & Farrington as cited in Dishion, et al., 1984).

Freedman, Rosenthal, Donahoe, Schlundt & McFall (1978) investigated a social skills conception of delinquency among adolescent males. The researchers hypothesized that adolescent male adjudicated delinquents would show situation-specific social skill performance deficits in comparison to matched nondelinquent adolescent male controls. By definition their theoretical approach followed a molecular model of social skill. The investigation consisted of two parts: the first focused on the construction of an inventory which
identified relevant potential problem situations for adolescents. The purpose of the inventory was to develop explicit situation-specific criteria for differentiating between the performance skills of delinquent versus nondelinquent male adolescents. The culmination of efforts in this first phase was the Adolescent Problems Inventory (API). The second part of the investigation centered on the empirical validation of the API, and thus, was an indirect test of the social skills conceptualization of delinquency.

In developing the API, the researchers attempted to select what they termed "maximally dissimilar, non-overlapping items" (Freedman, et al., 1978) and in accordance did not assume the existence of any underlying factors or domains of classification. The criteria for the items were based on two main ideas. First, each vignette described a familiar problem situation for adolescent males. Second, each situation, if handled inappropriately, could result in some type of trouble for the adolescent, most notably, trouble with the law. Thus, the more frequently the individual handled the situations in an incompetent manner, the more likely he was to get into trouble and be judged a delinquent.

As part of the development of the API, a rater's manual presenting explicit criteria for scoring responses
was formulated. The scoring reflects competence, incompetence, or neutrality of responses. Sample responses which represented different levels of performance were also compiled in the scoring manual.

In an initial validation of the API, the responses of institutionalized adolescent delinquents were rated as less competent than two nondelinquent adolescent groups, leaders and good citizens. Leaders were adolescents who participated in several school sports and other extracurricular activities. Good citizens were adolescents who maintained a "B" or above grade point average without a record of disciplinary actions. The good citizen group also had a significantly higher mean IQ than the delinquent group. The investigators postulated that the subject's verbal ability may have contributed to both IQ and API score. Nonetheless, they contended that the API measures "something above and beyond verbal intelligence" (Freedman, et al., 1978). (Freedman et al. [1978] resolve the issue of the relationship between social skill and intelligence in their third validation study.)

A second validation study was aimed at examining two groups of institutionalized adolescent males, those who had frequent behavioral problems within the institution, and those who had few acting-out problems within the institution. Results indicated that the acting-out
delinquents evidenced lower scores on the API than the less disruptive group, thus demonstrating the ability of the API to make an even finer discrimination in social skills.

In the third validation study of the API, Freedman et al. (1978) assessed whether or not poor performance on the API was due to skills deficits, as hypothesized, or whether it is an artifact of the instructions of the measure. Thus, for a portion of the subjects in the experimental and control groups, instructions were altered to ask for "the best response" as opposed to the traditional instructions which ask for the subject's most likely response. In addition, a portion of the subjects in both the experimental and control groups were given a multiple-choice version of the API, as opposed to the traditional open-ended response version. The investigators were interested in examining whether delinquents would show deficits in recognition as well as production of competent responses. This portion of the study addressed the issue of IQ discrepancy between groups by prematching subjects for age, socioeconomic status, and IQ. Results showed a negligible relationship between IQ scores and performance on the API. Both altered versions of the API (open-ended vs. multiple choice; best vs. typical response) were shown to
differentiate between the delinquent and nondelinquent groups. However, the type of instructions given to subjects (typical vs. best response versions) and the format of the inventory (open-ended vs. multiple choice) did significantly affect API performance. Subjects asked for the best response performed better than those asked for their typical response across both groups. In addition, all subjects performed better when given the multiple choice version rather than the open-ended version of the inventory.

When a cluster analysis was performed on the original open-ended response version of the API, Freedman et al. (1978) found that generally there was a lack of consistent clustering of the situations. In addition, inter-item correlations were moderate. It was therefore concluded that competence scores show a high degree of situational specificity. Nonetheless, inspection of the API items would suggest that the themes prominent elsewhere in the descriptive literature, e.g., response to provocation and to deviant peer pressure, are prominent among the API problems as well.

Taken as a whole, the research of Freedman et al. (1978) attests to the validity of the API as a measure of social skill performance in adolescent males. In addition, the results of this investigation point to the
relationship between social skill deficits and legal/interpersonal problems. The delinquent males were more apt to incorporate verbal and physical aggression in their solution to problem situations. One important offshoot of the Freedman et al. (1978) work should be noted, namely, parallel instrument development for female delinquents, the Problem Inventory for Adolescent Girls (Gaffney & McFall, 1981, 1986).

Recently, Hunter and Kelly (1986) have challenged the validity of the API as a measure of social skill in situations related to antisocial behavior in adolescent males. These researchers investigated the utility of the API in discriminating between level or amounts of antisocial behavior exhibited by juvenile delinquents. It was hypothesized that lower performance levels on the API should relate to higher levels of antisocial activity. Hunter and Kelly's (1986) results indicated that the API was not significantly related in the expected direction to level of antisocial activity.

However, it should be noted that there are several limitations in the Hunter and Kelly (1986) investigation. Firstly, the four detention center variables used to measure conduct within the institution included two measures of disruptive behavior (e.g., number of times in isolation room and token economy system level) that were
only measured for the beginning three weeks of the subjects stay in the institution. It is questionable whether a valid level of acting out behavior would emerge in such a brief period, prior to the individual's adjustment to the new environment. Secondly, the researchers utilized the original 44-item API, which was designed approximately a decade prior to Hunter and Kelly's (1986) investigation. Inspection of the items suggests that the language used in the vignettes is in need of updating to enhance contemporary ecological validity.

Statement of Problem

It is clear that further research is needed to ascertain the value of the API as a measure of social skills within the delinquent male population. Freedman et al. (1978) maintain that a wide array of social skills deficits may be related to delinquent behavior, and that delinquents and nondelinquents may perform competently in some skills areas while performing poorly on others. They further contend that there is no single deficit or pattern of deficits to explain delinquency and that the API cannot be broken down into separate skills factors. However, the authors' analysis is in the form of a cluster analysis as opposed to a factor analysis. As Achenbach (1978) states:
"...cluster analysis differs from factor analysis in that it yields groupings composed of particular variables or individuals, rather than dimensions on which every variable or individual has a loading, be it large or small" (p. 153).

If one is interested in identifying specific areas of social skills incorporated in the API (e.g., response to provocation, response to deviant peer pressure, etc.) and in determining which areas may prove most troublesome for adolescent delinquents, a factor analytic approach to data analysis may yield different, if not conflicting evidence in relation to Freedman et al's. (1978) original study. In addition, to adequately address the concerns of Hunter and Kelly (1986), who postulate that the "...44 specific situations employed by the API...may not adequately capture the environment of the subjects" (p. 302), it is necessary to update and edit the original version of the API to reflect more current language and themes. Furthermore, the practical value of the API (and PIAG) could be enhanced if less relevant items can be excluded without psychometric cost for the sake of shorter test administration time (the API and PIAG require 45-60 minutes per subject to administer). Finally, to determine the validity of the API in making finer discriminations between the rather heterogeneous delinquent population, additional validation utilizing an updated inventory format is needed.
The purpose of the present study, thus, was threefold. First, an updated, shortened version of the API, the Inventory of Adolescent Problems-Short Form (IAP-SF), was evaluated in terms of its relationship to the antisocial conduct of institutionalized male adolescent delinquents. Second, a factor analysis was conducted to determine whether or not there are specific social skills factors within the IAP which can be delineated. Third, distinguishable factors related to areas of social skills deficits were examined as to their relationship to degree of antisocial conduct.

**Outcome Hypotheses**

In reviewing the current literature, it can be seen that social skills are patterns of constructive behavior which help to ensure positive outcomes in interpersonal situations. Logically, social skills would be most needed in stressful or problematic situations. Freedman et al. (1978) in constructing a rating system for social skills have given higher, more positive ratings to constructive or competent responses, and lower, more negative ratings to responses which involve inappropriate aggression or submission. Hence, a socially skilled response is one which is assertive yet considerate, and rational or appealing to reason. A non-skilled response
is typically one which worsens a problem by either prolonging or exacerbating the problem or increasing the likelihood that the problem will recur.

The IAP-SF is a social skills assessment of adolescents' responses to various problematic or stressful situations. Freedman et al.'s. (1978) research demonstrated the ability of the original API to discriminate between delinquent and nondelinquent adolescents as well as to make finer discriminations between levels of antisocial conduct in delinquent adolescents. More recently, Hunter and Kelly (1986) have challenged that the API is not effective in making distinctions between the level of antisocial conduct of incarcerated juvenile delinquents. It was hypothesized, in the current study, that the IAP-SF would relate to degree of antisocial conduct in the incarcerated male delinquents. It was further hypothesized that performance of social skills, as measured by the IAP-SF, would be inversely related to antisocial conduct of the male delinquent.

If less positive social skill responses involve the extremes of either submissive appeasement on one hand, or unqualified aggression on the other, it seems plausible that these response styles are induced in different types of problematic situations. Furthermore, it can be
postulated that some degree of either submission or aggression may be adaptive in one type of situation while being maladaptive in another. Acquiescence or submission is likely to be a negative social skill response to peer pressure for deviant or antisocial conduct. Aggression or hostility may be expressed by an adolescent lacking in social skills in situations which are in some way provocative. Some degree of submission may be constructive in this situation, whereas it was not constructive in the deviant peer pressure situation. It was therefore hypothesized that factor analysis would yield at least two discrete sub-areas of social skills which are addressed by the IAP-SF (e.g., response to provocation, response to peer pressure, etc.).
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Sample

The criterion for delinquency utilized in the present study was adjudication and placement in a training center for delinquent minors. The specific sample used was comprised of male delinquents confined in the Buckeye Youth Center. The Buckeye Youth Center, located in Columbus, Ohio, is a medium security facility administered by the Ohio Department of Youth Services. The population of the center consists of youth from throughout southern and central Ohio who have committed felonies.

The data was obtained as part of a research project initiated by Dr. John Gibbs of Ohio State University in cooperation with the Superintendent of Buckeye Youth Center.

All subjects were between the ages of 15 and 18 years of age, with a mean age of 16.46. The sample consisted of 125 subjects who entered the institution between October 1, 1985 and November 25, 1985. All
subjects were tested during their first ten days of intake to the facility. Testing was conducted on a voluntary basis and subjects could choose not to participate. Two subjects were unable to complete the testing, thus making a total of 123 subjects completing testing. All subjects, information regarding the subjects, and test results were dealt with in accordance to the guidelines set forth by the Ohio State University's Revised Guidelines for Use of Human Subjects in Research and as approved by the Ohio Department of Youth Services.

**Measures**

**Inventory of Adolescent Problems - Short Form (IAP-SF)**

The IAP-SF was adapted from the Adolescent Problems Inventory (API) (Freedman, et al., 1978) and the Problem Inventory for Adolescent Girls (PIAG) (Gaffney & McFall, 1981, 1986) by Gibbs and Swillinger (Gibbs et al., 1987). (See Appendix A for the IAP-SF and IAP-SF scoring manual.) The inventory was designed to assess the competence or "constructive" effectiveness of male adolescents' social skills in social problem situations typically faced by this age group. The measure consists of 22 social situations identified as the most relevant and gender-generic of the original API and PIAG items.
The IAP-SF is individually administered in oral form. Adolescents are asked after hearing each situation: "What do you say or do now?". In addition to the verbal presentation, each subject is provided with a list of the situations and is instructed to read along as the item is presented orally. Each response is tape recorded and subsequently written verbatim on the IAP-SF Response Sheet. In the event an individual offers more than one response, the interviewer asks him to indicate the most likely response.

The scoring manual for the IAP-SF presents explicit criteria for rating responses to each of the 22 items on a 5-point scale. Scoring scale values are 8, 6, 4, 2, and 0, with 8 representing a very competent response to 0 representing a very incompetent response. The criteria are item specific and are based on data provided from the original construction of the API (Freedman, et al., 1978). Sample responses representing the different levels of competency are included for each item.

The original API has been shown to have acceptable levels of reliability (test-retest, parallel form, interrater, internal consistency) and validity.

**Socioeconomic Status**

All subjects provided the occupation of both parents and/or guardians. Socioeconomic status (SES) of each
family was determined by employing the Revised Duncan Sociometric Index (Featherman & Stevens, 1980). Mueller and Parcel (1981) endorsed the use of this measure in their review of measures of SES.

**Chronological Age and Intelligence**

Chronological age and intelligence for each subject was determined by examining their personal files. Three forms of intelligence and academic data were available for the majority of subjects. Normative grade status and actual grade status were available for all subjects. The California Achievement Test (CAT) scores, including reading and mathematics percentiles, were obtainable for most subjects. In addition, either WISC-R or WAIS-R intelligence scale scores, including full scale IQ scores, were available for most subjects.

**Archival Data**

Through the cooperation of the staff at the Buckeye Youth Center, archival data was obtained on all subjects. Although not all files were totally complete, the following information was obtained on the majority of the subjects:

1. current age,
2. normative grade,
3. actual grade,
4. WISC-R or WAIS-R intelligence test scores,
5. California Achievement Test, reading percentile, mathematics percentile,
6. parental status,
7. with whom the subject had been living,
8. parental employment status and occupation,
9. public assistance status,
10. felony and/or court record
   a. age of first offense
   b. felony for which committed
   c. most serious offense
   d. number of felonies committed
   e. number of times committed to an institution
   f. number of institutions to which the subject had been committed and number of times
   g. types of institutions with which the subject had involved;
      1) children's services
      2) children's home
      3) psychiatric treatment
      4) drug rehabilitation program
      5) group home
      6) foster home
      7) minimum security
      8) medium security
      9) maximum security
11. drug and alcohol abuse,
12. psychological problems,
13. conduct in the institution.

Conduct within Buckeye Youth Center was measured by a weekly point system. Points were administered to subjects by BYC staff as incentive for good conduct. The incarcerated delinquent was credited with 112 points each week. Points were subtracted for misbehavior. Privileges and levels of freedom in the institution were contingent on weekly point levels. The weekly point system provided an index of the subjects' ability to cope with the rules of the institution.

All of the archival data collected was recorded on a standardized form developed by Dr. E. Kay Douglas in accordance with guidelines provided by Dr. John Gibbs and the Superintendent of Buckeye Youth Center. (See Appendix B for copies of the forms used to record archival data.)

An additional method of assessing conduct in the institution was comprised of examining a daily report for a list of AWOL attempts and successes.

Procedure

All assessment was completed at the Buckeye Youth Center. A researcher escorted all subjects to an individual testing room. Selection of subjects was based
on entrance to the institution within the last ten days and current involvement in the intake process.

After the researchers introduced themselves, they explained that this testing was voluntary and that results of this testing would remain confidential and would in no way affect the subjects' stay at BYC. Subjects were instructed that they would be only identified by a code number, not their names.

Each individual interview was tape recorded and each subject was asked if he had any objections to this procedure. All but one subject consented to being interviewed and recorded. The three researchers conducting the testing randomly selected the subjects for the interviews. Each researcher attempted to put the subject at ease by discussing a neutral topic such as the weather, where the subject was from, or any similarly neutral topic which seemed to relax the subject. The researcher explained that he/she was going to read a series of situations that could happen to someone similar to the subject. Subjects were provided with a written copy of the IAP-SF items and instructed to read along as the researcher read aloud. Subjects were instructed to imagine themselves in the situations and to report what they would do if this were really them. After the researcher finished reading the paragraph about a
situation, he/she asked the subject to explain what he thought he would do if this every happened to him.

The interview lasted approximately 20-30 minutes per subject. Upon completion of the taped interview, each subject was thanked for his cooperation and participation and returned to the lobby to be given permission by the duty officer to return to his normal daily schedule.

Analysis of Data

The first question to be answered by the analysis of data was to determine the relationship between social skill, as measured by the IAP-SF and conduct. First, a Spearman correlation was performed to determine if there was a significant correlation between the IAP-SF and measures of conduct. The Spearman rank correlation was chosen because much of the data was ordinal data rather than nominal or interval data (Kerlinger, 1973, 436-452). Second, a simple regression was used to determine the magnitude of the effect social skill on conduct. Because intelligence was found to correlate with one of the measures of conduct, intelligence was partialled out of the relationship between social skill and conduct to determine if the relationship remained significant.

The second question to be addressed was whether the IAP-SF contained any delineable factors. To accomplish this, a factor analysis was conducted. The first step of
the procedure involved determining the number of discrete factors, based on Eigen values, which could be retained in the analysis. This portion of the analysis supported the inclusion of two factors in further factor analysis. In the second step of the factor analysis, a Harris-Kaiser orthoblique rotation (HK power=.10) was employed. The oblique rotation was chosen because this method best accounts for correlation between factors, e.g., both factors to a general construct of social skill. Ford, MacCallum and Tait (1986) support the use of an oblique rotation since "Oblique rotation more accurately represents the complexity of the examined variables because constructs in the real world are rarely uncorrelated" (p. 296).

The third question to be answered was how the factors derived in the factor analysis related to conduct. Four constructs were used to determine conduct. These variables were number of offenses, committing offense (offense which was assigned by the juvenile justice system at the time of sentencing), most serious offense, and the mean score of attempted and successful AWOL's (AWOL). A multiple regression was performed on these four variables as dependent variables with IAP-SF Factors 1 and 2 serving as independent variables.
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Rationale

The results of this study are presented to explain the relationship of social skills and its impact upon conduct and offense record of incarcerated male delinquents.

First, a description of the sample will be presented. Second, the relationship between social skill and institutional conduct and offense record will be analyzed. Third, a factor analytic investigation of the measure of social skill will be examined.

Since the measure of social skills (the IAP-SF) was rated by more than one rater, the interrater reliability will be presented.
Description of Sample

The sample for the present study was composed of 125 incarcerated male delinquents, all of whom had committed felonies. Ethnic distribution was as follows: 76% (95) white and 24% (30) black, biracial, or Latin American. The age of the subjects ranged from 15.2 years to 18.2 years (mean 16.46) at the time of intake. Their normative grade level ranged from 10th to 12th grade (mean 11.3), while their actual grade level ranged from 7th to 12th grade (mean 9.6). All of the subjects had completed the California Achievement Test (reading and mathematic scales), with reading percentiles ranging from 1% through 93% (mean 26.1%); mathematics percentiles ranged from 1% through 92% (mean 19.8%). On the WISC-R intelligence scale, the full scale IQ of the subjects ranged from 69 to 110 (mean 87.3). In looking at the parents of the subjects, 31% of the subjects had parents who were still married, and 25% of the subjects lived with both parents. Slightly above one-half, 54%, of the households had parents who were employed, with the mean employment level at a lower SES status, 27.68. 85% of the subjects were committed for a felony; the remaining 15% were returning to BYC for parole violation. 96% of the subjects were committed to BYC for felonies 3 or 4. Felonies 3 and 4 include: breaking and entering, auto
theft, theft, child endangerment, involuntary manslaughter. The range in age of the first official recorded legal offense for the subjects was 8.9 years to 17.6 years (mean 14.3). See Table 1 for a description of the sample.

Social Skills and Conduct

The range of scores on the IAP-SF for this sample was 1.3968 through 7.6300 (mean 4.5190). Theoretically, positive social skills would be defined as a mean score approaching 8. Spearman correlations were computed to examine the relationship of mean IAP-SF scores to measures of conduct. Correlations were highly significant between social skill and most serious offense, $r = -.260, p = .004$; number of commitments, $r = -.274, p = .0025$; number of institutions, $r = -.207, p = .023$; attempted AWOL, $r = -.248, p = .007$; and successful AWOL, $r = -.183, p = .048$. An aggregate of AWOL attempts and successful AWOL yielded a correlation to social skill of $r = -.246, p = .007$. Intelligence was found to correlate with most serious offense, $r = -.202, p = .044$, but not with social skill. Thus, it was important to partial intelligence out of the relationship between social skill and seriousness of offense. When full scale IQ was partialled out of the relationship between most
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age Male</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>0.7099</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>18.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parental Status</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parental Employment</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SES</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age at First Offence</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>17.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Level of Felony for which Committed</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Most Serious Offense</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of Felonies Committed</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Number of Times Committed</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of Institutions</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of institutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Children's Services</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Children's Home</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Psychiatric Treatment</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Drug Rehabilitation</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Foster Home</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Psychiatric Treatment</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Women Security</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Minimum Security</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Maximum Security</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Drug Problem</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Alcohol Problem</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Psychiatric Problem</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Appendix B for classification of score
serious offense and social skill, the correlation remained significant, $r = -0.240$, $p < 0.01$.

Weekly point ratings did not correlate significantly with social skill. An aggregate of points from all six weeks was also not significantly correlated to social skill. The two remaining measures of conduct, committing offense (according to judicial decision) and number of offenses did not correlate significantly to social skill.

A recorded history of a drug problem was significantly correlated with social skill, $r = -0.221$, $p = 0.015$, as was a history of an alcohol problem, $r = -0.216$, $p = 0.018$. Alcohol and drug problems were meaned to form a construct of general chemical dependency, which also proved to be significantly correlated to social skill, $r = -0.227$, $p = 0.013$. Table 2 presents significant correlations with social skill; Table 3 presents item to overall measure correlations.

Since several factors of conduct were found to correlate significantly with social skill, a multiple regression was performed to determine how much effect social skill had upon these indices of conduct.

The regression between the mean of attempted and successful AWOLS, (AWOL), was significant, $F(1,116) = 8.36$, $p = 0.005$. Social skill, as measured by the IAP-SF, accounted for 7% of the variance in AWOL attempts and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social Skill</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. FS10</td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not. Ser. Off.</td>
<td>-0.256</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No.Commiss.</td>
<td>-0.274</td>
<td>(-0.070)</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No.Instit.</td>
<td>-0.267</td>
<td>(-0.166)</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Commiss.</td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>(-0.035)</td>
<td>(-0.169)</td>
<td>(-0.025)</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. No. of</td>
<td>(-0.110)</td>
<td>(-0.137)</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>-0.211</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. AML</td>
<td>-0.240</td>
<td>(-0.080)</td>
<td>(-0.151)</td>
<td>(0.078)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>(-0.026)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. AML</td>
<td>-0.183</td>
<td>(-0.104)</td>
<td>(-0.172)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.155)</td>
<td>(0.123)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successes</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mean</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(-0.056)</td>
<td>(0.081)</td>
<td>(0.114)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(-0.091)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.071)</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>103.53</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1. Book</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Drug</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>(-0.172)</td>
<td>(-0.029)</td>
<td>(-0.063)</td>
<td>(-0.218)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(-0.031)</td>
<td>(0.149)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Alcohol</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>(-0.147)</td>
<td>(-0.024)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.180)</td>
<td>(0.127)</td>
<td>(-0.079)</td>
<td>(0.143)</td>
<td>(0.122)</td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) = p < 0.05
### Table 3
Spearman Correlations of IAP-SF Items with IAP-SF Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Correlation to Total</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.48416</td>
<td>4.256</td>
<td>2.882</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.54444</td>
<td>2.413</td>
<td>3.161</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.50517</td>
<td>5.083</td>
<td>3.438</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.47289</td>
<td>4.016</td>
<td>3.175</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.56037</td>
<td>4.576</td>
<td>2.398</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.46375</td>
<td>4.512</td>
<td>2.229</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.47663</td>
<td>4.925</td>
<td>3.396</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.55387</td>
<td>4.067</td>
<td>2.510</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.66931</td>
<td>4.214</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.52504</td>
<td>5.504</td>
<td>2.992</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.42427</td>
<td>5.503</td>
<td>2.444</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.54467</td>
<td>4.766</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.24127</td>
<td>6.247</td>
<td>2.199</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.38449</td>
<td>5.783</td>
<td>2.004</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While interitem correlation for item 13 is relatively low, factor loading for this item was very strong.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>CORRELATION TO TOTAL</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.55106 0.0001</td>
<td>3.950</td>
<td>3.502</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.62788 0.0001</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>2.634</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.51299 0.0001</td>
<td>3.909</td>
<td>3.157</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.35884 0.0001</td>
<td>5.675</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.46076 0.001</td>
<td>3.017</td>
<td>2.118</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.46997 0.0001</td>
<td>4.768</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.54924 0.0001</td>
<td>4.231</td>
<td>2.077</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.38666 0.0001</td>
<td>4.516</td>
<td>2.650</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
successes. The regression between most serious offense committed and social skill was also significant, $F(1, 116) = 8.07$, $p = .005$. Social skill accounted for 7% of the variance in most serious offense. While Spearman correlation was significant between number of commitments and social skill, regression analysis (parametric statistics) weakened that relationship to a trend.

A multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) produced a significant effect of interaction of AWOL, most serious offense, number of offenses, and number of commitments upon social skill, $F(4, 113) = 4.18$, $p = .003$, and accounted for 15% of the variance.

A simple regression between chemical dependency (aggregate of alcohol and drug dependency) was significant, $F(1, 116) = 6.36$, $p = .013$, and accounted for 5% of the variance. A multiple analysis of variance (MANOVA) produced a significant effect of social skill upon the interaction of conduct measures (AWOL, most serious offense, number of offenses, and number of commitments) and chemical dependency, $F(5, 112) = 4.80$, $p = .0005$, and accounted for 21% of the variance.

Factor Analytic Investigation of the IAP-SF

A principal components analysis was performed to determine the number of factors, if any, suitable for
further factor analytic analyses. The analysis revealed two components with eigenvalues greater than 1.

The principal component loadings were rotated to oblique simple structure by the Harris-Kaiser case II orthooblique procedure (HK = .10). The factor pattern matrix for the Harris-Kaiser solution is shown on Table 4.

Items which had factor loadings for both factors 1 and 2 which were greater than forty were considered not to be specific to either factor. Only items which were assigned factor scores of 40 and above on one factor only were included in the factor for further analyses. Two clear factors were statistically supported. Inspection of the items in each factor supported the labeling of the factors as follows: Factor 1, Peer Pressure/Rejection (PP/R); and Factor 2, Provocation (P).

Relationship of Factors to Conduct

Spearman correlations were conducted to investigate the relationship between Factor 1 (PP/R) and Factor 2 (P) and conduct. Correlations between Factor 1 and three measures of conduct proved to be significant; most serious offense, \( r = -0.214, p = 0.034 \); number of commitments, \( r = -0.313, p = 0.002 \); AWOL, \( r = -0.254, p = 0.012 \). A fourth measure of conduct, number of offenses, was almost significant, \( r = -0.186, p = 0.066 \).
TABLE 4
FACTOR STRUCTURE MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>IAP-SF</th>
<th>Factors 1</th>
<th>Factors 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>61*</td>
<td>52*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12*</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15*</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>56*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>57*</td>
<td>60*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>52*</td>
<td>53*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>43*</td>
<td>47*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance Explained By Each Factor Ignoring Other Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.941277</td>
<td>4.686013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Score for both factors is above 40
Correlations between Factor 2 and four measures of conduct were also significant; most serious offense, $r = -.280, p = .005$; number of commitments, $r = -.262, p = .009$; number of institutions, $r = -.269, p = .007$; and AWOL, $r = -.207, p = .041$. Neither of the two factors correlated significantly with chemical dependency. However, a trend was evident between Factor 1 (PP/R) and alcohol problems, $r = -.172, p = .088$. Table 5 presents significant correlations of Factors 1 and 2 with conduct.

A multiple regression was conducted to further investigate the amount of effect Factors 1 (PP/R) and 2 (P) had on conduct. A regression between AWOL and Factor 1 was significant, $F(1,95) = 10.20, p = .002$. Factor 1, Peer Pressure/Rejection, accounted for 10% of the variance in AWOL. Regression between number of commitments and Factor 1 was also significant, $F(1,97) = 8.35, p = .005$ and accounted for 8% of the variance, as was the regression between most serious offense and Factor 1, $F(1,97) = 5.84, p = .018$ which accounted for 6% of the variance.

A multiple regression between AWOL and Factor 2, Provocation, was not significant. However, regression analyses between Factor 2 and number of commitments and most serious offense did prove to be significant; number of commitments, $F(1,97) = 4.80, p = .031$, accounting for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Serious Offense</td>
<td>-0.21350</td>
<td>-0.28027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0338</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Offenses</td>
<td>(-0.16574)</td>
<td>(-0.16449)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0657)</td>
<td>(0.0996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Commitments</td>
<td>-0.31345</td>
<td>-0.26176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td>0.0089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Institutions</td>
<td>(0.00095)</td>
<td>-0.26892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Problem</td>
<td>(-0.16578)</td>
<td>(-0.0330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Problem</td>
<td>(-0.17242)</td>
<td>(-0.12889)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0879)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Dependency</td>
<td>(-0.17939)</td>
<td>(-0.09767)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0756)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWOL</td>
<td>-0.25365</td>
<td>-0.20724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0122</td>
<td>0.0417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) p > .05
5% of the variance; and most serious offense, $F(1, 97) = 9.12, p = .003$, accounting for 9% of the variance. Table 6 presents results of multiple regressions between Factors 1 and 2 and conduct.

**Interrater Reliability**

The IAP-SF was rated by two researchers. The range of scores for rater #1 was 1.18 to 5.82 (mean 3.94); the range of scores for rater #2 was 1.00 to 6.27 (mean 3.92). The correlation between rater #1 and rater #2 was $r = .990, p = .0001$. Thus, the interrater reliability of the IAP-SF can be assumed to be quite accurate.
### TABLE 6

**RESULTS OF REGRESSION BETWEEN FACTORS AND CONDUCT VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWOL</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>(0.0965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance=.09699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Commitments</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>0.0308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance=.07922</td>
<td>Variance=.04717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Serious Offense</td>
<td>0.0176</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance=.05675</td>
<td>Variance=.08597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Offenses</td>
<td>(0.1003)</td>
<td>(0.0668)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) = p>.05
Chapter IV
Discussion

Interpretation of Results

Juvenile delinquency research is valuable, not only for its theoretical contribution to the behavioral and social sciences, but also for the insight it lends to treatment, intervention, and prevention programs.

It has long been recognized that deficits in the area of social skills can adversely affect social judgement. The present study focused on a juvenile delinquent population, more specifically, on institutionalized male delinquents. The purpose of this research was twofold: first, to investigate the relationship of social skill and antisocial conduct, and second, to determine if subareas of social skill and skill deficits can be delineated.

It was hypothesized that positive social skill would be inversely related to antisocial conduct. In other words, the poorer the individual's social skills, the greater his antisocial conduct.

The assumption was also made that there are statistically and clinically relevant subareas of social skills which can be identified. The results of this
study provide important insight regarding both assessment and treatment of social skills deficits in the male juvenile offender population.

The results of the present study are in contrast to the recent work of Hunter and Kelly (1986) who contended that the API was not able to make differentiations based on degree of antisocial conduct in male delinquents. The authors postulated that the original API may "...not adequately capture the environment of the subjects" (p. 302), and questioned the use of role play situations to gather response information. Hunter and Kelly (1986) suggested further development and refinement of social skills assessment instruments for juvenile delinquents. The present study documents the ability of an updated, refined, shortened version of the API (Freedman et al., 1978), the IAP-SF, to distinguish between levels of antisocial conduct in incarcerated male delinquents. Results show a rather consistent pattern of correlation between poor social skills and antisocial conduct. Number of commitments, number of institutions confined to, most serious offense committed, AWOL attempts and AWOL successes all were significantly negatively correlated to level of social skill. The non-significant correlation of committing offense and number of offenses to social skill may, in part, be due to the discrepancy
often occurring between the actual crime committed and the charge the court assigns after trial. It is plausible that an individual with more positive social skills is better able to deal with arresting officers and members of the juvenile justice system. It may be that more positive social skills enable the adolescent to present himself more positively, and hence fair better in the judicial process. The latter reasoning may also hold true for the number of commitments for an individual. It is possible that a juvenile offender with more positive social skill is better able to lend credibility to his legal representative's plea for probation, day home, special school, etc.

The predicted correlation between social skill and mean points earned per week within the institution did not prove to be significant. With the large number of raters, and the inability to control for changes in raters, rater bias, etc., the lack of correlation may have been due to problems inherent in the collection and reporting of the measure, rather than the relationship itself.

Factors of the IAP-SF

Contrary to the research of Freedman et al. (1978), two distinct factors were found in the IAP-SF which were both statistically valid and clinically sound. Due to
the large sample size of the present study, a factor analysis could be performed. Freedman et al. (1978) were unable to perform such an analysis due to a small sample size, and opted to perform a cluster analysis, which is not the analysis of choice in investigating for the presence of factors in an assessment tool.

The two factors identified in the present research were peer pressure/rejection and anger provocation. Dishion et al. (1984) made reference to the presence of "7 of 42 API items... (which) specifically involve resisting peer pressure to commit illegal offenses" (p. 51). Other items clearly contain provocation as the underlying content of the vignette.

Homogeneity is apparent not only in the content of the item vignettes, but also in the scoring criteria for the items. DeLuty (1979), in his investigation of aggressiveness, assertiveness, and submissiveness in children, conceptualizes a continuum, with positive responses lying at the middle point. The extremes of the continuum are submissiveness and aggressiveness, both representing maladaptive responses. Results of the present study support a conceptualization of social skills in the same manner. Social skills can be seen as a continuum ranging from subjugation to domination.
Positive social skill can be seen as the midpoint, a balance between respecting one's own rights and the rights of others.

Factor 1, the peer pressure/rejection factor, represents issues of inappropriate subjugation, including hurting oneself, succumbing to deviant group pressure, non-assertiveness and being easily misled. Factor 2, the provocation factor, represents the other extreme, hurting others, asserting oneself at the expense of others, and inappropriate aggression. The socially skilled response is one which is (a) assertive but considerate, and (b) rational or appealing to reason. A positive response, thus, is one that avoids the extremes of aggressive assault on one hand, and submissive appeasement on the other.

A priori inspection of Factor 1 provides further insight valuable to clinical diagnosis and remediation. It would be of further clinical value to divide the factor items into two subfactors, deviant peer pressure and fear of peer rejection. While Factor 1 represents the full spectrum of subjugation, subjugation can involve both response to peer pressure and response to fear of peer rejection. IAP-SF items 7, 11, and 13 are vignettes involving direct deviant peer pressure. Items 20, 4, 21, 6, 22, and 14 involve fear of peer rejection. By
clinically subdividing the factor as such, additional insight is gained from a practitioner's viewpoint, especially regarding remediation of specific skills deficits.

**Relationship of Factors to Conduct**

By investigating measures of conduct in relation to individual factors, patterns emerge which are congruent to the continuum type conceptualization of social skill. Factor 1 and Factor 2 both were significantly negatively correlated to AWOL involvement. More statistically demanding analysis revealed, however, that Factor 1 significantly accounted for 10% of the variance in AWOL activity. (Regression with Factor 2 was not significant.) It seems that submission to deviant peer pressure and fear of rejection by peers leads to increased involvement in AWOL activity. The source of deviant pressure may stem from other adolescents inside the institution as well as from peers on the outside.

While both Factor 1 and Factor 2 account for significant portions in the variance of number of commitments, Factor 1 accounts for almost twice the amount of variance. It is plausible that the tendency to be pressured into antisocial activity results in more trouble with the law. An adolescent who consistently follows along with deviant others and/or constantly
engages in unlawful acts out of fear of peer rejection may have a tendency to be involved in more antisocial activity merely because he is involved in the crimes of many others as well as his own.

Factors 1 and 2 also both account for significant amounts of variance in the most serious offense committed by the individual. However, in this case, Factor 2 accounts for more of the variance, almost double of that accounted for by Factor 1. According to legal classification, serious offenses, more often than not, involve direct harm of another through either destructive aggression or blatant disregard for the rights of another. Therefore, delinquents whose skills deficits encompass the inappropriate aggression/domination end of the social skill continuum, would be expected to commit crimes which receive a more serious legal classification.

While the relationship between chemical dependency and factors of the IAP-SF was not statistically significant, a trend between Factor 1 and chemical dependency, especially alcohol, was evident. It would seem clinically logical that an individual who readily submits to peer pressure or acts out of fear of peer rejection may more easily become involved in substance abuse. Again, if social skill is conceptualized along a continuum of hurting oneself to hurting others, substance
abuse coincides with self-hurting behavior. The presence of alcohol and drug abuse was determined by official record. Perhaps self-report measures would have been more sensitive in documenting the presence or absence of such problems, and would have affected the results of this study. The presence of a significant overall relationship between chemical abuse, conduct, and social skill in general, suggests a need to address the issue of substance abuse as a treatment focus within the institution.

Since factor weights were not compatible for nondiscriminating items, these items were not included in the analysis by factors. These items are useful as general items, those which encompass both factors, and were considered only in analysis of the IAP-SF in a general form.

Limitations of the Present Study

The present study focused exclusively on male delinquents in a medium security setting. While the results of this study are indeed promising, in order to generalize from this research, it would be necessary to include female delinquents, nonincarcerated delinquents, and delinquents incarcerated in both minimum and maximum security settings.
A second type of limitation possibly involves the choice of measures of conduct. Inclusion of self-report measures of offenses committed and chemical abuse may have yielded a more accurate account of antisocial activity.

**Implications for Future Research**

Social skill has been considered intrinsically related to positive social adjustment. Conversely, deficits in social skills have been seen as related to antisocial conduct and juvenile delinquency. There is a need to continue to explore the relationship of antisocial, unlawful conduct and social skill. Most notably, it is important to replicate the findings of the present study with a female delinquent population. In addition, both remediation and preventative treatment would benefit from research which focuses on the predelinquent's social skills and behavior.

Longitudinal studies which follow conduct and the development, or lack of development, of positive social skills from childhood through early adulthood would yield invaluable information for preventative treatment of skills deficits.

From a remediation standpoint, research on the development of programs which target specific areas of
skills deficits (i.e., along the dominated/domination continuum) may prove to be helpful in settings such as juvenile institutions. The present research suggests that different types of social skill deficits require different emphases in remediation.

Finally, the relationship of social skill to other cognitive variables, such as moral judgement, is in need of exploration. This research would have important implications for remediation programs. It may be that by improving delinquents' social skills without fostering underlying moral thinking, the result would merely be more socially skilled delinquents, i.e., delinquents who avoid altercations with the law by effectively negotiating social situations, and dealing more positively with both law enforcement and judicial personnel.

Summary

The purpose of this study has been to examine the relationship of the IAP-SF, an updated, shortened version of the API (Freedman, et al., 1978) and the PIAG (Gaffney & McFall, 1981) to the antisocial conduct of institutionalized delinquent males. It has been the focus of the present research to determine if there are specific social skill factors within the IAP-SF which can be statistically and clinically delineated.
The current study has shown that the IAP-SF is related to antisocial conduct in incarcerated juvenile delinquent males. Social skill was inversely related to increased antisocial activity. In addition, two statistically supported, clinically relevant factors within the IAP-SF, peer pressure/rejection and provocation were supported. Conceptualizing social skill as a continuum ranging from submission to domination, Factor 1 related to inappropriate subjugation, while Factor 2 related to inappropriate aggression and domination.

Further research is needed in the area of juvenile delinquency to foster both theoretical development in the social and behavioral sciences and strengthen delinquency prevention and treatment programs. An important implication of this study is that deficits in social skills may encompass different types of social response difficulties. Therefore, future research is needed to investigate effective prevention and remediation of these different types of deficits. In addition, there is a need to generalize to other samples, especially female delinquents. Second, there is a need to strengthen the measures of conduct utilized in future research. Third, there is a need to consider longitudinal studies.


APPENDIX A

INVENTORY OF ADOLESCENT PROBLEMS—SHORT FORM
AND
SCORING MANUAL
Inventory of Adolescent Problems - Short Form (IAP-SF)

Male-Appropriate Version

John C. Gibbs (The Ohio State University)
Ann Swillinger (Ohio Department of Youth Services)

Problems

1. You're visiting your aunt in another part of town and don't know any of the guys your age there. You're walking along her street and some guy is walking towards you. He is about your size. As he is about to pass you, he deliberately bumps into you and you nearly lose your balance. What do you say or do now?

2. You're driving around with a good friend on a hot, muggy summer night, and he says, "Whew, am I thirsty! I could really use a cold beer. Listen, I know a guy who sells it, to anyone who comes, right off his front porch, and he doesn't even check ID. How about our going over that way and getting some booze?" What do you say or do now?

3. It's 7:30 on a Saturday night and you ask your father if you can go out driving around with the guys. He says no, and is angry. He yells, "Nothing doing! You know what happens when you go driving around with those guys. You can stay home tonight and watch television with the family!" What do you say or do now?

4. You've been going steady with a girl named Mary for about three months. It used to be a lot of fun to be with her, but lately it's been sort of a drag. There are some other girls you'd like to go out with now. You decide to break up with Mary, but you know she'll be very upset and angry with you. How will you go about breaking up with her? What will you say to her?
5. Your father has been hassling you for months about getting home by midnight, and sometimes that's a problem because none of your friends have to be home before 1 a.m., and you feel like an idiot always leaving places early. One night you walk in at 1:30 a.m. and your father is sitting in the living room in his slippers and robe, looking mad. He says, "Where the hell have you been? Do you have any idea what time it is?" What do you say or do now?

6. You walk into the kitchen one morning before school wearing a t-shirt and jeans, and your mother takes one look at your clothes and says, "Oh no! You're not going out of this house one more time looking like that! You march yourself right up those stairs and get on some decent things, or you're not going anywhere this morning, young man! Do you think your father ever looked like that?" What do you say or do now?

7. One of your friends does some dealing on the street. Once in a while he even gives you some pills or something for free. Now he says to you, "Listen man, I've got to deliver some stuff on the south side, but I can't do it myself. How about it -- will you take this stuff down there for me in your car? I'll give you some new stuff to try plus $25 besides, for half an hour's driving. Will you help me out?" What do you say or do now?

8. One of your friends really likes a girl named Debbie, but they're not going steady. You think she's pretty nice yourself. You went out with her Saturday night and you both had a really good time. Someone must have told your friend because he comes running up to you in the school yard and says, "You dirty cheater! Bill just told me about you and Debbie. If you ever go out with her again, I'll knock your ugly face in!" What do you say or do now?

9. Your friend calls on a Sunday night to ask if you want to get together with him and some other friends. You tell him you've been grounded because you got home after curfew the weekend before. He says, "So what's the big deal? Just sneak out the back door and meet me in the next block. Your parents will never know you're gone." What do you say or do now?
10. It's Friday night and you have the car but you don't have anywhere to go. The evening stretches ahead of you, empty. You're bored, and you feel restless, and you wish there were some excitement. What can you do to go about solving this problem?

11. You're walking along a side street with a friend, and he stops in front of a beautiful new sports car. He looks inside and then he says excitedly, "Look man, the keys are still in this baby! Let's see what she can do. Come on, let's go!" What do you say or do now?

12. You're about an hour late getting to your part-time job in a supermarket because your car ran out of gas. You feel pretty dumb about that and you know your boss will be mad, because this is the busiest time of the day in the store. You punch in at the time clock and he comes storming over to you and says, "You're fired! I've put up with you kids being late and not coming in one time too many. Starting with you, anyone who comes in late gets canned!" What do you say or do now?

13. You have a friend who's a few years older than yourself. He's been in trouble with the law a lot and he's even been to prison, but he's out now. You really like him a lot and respect him and you wish he would like and respect you too, because he's a popular man in the neighborhood. He comes to your house one night and tells you that he and another man are going to hold up a gas station out in the country. He says, "You want to come along? We think you could be a big help to us." What do you say or do now?

14. You're looking for a job, and as you pass the local McDonald's, you notice a sign in the window that says "Part-time help wanted". You go in and ask for the manager. He comes to the counter. What do you say or do now?

15. You're at a party and all the people there are smoking grass. You used to do a lot of smoking yourself, but now you're on probation, because you got busted. Everyone knows you used to smoke. Your girlfriend offers you a joint. What do you do or say now?
16. You ask the girl who sits next to you in study hall if she'd like to see the show Saturday night, and she says, "I'd like to, but my father won't let me go out with boys who are on parole." What do you say or do now?

17. You're out on parole after a 10-month stay in a boys' school for theft. It seems like your troubles just started when you got home. Now some of the boys at school treat you like you're a hardened criminal. You're at your gym locker, changing into your gym things, and a guy asks if you'll lend him a quarter. Another guy, who you don't know well, and who is about your size, says to him, "What? You gonna take money from a jailbird?" What do you say or do now?

18. You're in a job interview, and you really want the job because the pay is good and the hours aren't bad. The interviewer seemed interested in you until he found out you were on parole. Now he says, "We have a policy of not hiring anyone who's on parole. We've had too many problems with you boys in the past. Sorry." What do you say or do now?

19. You're on parole after nine months in a boys' school for theft. You're back in your old school, and it's been hard, getting back in with the other students, and especially with the teachers. A couple of teachers are on your back all the time, always hassling you because of your record. Just now, one of them has surprised you in an empty classroom, where you're catching a smoke, which is against school rules. The teacher says, "OK, just what do you think you're doing in here, young man" Didn't you learn anything in that reform school?" What do you say or do now?

20. It's early afternoon and ever since you woke up this morning, you've been in a bad mood. You feel empty, tired, a little sad, and a little angry, all at the same time. What can you do to get out of this bad mood?

21. Your parents never seem to like your friends. They say they're dirty, or that they have no manners, or that they'll get you into trouble. Joe, a new friend, has just left your house after his first visit over to your place. After he's gone, your
mother gets on his case, calling him a good-for-nothing and forbids you to see him again. You know that Joe has become more responsible lately. How will you go about handling this problem? What will you do?

22. The girl you've been going out with just broke up with you. She said that you're OK but she'd like to go out with other guys, too. You still like her, and you're hurt that she doesn't want to go out with you and continue to be your girl. You're in a terrible, miserable mood. You feel really down. How will you go about solving this problem?
The IAP-SF, adapted from the Adolescent Problems Inventory (Freedman, Rosenthal, Donahoe Schlundt, & McFall, 1978), is designed to assess the competence or "constructive" effectiveness of adolescents' social skills in problematic social situations. The juvenile is presented with 22 social problem situations that are typical for adolescents (especially adjudicated adolescents), and asked after each situation: "What do you say or do now?"; each response is recorded (by tape or in writing) and subsequently scored high or low in social competence. The juvenile should be provided with a list of 22 social problem situations and should read along as each is presented orally in an individual interview. The interviewer should write down the subject's response verbatim on the IAP-SF Response Sheet (unless a tape recorder is used). If an S indicates more than one response, the interviewer should ask S to choose the most likely response (that response should then be underlined). Make notes also regarding tone (see below). This rating manual (male-appropriate version) provides the scoring criteria for rating each response. A female-appropriate version of the problems and scoring criteria is also available.

**Scoring Guidelines and Rules**

In scoring the response, keep in mind that a competent response is one which effectively and constructively resolves a problem situation, making it less likely that $S$ will have to face more such problems in the future.
On the basis of the scoring criteria provided for each problem, rate the S's response along the following scale: 8 = very competent; 6 = competent; 4 = neither competent nor incompetent (will neither help nor hurt the situation); 2 = incompetent; and 0 = very incompetent. The word "and" in a scoring criterion means that both requirements must be met for a S to receive that score. The word "or" means that only one of the requirements need be met. Also, keep in mind the following scoring rules.

1. **Multiple Responses.** When an S has given more than one response to a problem and has not indicated a final choice, enter the rating for the less competent response if the responses are scorable at different levels.

2. **Content Vis-a-Vis Tone.** Consider not only the content but also the tone of the S's responses. For example, in a situation calling for definiteness (e.g., resisting an unethical temptation) as a criterion for response competence, both the content and tone of the S's responses should be definitive; if the words are competent but the tone is giggly or otherwise very incompetent, credit S with one point less than you would have given him had his tone matched his words in quality. Deduct 2 points where the tone is theatrical or unctuous, suggesting that S is putting on a "front". Also deduct 2 points where the competence criterion calls for a conciliatory but interpersonally constructive response, and such a response is given in content but not tone (i.e., the tone is angry or antagonistic).

3. **Non-responses.** If an S says he does not know what he would say or do, score 0. Do not necessarily score 0, however, if S says he would say or do nothing, since this may be a criterion for a competent response in some problem situations.

**Reference**

Problems and Scoring Criteria

1. You're visiting your aunt in another part of town, and don't know any of the guys your age there. You're walking along her street, and some guy is walking toward you. He is about your size. As he is about to pass you, he deliberately bumps into you, and you nearly lose your balance. What do you say or do now?

8 - S ignores the boy, says nothing or walks on (he may give him a dirty look), OR gives an assertive, calm response, OR tries to get to know the other boy.

6 - Polite but conciliatory or apologetic response. EX: Excuse me; Sorry about that.

4 - Response is unassertive, wishy-washy, overly wordy, or otherwise ineffective, but not likely to provoke a fight.

2 - Response is insulting, antagonistic, or provocative. EX: Watch where you're going; What'd you do that for?

0 - S pushes or fights the other boy, in any way. (It does not matter what else he says or does. Fighting takes precedence, unless he says he would try to avoid a fight, but if the other boy swung first, he'd hit back. That receives a 2.)

2. You're driving around with a good friend on a hot, muggy summer night, and he says, "Whew, am I thirsty! I could really use a cold beer. Listen, I know a guy who sells it, to anyone who comes, right off his front porch, and he doesn't even check ID. How about our going over that way and getting some booze?" What do you say or do?

8 - Response is an assertive (but non-theatrical) "no", or S suggests an alternate plan. EX: With our luck, the cops would be watching the place. Let's go get an A & W float; No, let's not risk that.

6 - S says no, but less assertively, leaving him open to further pressuring now or at a future time. EX: I'm not thirsty; I'm not in the mood; I don't think so.
4 - No specific criteria for this score. Use it when response is neither competent nor incompetent and falls between 6 and 2 in quality.

2 - S refuses to have a beer himself, but he stays with the other boy who does get some, perhaps offering to drive. EX: You go ahead, but I'll pass; You drink. I'll drive.

0 - S agrees to have some beer himself.

3. It's 7:30 on a Saturday night, and you ask your father if you can go out driving around with the guys. He says no, and is angry. He yells, "Nothing doing! You know what happens when you go driving around with those guys. You can stay home tonight and watch television with the family!" What do you say or do now?

8 - EITHER S accepts his father's wishes and agrees to stay home (and does) OR his response is respectful and calm and he tries to change his father's mind with rational arguments. EX: We'll just be driving around in Brookfield and I'll be home by midnight; We won't get into any trouble. We've changed, and neither of us wants any trouble now.

6 - No specific criteria for this score. Use it for competent but less convincing responses which fall between 8 and 4 in quality.

4 - S badgers his father, or uses weak arguments which are not likely to anger his father but aren't likely to change his mind either. EX: Why not? I want to go out; You give me the same argument every night. You never let me go out; We're just going out to have a good time.

2 - Response is mildly antagonistic or angry or provocative.

0 - Response is very antagonistic or insulting OR S goes out anyway, against his father's wishes, either telling him he's leaving, or sneaking out.

4. You've been going steady with a girl named Mary for about three months. It used to be a lot of fun to be with her, but lately it's been sort of a drag.
There are some other girls you'd like to go out with now. You decide to break up with Mary, but you know she'll be very upset and angry with you. How will you go about breaking up with her? What will you say to her?

8 - Response is gentle, sympathetic, tactful, but clear, not beating around the bush, and S suggests they both date other people. EX: Mary, we've had some wonderful times together, and I like you an awful lot, but I'm beginning to feel like I'm tied down. I think it would be a good idea if we both kept on seeing each other, but went out with other people, too, so we can be really sure of our feelings.

6 - No specific criteria...response is competent and honest but not as sensitive or tactful as (8).

4 - S lies in such a way that it is not likely Mary will find out. EX: My father says I have to go out with other people.

2 - S says he will have someone else tell Mary for him.

0 - EITHER S uses an obvious lie (EX: I'm getting sent up), OR he is tactless, insensitive, and antagonistic, OR he just stops seeing her, without giving her any explanation, hoping she will get the message herself.

5. Your father has been hassling you for months about getting home by midnight, and sometimes that's a problem, because none of your friends have to be home before 1 a.m., and you feel like an idiot, always leaving places early. One night you walk in at 1:30 a.m., and your father is sitting in the living room in his slippers and robe, looking mad. He says, "Where the hell have you been? Do you have any idea what time it is?" What do you say or do now?

8 - S is reasonable and respectful and apologetic or accepts responsibility for having violated a rule. He may or may not raise rational arguments against the fairness of the rule. EX: Dad, I realize I'm an hour late, but nobody else has to be in till 1, and I couldn't get a ride before now.
6 - S does not apologize but he is reasonable and respectful; he explains where he was or what he was doing or he appeals to the fact that his father must have been late sometimes when he was a boy.

4 - S is respectful and calm, but not apologetic, and not likely to convince his father to change the rule, OR he stands there without saying anything.

2 - S lies about what happened or he is mildly insolent or flippant or disrespectful. EX: Forget it. I'm too young to tell time.

0 - EITHER: S runs away from home OR hits his father OR he is very disrespectful or insolent. EX: Bye; I don't give a fuck what time it is.

6. You walk into the kitchen one morning before school, wearing a t-shirt and jeans, and your mother takes one look at your clothes and says, "Oh no! You're not going out of this house one more time looking like that! You march yourself right up those stairs and get on some decent things, or you're not going anywhere this morning, young man! Do you think your father ever looked like that?" What do you say or do now?

8 - S is reasonable and respectful, and presents a rational argument why he ought to be allowed to dress like this. May change clothes. EX: There's no dress code, and they're perfectly clean, and everyone else wears clothes like these so I don't see what's the difference.

6 - S simply changes his clothes.

4 - S is respectful, but his arguments are not likely to change his mother's mind. EX: Nobody goes to school dressed up any more; What's wrong with the clothes I got on? I think they're perfectly all right.

2 - EITHER: S walks out OR he is rude or disrespectful OR he changes his clothes now but says he'll put the old ones back on in school.

0 - S indicates a physical threat or says he will skip school for the day and stay home.
7. One of your friends does some dealing on the street. Once in a while, he even gives you some pills or something for free. Now he says to you, "Listen man, I've got to deliver some stuff on the south side, but I can't do it myself. How about it - will you take this stuff down there for me in your car? I'll give you some new stuff to try plus $25 besides, for half an hour's driving. Will you help me out?" What do you say or do now?

8 - S assertively (but non-theatrically) refuses to deliver the pills, making it clear that he won't do something like that, even for a friend. EX: Forget it; No, I won't take that kind of risk.

6 - S refuses, but not as assertively, making it possible that the man will put more pressure on him. EX: No; No thanks.

4 - S refuses by making up an excuse which gets him out of the situation this time, but leaves him open to further pressuring in the future. EX: No, I can't make it. My car's in the shop; Sorry, I don't have time now.

2 - S says he will drive the other man, but won't actually deliver it himself or he asks a question, suggesting that he might consider doing it if the answer is right. EX: And what if I get busted with that stuff on me?; What kind of stuff is it?

0 - S agrees to deliver the pills. Score him 0 even if he demands more money for the errand.

8. One of your friends really likes a girl named Debbie, but they're not going steady. You think she's pretty nice yourself. You went out with her Saturday night and you both had a really good time. Someone must have told your friend because he comes running up to you in the school yard and says, "You dirty cheater! Bill just told me about you and Debbie. If you ever go out with her again, I'll knock your ugly face in!" What do you say or do now?

8 - S attempts to calm his friend down and avoid a fight, OR he explains calmly that since they weren't going steady, he had a right to take her out too, OR expresses regret at hurting the friend's feelings.
EX: Cool it a minute man. Let's talk about this first. She's not your girl yet. You know I'd never take her out if you were going steady or something like that.

6 - S is reasonable and calm but unassertive in defending his right to date Debbie, OR he says his friend can have her, OR suggests that they let Debbie choose between them.

4 - S attempts to avoid a fight but does not resolve the situation; however, he does not make it any worse either. EX: Well, it's only one date.

2 - EITHER S lies and says that he didn't go out with Debbie or that she asked him out, OR he laughs OR his response is likely to provoke a fight. EX: Just try it!

0 - S his his friend first; if he fights but only if the friend swings first, score it 2.

9. Your friend calls on a Sunday night to ask if you want to get together with him and some other friends. You tell him you've been grounded because you got home after curfew the weekend before. He says, "So what's the big deal? Just sneak out the back door and meet me in the next block. Your parents will never know you're gone." What do you say or do now?

8 - S assertively (but not theatrically) refuses to meet his friend, and he explains that the reason is that he is grounded. EX: I'd better not. If I ever snuck out when I'm grounded, I'd be grounded for the rest of my life; I can't, I'm grounded.

6 - S refuses to meet his friend but less assertively, making it likely that his friend will put more pressure on him. EX: I'd better not; I'm grounded.

4 - S does not give his friend a definite answer. He does not resolve the situation but he does not aggravate it any further either.

2 - S refuses, making up an excuse or lying to get his friend off his back, instead of saying that if he disobeys his parents, he'll be grounded even longer. (I can't, I'm sick.)
0 - S agrees to meet his friend.

10. It's Friday night and you have the car but you don't have anywhere to go. The evening stretches ahead of you, empty. You're bored, and you feel restless, and you wish there were some excitement. What can you do to go about solving this problem?

8 - S becomes involved in an activity in which it is not likely that he will get into trouble (e.g., a quiet drive in the country, a movie, a visit to a friend, sports activities, etc).

6 - Drive around and look for a party or get together with friends (as long as activity is nonaggressive and legal).

4 - Just drive around (no goal mentioned).

2 - Pick up a girl (except if it's done in a bar, which is scored 0) or engage in any activity which is not law-breaking in itself, but which might lead to antisocial or illegal behavior (e.g., drive around looking for action, pick up hitchhikers, make fun of people, etc.).

0 - Any activity which by its nature is aggressive or illegal or antisocial including drinking, taking dope, drag racing, going to a bar, etc.

11. You're walking along a side street with a friend, and he stops in front of a beautiful new sports car. He looks inside and then he says excitedly, "Look man, the keys are still in this baby! Let's see what she can do. Come on, let's go!" What do you say or do now?

8 - S refuses assertively (but not theatrically), with explanation; he may point out the risk involved or ask the friend how he would feel if someone stole his car. EX: Forget it, buddy; No man, count me out; How would you feel if someone took your car?

6 - S refuses, but less assertively, making it possible that the friend will subject him to further pressuring. EX: No; What do you want to do that for?
4 - S says that he will not do it, but he does not try to stop his friend from doing it (e.g., That's not for me, but go ahead if you want to).

2 - (Do not use a score of 2 for this item. All incompetent responses are scored 0.)

0 - EITHER S agrees to steal the car or borrow it for a while, or he tells his friend to take it and pick him up somewhere else in a while.

12. You're about an hour late getting to your part-time job in a supermarket because your car ran out of gas. You feel pretty dumb about that and you know your boss will be mad, because this is the busiest time of the day in the store. You punch in at the time clock and he comes storming over to you and says, "You're fired! I've put up with you kids being late and not coming in one time too many. Starting with you, anyone who comes in late gets canned!" What do you say or do now?

8 - EITHER S is polite, respectful, and apologetic and explains fully what happened OR he asks if he can talk to the boss about it later. EX: Can I finish this day and then talk to you after?; Could we talk about this a minute? I'm really sorry I was late. I ran out of gas and that was stupid of me but otherwise, I'm doing a good job around here and it really isn't fair to punish me for what other guys have been doing. I really would appreciate it if you'd give me another chance.

6 - S apologizes OR he is polite and respectful but his explanation is less complete or less convincing than those scored 8.

4 - EITHER S merely promises that it won't happen again OR says that it happens to everybody sometimes, OR he accepts being fired, without saying anything, OR with exaggerated politeness, OR he presents vague, poor excuses for his lateness, OR he says he'll get his parole officer.

2 - S announces that he's quitting, OR response is mildly disrespectful.
0 - S is very rude or disrespectful or he hits the boss or does something illegal, such as coming back at night to vandalize the store.

13. You have a friend who's a few years older than yourself. He's been in trouble with the law a lot and he's even been to prison, but he's out now. You really like him a lot and respect him and you wish he would like and respect you too, because he's a popular man in the neighborhood. He comes to your house one night and he tells you that he and another man are going to hold up a gas station in the country. He says, "You want to come along? We think you could be a big help to us." What do you say or do now?

8 - S refuses, definitely and assertively, without making up any excuses and without sounding self-righteous or theatrical. EX: Look, I think you're a great guy and I like you a lot but there's no way I want to get involved in that stuff; No, that's not my thing; No, that's a little heavy for me.

6 - S refuses, but in a less definite or less assertive manner, OR he sounds pompous or goody-goody. EX: Thanks anyway, but I'd rather not; Nope, I don't want to go to jail; I can't; I gotta stay home.

4 - S is wishy-washy, does not give a definite answer.

2 - S lies or makes up an excuse to get out of it.

0 - S agrees to participate in the robbery, or to drive the car or even just to go along without participating in the actual crime.

14. You're looking for a job, and as you pass the local McDonald's, you notice a sign in the window that says "Part-time help wanted". You go in and ask for the manager. He comes to the counter. What do you say or do now?

8 - Response is brief and grammatical; S either asks to apply for the job or requests more information about
it. EX: I saw your sign in the window and I'd like to apply for the job; I'd like to find out about the job you have available.

6 - Response is basically good but it either lacks self-confidence or it says too much all at once, or it is overly wordy or rambling or very ungrammatical.

4 - No specific criteria; response isn't likely to impress or to offend the manager. EX: I'd like an application; Can I fill in an application form?

2 - S sounds dumb or unreliable or irresponsible, and is not likely to impress the manager.

0 - S is EITHER disrespectful or rude or so casual that he gives the impression that he really doesn't care if he gets the job or not.

15. You're at a party and all the people there are smoking grass. You used to do a lot of smoking yourself, but now you're on probation, because you got busted. Everyone knows you used to smoke. Your girlfriend offers you a joint. What do you say or do now?

8 - EITHER S leaves the party when he discovers others are smoking, OR he refuses, briefly and assertively (but not theatrically), explaining honestly why he can't smoke. EX: No thanks, honey. I have to be a super-kid for a while; No thanks, but I'm open for other offers.

6 - S refuses, but his answer is either long, rambling or unassertive (leaving him open to further pressuring). OR he makes up an excuse. EX: I'm not in the mood; I'm too tired already. OR he just says "no" without any explanation.

4 - S refuses, in a manner which is likely to alienate his girlfriend (e.g., too goody-goody, "theatrical", or holier-than-thou).

2 - S suggests that they go smoke somewhere more private, where there is less risk of getting caught.

0 - S agrees to smoke.
16. You ask the girl who sits next to you in study hall if she'd like to see the show Saturday night, and she says, "I'd like to, but my father won't let me go out with boys who are on parole." What do you say or do now?

8 - S asks if he can meet her father to explain the situation and demonstrate to him that he has matured and is responsible. EX: Could I meet your father and explain the situation to him? He probably has some wrong ideas about what parolees are like. How about if I come over and talk to him?

6 - S asks if he can meet her father, but without any further explanation, OR he explains how he has matured to the girl but not to her father.

4 - S accepts her refusal passively, without taking any action to change the situation in his favor. Response is quiet and not antagonistic. EX: OK; I guess that's your decision.

2 - EITHER S questions her father's right to make such a rule OR his response is irrelevant or meaningless. EX: Are you your father? So what? Who does he think he is?

0 - S is very disrespectful toward her father or curses him out OR he tells the girl to call him behind her father's back OR he suggests that she sneak out, or not tell her father that he's on parole, or lie about who she's going out with or where she's going. EX: How would your father know? Tell him you're going to study with a girlfriend and I'll meet you downtown.

17. You're out on parole after a 10-month stay in a boys' school for theft. It seems like your troubles just started when you got home. Now some of the boys at school treat you like you're a hardened criminal. You're at your gym locker, changing into your gym things, and a guy asks if you'll lend him a quarter. Another guy, who you don't know well, and who is about your size, says to him, "What? You gonna take money from a jailbird?" What do you say or do now?

8 - EITHER S ignores the second boy and gives the quarter to the first boy, OR he gives a brief
humorous response to either one, which should shut up the second boy, without provoking a fight. EX: I'm an ex-jailbird (and give a broad smile, and keep your cool); Should buy you as much as any other quarter (laugh at him, and give the second boy a dirty look).

6 - Response is non-antagonistic, but less effective than those scored 8 because it is less concise or less humorous. EX: Here's the quarter. It's just as good as any quarter he would give you.

4 - S's response is ineffective, because it responds to the content of the second boy's taunt, by denying it or otherwise disputing it. It's such a stupid insult, it shouldn't even be dealt with. EX: I spent my 10 months at Wales and I'm not going to look back. I'm just going to look forward. (Response is not likely to provoke a fight but it does indicate that S is rattled.)

2 - S's response is provocative, insulting, or antagonistic, and likely to lead to a fight. EX: Would you mind repeating that (and walk up to him with my fist doubled up); You jealous?; Get your ass out of here before I beat you up.

0 - S takes the second boy's money, OR he fights or takes the first swing at the second boy. If he says he would only fight if the other swung first, score a 2.

18. You're in a job interview, and you really want the job because the pay is good and the hours aren't bad. The interviewer seemed interested in you until he found out you were on parole. Now he says, "We have a policy of not hiring anyone who's on parole. We've had too many problems with you boys in the past. Sorry." What do you say or do now?

8 - S is assertive, polite, and reasonable, and he clearly and concisely asks the interviewer to reconsider, saying that he has changed, or that he will do a good job, OR he offers to work on probation for a while to demonstrate his competence. EX: That's too bad. I think I could do a good job here, and I really would appreciate the chance to prove to you that being a parolee doesn't automatically mean you're going to be a problem.
6 - S is polite and reasonable, but EITHER he accepts the interviewer's rejection without standing up for himself, or he just isn't as clear or convincing as in responses scored 8. EX: I think I could do as good a job as anyone else.

4 - S's response isn't likely to improve the situation, but it doesn't make it any worse either. Responses may be long and rambling, or irrelevant, or meaningless, or just less convincing than those scored 6. EX: I have really changed; If you can't even trust a guy on parole, who's trying to straighten up?; You can't trust anybody. How am I gonna change if I don't get a job?

2 - S is mildly sarcastic or antagonistic or he threatens to bring a lawsuit.

0 - S's response is very antagonistic, provocative, or insulting, or he hits the interviewer. EX: If that's the way you feel about it, you can stick the job up your ass!; Sorry, hell! You got a policy? Let me read it.

---

19. You're on parole after nine months in a boys' school for theft. You're back in your old school, and it's been hard, getting back in with the other students, and especially with the teachers. A couple of teachers are on your back all the time, always hassling you because of your record. Just now, one of them has surprised you in an empty classroom, where you're catching a smoke, which is against school rules. The teacher says, "OK, just what do you think you're doing in here, young man? Didn't you learn anything in that reform school?" What do you say or do now?

8 - The trick is for S to ignore the provocativeness of the criticism, acknowledge that he was doing wrong, apologize, and explain why it happened. EX: I was just trying to catch a quick smoke to calm my nerves. It's been hard making the transition back into school and I've been feeling uptight. I'm sorry. I won't let it happen again.

6 - S uses a brief humorous response or he is either less apologetic or less respectful or he doesn't explain why it happened; response is less effective than those scored 8 but still competent. EX: Look,
I know it's against the rules and all that. I'm sorry it happened; Guess I didn't learn how not to get caught smoking. I'm sorry.

4 - No special criteria -- response doesn't make things worse but it doesn't make things better, in terms of helping the teacher understand S's motivation for smoking, or improving their relationship. S puts out the cigarette, says nothing, and walks out. EX: I wish you'd have a smoking room around here; Lots of kids smoke in here, but you just caught me. It's not so bad.

2 - S responds to the teacher's question about what he learned in reform school, by saying either yes or no, OR he says he is smoking, with no further explanation. EX: Yes, I learned something there; Nope, I didn't learn a thing; I'm smoking. What does it look like I'm doing?

0 - S's response is challenging, very antagonistic or disrespectful, or he hits the teacher, or leaves school, or vandalizes the school. EX: Why are you always on my back? I haven't done anything to you!; What the hell's it look like I'm doing, bitch?; What're you going to do about it?

20. It's early afternoon and ever since you woke up this morning, you've been in a bad mood. You feel empty, tired, a little sad, and a little angry, all at the same time. What can you do to get out of this bad mood?

8 - S gives one of the following constructive, active, prosocial responses: talk to somebody about the problem; engage in an activity that boosts self-esteem or bolsters self-confidence (e.g., looking at scrapbook of activities, think about good times in the past or talk them over with a friend, do something you're good at or that makes you feel good); do something that helps someone else, like community volunteer work or chores around the house.

6 - S says he will do something that gets his mind off his mood, like sports or eating or movie, or talking to somebody about something else, in order to distract himself.
4 - S takes a shower or keeps his mood to himself and tries not to let it show or affect his behavior.

2 - S goes back to bed (or some other equally passive solution).

0 - S does nothing, or does something antisocial or illegal, like teasing people, talking back to people, taking dope, or drinking.

21. Your parents never seem to like your friends. They say they're dirty, or that they have no manners, or that they'll get you into trouble. Joe, a new friend, has just left your house after his first visit over to your place. After he's gone, your mother gets on his case, calling him a good-for-nothing and forbids you to see him again. You know that Joe has become more responsible lately. How will you go about handling this problem? What will you do?

8 - EITHER S expresses understanding but asks his mother to reserve judgement and let him continue to bring Joe home so she can get to know him better, OR he reasonably and articulately argues that he is old enough to be trusted to pick his own friends.

6 - S asks his mother what she doesn't like about Joe and tries to correct her impressions, OR he simply stops seeing Joe.

4 - Content of response is same as in those responses scored 8 or 6 but it is less articulate and less convincing. OR S uses poor arguments (e.g., Joe won't influence him, or he is as bad as Joe anyway). OR S asks Joe to change further to please his mother.

2 - S is disrespectful and/or says his mother doesn't have the right to pick his friends.

0 - Either S insults his mother's friends, OR he says he'll continue to see Joe, either with or without his mother's knowledge, but doesn't make any effort to try to change her mind, OR he lies about his companions and continues to see Joe.
The girl you've been going out with just broke up with you. She said that you're OK but she'd like to go out with other guys, too. You still like her, and you're hurt that she doesn't want to go out with you and continue to be your girl. You're in a terrible, miserable mood. You feel really down. How will you go about solving this problem?

8 - EITHER S talks to somebody about how bad he feels, OR he tries to meet and date other girls he's met in school, church, prosocial activities, or through friends.

6 - S gets involved in an activity which takes his mind off the problem or begins to do things with his boy friends.

4 - S tries to convince the girl to keep dating him, as his steady, OR he accepts the situation and does nothing at all about it.

2 - S tries to meet other girls, by picking up girls he doesn't know, or meeting them in a bar or pool hall.

0 - S beats up the girl or boy he sees her with, or he gets drunk or takes dope or engages in any other illegal or antisocial activity to make himself feel better.
APPENDIX B

ARCHIVAL DATA FORMS
**Code for file Request**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A-4) Sex</th>
<th>03 - Stepfather</th>
<th>04 - Stepmother</th>
<th>05 - Brother or Stepbrother</th>
<th>06 - Sister or Stepsister</th>
<th>07 - Aunt</th>
<th>08 - Uncle/Aunt &amp; Uncle</th>
<th>09 - Grandparents Paternal</th>
<th>10 - Grandparents Maternal</th>
<th>11 - Spouse/Other Relative</th>
<th>12 - Foster Parent</th>
<th>13 - Guardian</th>
<th>14 - Indep.</th>
<th>15 - No Information</th>
<th>16 - Father</th>
<th>17 - Father &amp; Stepfather</th>
<th>18 - Mother &amp; Stepfather</th>
<th>19 - Stepfather &amp; Stepmother</th>
<th>20 - Boarding House</th>
<th>21 - Public Institution</th>
<th>22 - Parent &amp; Stepfather</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A-5) Race</td>
<td>01 - Male</td>
<td>02 - Female</td>
<td>03 - Asian (Chinese-Japanese)</td>
<td>04 - Black</td>
<td>05 - American Indian</td>
<td>06 - Latin (Spanish Speaking)</td>
<td>07 - Other (non-classified)</td>
<td>08 - White, Caucasian</td>
<td>09 - Black</td>
<td>10 - American Indian</td>
<td>11 - Latin (Spanish Speaking)</td>
<td>12 - Other (non-classified)</td>
<td>13 - White, Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (A-6) In School | 01 - No | 02 - Yes |

| (A-11) Referred By | 01 - Parents or Relatives | 02 - Protection Officer | 03 - Law Enforcement Officer | 04 - Other Court | 05 - School | 06 - Social Agency | 07 - Parole Officer | 08 - Victim | 09 - Other |

| (A-12) Parental Status | 01 - Married | 02 - Common Law | 03 - Legally Separated | 04 - Parents Divorced/Neither Married | 05 - Parents Divorced/Father Married | 06 - Parents Divorced/Father Remarried | 07 - Parents Divorced/Both Remarried | 08 - Widow Married | 09 - Father Deceased/Other Remarried | 10 - Father Deceased/Other Not Remarried | 11 - Mother Deceased/Other Remarried | 12 - Mother Deceased/Other Not Remarried | 13 - Both Parents Deceased | 14 - No Information |

| (A-13) Living W/Habit. | 01 - Parents | 02 - Other |

 Minimum Security - Rehersals (RMC) Republican (younger) - D.M. - any area name - Millcreek Medium Security - Buckeye Youth Center (BTC) - Training Center for Youth (TCY) (younger) - Alversa/Sebota Village (ASB) (younger) Maximum Security - TEDO, Indian River - Cayuga Hills (CHS)
Report From File

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name</td>
<td>10. Case #</td>
<td>18. Committing Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Race</td>
<td>14. School Name</td>
<td>22. No. in Household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Last Grade</td>
<td>16. Date Admitted</td>
<td>24. Date Last in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History of Delinquency and Unruly

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disp. | ORC/A | Degree of Offense | Reason for Referral | Code | Disposition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Age at 1st Offense | 27. Offense for which Committed | 28. # of Offenses | 29. # of Offenses
|   |   |   |   |

List of Previous Commitments:

Family History:

Drug & Alcohol & Psychiatric Problems:

Pt. Level Newsletter Report:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Date</td>
<td>No. Beside Name</td>
<td># of Pts.</td>
<td>Reasons for Low Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>