

BRIEF REPORT

GENERALIZED EXPECTATIONS OF DRUG-DELINQUENTS, OTHER DELINQUENTS, AND A CONTROL SAMPLE

GÜNTER KRAMPEN

University of Trier, Federal Republic of Germany

ALEXANDER VON EYE

Max Planck Institute for Human Development and Education

INTRODUCTION

Taylor (1968) assumes in his reformulations of some propositions on alienation and anomie concerning delinquency that lack of control in social interaction is a relevant determinant of delinquency, and that delinquent responses can be regarded as adaptive responses to the lack of such internal control. Accordingly, Drasgow, Palau, and Taibi (1974) found that locus of control of reinforcement discriminates most effectively among delinquents, alcoholics, and people who score high in level of functioning measures. Empirical results also show that convicted and non-convicted drug-dependent men differ in personality characteristics such as hostility or extraversion (see Gossop & Kristjansson, 1977; Gossop & Roy, 1977). The aim of the present study is to differentially analyse in three samples some aspects of generalized expectancies (locus of control, hopelessness, machiavellianism) and some aspects of conservative attitudes (conservatism, sex-role orientation, rigidity), which together may be termed *indicators of subjective freedom of action*.

The first sample consists of prisoners who were convicted for drug-related crimes, the second sample of prisoners convicted for other crimes, and the third, a control-sample, of free non-drug-dependent men. There are some hints in the literature that there might be remarkable differences between drug-dependent and non-drug-dependent prisoners (Burian, 1983). Our hypothesis is, therefore, that prisoners do not only differ in personality variables from free men, but that there are also differences between prisoners who were convicted either for drug-related or for other (non-drug-related) crimes.

METHOD

The variables of subjective freedom of action were measured with German adaptations of the following questionnaires: (1) IPC-scales by Levenson (1974) for the measurement of three aspects of locus of control of reinforcement (internality, powerful-others externality, chance control orientation); (2) H-scale by Beck et al. (1974) for the measurement of hopelessness versus optimism concerning personal future; (3) SRO-scale (Brogan & Kutner, 1976) for the measurement of normative sex-role orientations (liberal versus traditional); (4) the questionnaires for personality-perceptual rigidity from the Test for Behavioral Rigidity (Schaie, 1960); and (5) short questionnaires for the measurement of conservatism and machiavellianism (Cloetta, 1974). The split-half reliability of each scale (Spearman-Brown) exceeds the value of $r_{tt} = .69$.

Table 1. Results of the multivariate analysis of variance for eight personality variables in the three samples.

Variable	Group A ^a		Group B ^a		Group C ^a		Source of variance		F ₃ ⁷	eta ²
	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}	SD	Between SQ	Within SQ		
Internality	36.6	3.9	35.5	3.9	36.2	4.4	6.69	17.75	0.38	.0086
Powerful-others externality	24.8	6.8	28.2	4.9	25.0	5.2	109.76	32.66	3.36*	.0717
Chance-control	25.6	4.8	30.4	4.6	24.7	5.3	262.91	32.11	8.19**	.1584
Optimism	35.3	3.2	31.4	3.7	32.7	4.2	83.90	19.53	4.30*	.0899
Conservatism	31.0	2.8	31.4	2.9	27.8	3.1	114.86	22.34	5.14**	.1057
Machiavellianism	25.0	7.6	30.5	4.4	25.0	5.2	280.76	39.59	7.09**	.1402
Sex-role orientation	95.2	17.5	104.5	23.5	97.2	19.4	604.19	686.63	0.88	.0198
Rigidity	45.7	3.2	49.2	2.9	47.5	3.5	65.67	21.94	2.99	.0644

MANOVA *F* for equality of dispersions $F = 1.667^{**}$ ($df_1 = 72$, $df_2 = 9208$).
MANOVA *F* for overall discrimination $F = 2.690^{**}$ ($df_1 = 16$, $df_2 = 160$).
Wilks Lambda = .62; eta² = .38.

* $p < .05$.** $p < .01$.^aGroup A = 18 drug delinquents; group B = 27 other delinquents; group C = control sample ($N = 45$).

Respondents were 45 male delinquents¹ (mean age = 20.4, $SD = 1.51$ years) and 45 free young men (mean age = 21.6, $SD = 1.97$ years). Educational level and social status of the groups were similar. Eighteen delinquents were convicted for drug-related crimes and 27 for other non-drug-related crimes. Data analysis was made by a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). Single mean comparisons for the eight variables were made by univariate analysis of variance. The null hypotheses will be rejected when a significance level of $p = .05$ or smaller is reached.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In Table 1, means and standard deviations of the variables in the three samples and the MANOVA are summarized. The MANOVA *F* score for the equality of the dispersions is significant, indicating that the standard deviations of the variables in the three samples are heterogeneous. This result will be neglected in the following because the overall MANOVA procedure is considered robust against heteroscedasticity (see Cooley & Lohnes, 1971).

Of much more substantial interest is the significant *F* score of overall discrimination. The three samples differ in the indicators of subjective freedom of action. The generalized correlation ratio (eta²) indicates that 38% of the variance in the eight variables can be explained by the group differences. The univariate *F* scores show that most of this specific variance is covered by chance-control orientation: fatalism, 16%; machiavellianism, 14%; conservatism, 11%; optimism/hopelessness, 9%; and powerful-others externality in locus of control, 7%. The means of these variables (see Table 1) show that the delinquents who were convicted for non drug-related crimes differ clearly from the two other samples, which seem to be more similar as far as these variables are concerned. This sample (group B in Table 1: Other delinquents) has higher mean scores in powerful-others externality, chance-control of orientation, and machiavellianism; in

¹We appreciate Dr. D. Doenges' friendly help in collecting the data in the delinquent sample.

addition, this group is more hopeless in regarding their personal future. Drug delinquents and free men differ considerably only in conservatism in which the two samples of prisoners score higher than the control sample.

To conclude, there is empirical evidence for the hypothesis of differences among drug delinquents, other delinquents, and a control sample of free young men in eight variables of subjective freedom of action. Noteworthy is the finding that the drug delinquents and the control sample display values that are more similar than the values of drug delinquents as compared to delinquents who were convicted for other crimes. This is a hint for the specific psychological and sociological status of drug delinquents and for the need of considering in future research more often indicators of subjective freedom of action.

REFERENCES

- Beck, A.T., Weissman, A., Lester, D., & Trexler, L. (1975). The measurement of pessimism: The hopelessness-scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 861-865.
- Brogan, D., & Kutner, N.G. (1976). Measuring sex-role orientation: A normative approach. *Journal of Marriage and The Family, 38*, 31-40.
- Burian, C. (1983). Kriminalitätsbelastung inhaftierter Drogenabhängiger. *Suchtgefahren, 29*(1a), 81-85.
- Cloetta, B. (1974). Neue Daten zum MK. Konstanz, Germany: University of Konstanz. Unpublished manuscript.
- Cooley, W.W., & Lohnes, P.R. (1971). *Multivariate data analysis*. New York: Wiley.
- Drasgow, F., Palau, J., & Taibi, R. (1974). Levels of functioning and locus of control. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 30*, 365-369.
- Gossop, M.R., & Kristjansson, I. (1977). Crime and personality. *British Journal of Criminology, 17*, 264-273.
- Gossop, M.R., & Roy, A. (1977). Hostility, crime and drug dependence. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 130*, 272-278.
- Levenson, H. (1974). Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 38*, 377-383.
- Schaie, K.W. (1960). *Test of behavioral rigidity (TBR)*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Taylor, L.J. (1968). Alienation, anomie and delinquency. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 7*, 93-105.