

SI

Shoplifting Inventory

An Inventory of Scientific Findings

Provided by:
Behavior Data Systems, Ltd.
P.O. Box 44256
Phoenix, Arizona 85064-4256

SI Copyright © 1996. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SHOPLIFTING INVENTORY (SI)

Theories about shoplifters proliferate. Shoplifters come from a wide variety of backgrounds - from urban and rural settings - and are representative of different ages, gender, ethnic groups and educational backgrounds. Yet, there is little consensus about characterological or personality differences common to shoplifters.

Moreover, a universally accepted theory is lacking. The reasons for shoplifting are complex. For example, many shoplifters have a distorted self-image in which they regard themselves as special or deserving. Some have inflated self-esteem, whereas others disapprove of themselves. Some shoplifters believe they are entitled to the things they want and will take them whenever they can. These people believe they are entitled, as opposed to working for and earning the things they want. Then there are the antisocial, uncaring and unsocial shoplifters. These include people often manifesting a moral blunting. Some shoplifters blame their actions on substance (alcohol or other drugs) use or abuse. This is often an attempt to avoid personal responsibility. Kleptomania is a psychiatric term for persons with "an uncontrollable impulse" to steal. Some experts argue what is habitual is not necessarily compulsive. However, many shoplifters do maintain their stealing is impulsive. Criminal justice professionals frequently hear, "my child hangs out with the wrong crowd," implying the shoplifter was corrupted by others. Peer pressure, particularly during adolescence, is generally recognized as a powerful influence. Most people want acceptance - to belong to the crowd. And then there are people that maintain they don't know why they shoplift - but they do steal from stores during shopping hours.

Simon Samenow, Ph.D. states in his book "Inside the Criminal Mind" debunks many of the myths about shoplifters. For example, Samenow maintains most criminals know right from wrong. He states "sociological explanations for crime, plausible as they may seem, are simplistic." After being apprehended many shoplifters "portray themselves as victims, they seek sympathy and hope to absolve themselves of culpability." Indeed, "no factor or set of factors - sociological, psychological or biological - is sufficient to explain why a person becomes a criminal." Continuing, "behind the appearance of uncontrollable impulse lies the stark reality . . . the shoplifters habitually scans the environment to take advantage of opportunities." Vigilance is necessary for successful shoplifting. By definition, shoplifters steal during normal store hours.

Due to the complexity of shoplifting motives, attitudes and behaviors several measures (or scales) are needed to establish a representative shoplifter profile.

The **Shoplifting Inventory (SI)** is designed to evaluate people charged or convicted of shoplifting. The Shoplifting Inventory contains nine measures (scales). The Shoplifting Inventory goes beyond the obvious - to motivation, attitude and behavior.

NINE SHOPLIFTING INVENTORY (SI) MEASURES

- 1. Truthfulness Scale:** measures how truthful the respondent was while completing the test. This scale identifies guardedness, faking and defensiveness - as well as the reading impaired.
- 2. Entitlement Scale:** measures a person's attitudes and beliefs regarding what they believe they are entitled to. Some people believe they are entitled to more than others, e.g., lifestyle, goods, desired items.
- 3. Shoplifting Scale:** measures a person's tendency (probability) of shoplifting. A shoplifter steals articles from a store during shopping hours.
- 4. Peer Pressure Scale:** measures the susceptibility of a person to the pressure or influence of other people. This scale shows how easily a person can be influenced by others.
- 5. Antisocial Scale:** measures antisocial behavior which incorporates an uncaring, emotionally blunted, unsociable and irresponsible attitude. Characteristics include hostility, disloyalty, unsocial outlook and many adjustment problems.
- 6. Self-Esteem Scale:** measures a person's perception of self. Self-Esteem incorporates an attitude of acceptance-approval versus rejection-disapproval of oneself. It describes the person one believes oneself to be.
- 7. Impulsive Scale:** measures a person's tendency to act on sudden impulse. Characteristic of a person who responds suddenly, abruptly or spontaneously.
- 8. Drugs Scale:** measures drug use or abuse-related problems. Drugs refer to marijuana, cocaine, crack, amphetamines, barbiturates and heroin, etc.
- 9. Alcohol Scale:** measures alcohol use and abuse-related problems. Alcohol refers to beer, wine and other liquor. Alcoholism is a significant problem in our society.

UNIQUE FEATURES

RISK LEVEL CLASSIFICATION

Each SI scale score is classified in terms of the risk range it represents. These risk level classifications are calculated individually for each of the nine empirically based scales as follows:

PERCENTILE RANGE	RISK RANGE
0 to 39th percentile	Low Risk
40 to 69th percentile	Medium Risk
70 to 89th percentile	Problem Risk
90 to 100th percentile	Severe Problem Risk

Scale scores are reported individually and concurrently classified in their appropriate risk range. Each scale score is independently calculated and classified each time an SI is scored.

SIGNIFICANT ITEMS.

Significant items represent self-admissions or important self-report responses. They are provided for reference and do not determine the respondent's scale score. For example, **a person could have a high scale score and few significant items or vice versa.** Significant items are printed on the last page of the SI report for the Alcohol and Drug scales. Significant items augment scale scores and sometimes provide a more complete understanding of the client. **Significant items permit comparison of the client's self-perception and attitude with their objective scale scores.**

EXPANDING DATABASE

Copyrighted SI software was designed with the capability of "saving" the data from each test in a confidential (no names) manner for ongoing research and analysis. This is one of the reasons why used diskettes are returned to Risk & Needs Assessment, Inc. No client names appear in SI research or annual program summary reports. Returned diskettes are downloaded into the SI database for subsequent analysis and client names are removed. **The expanding SI database is statistically analyzed each year.** This feature represents a unique advantage of the SI. The database ensures ongoing research at no additional cost to the SI user. As the SI database continues to grow, new and exciting research discoveries and innovative software remedies are anticipated. Gender (male/female) differences have already been identified (and remedies developed) by this procedure.

TRUTHFULNESS SCALE

Self-report tests and interviews are subject to the danger of respondents not telling the truth. An important advance in testing is the Truthfulness Scale, which measures how honest the client is while completing the test. It would be naive to believe that all people taking tests always answer questions truthfully. Truthfulness Scales identify self-protective and guarded people who attempt to deny, minimize or even conceal information. These scales can also detect functionally illiterate and visually impaired individuals. This feature is of special importance in court-related, probation, parole and treatment settings, since the outcome of a person's test results could affect their level of supervision, nature of intervention and life situation. **The Truthfulness Scale identifies attempts to fake or under report problems and concerns.**

TRUTH-CORRECTED SCORES

Another sophisticated psychometric technique involves "truth-corrected" scores which are individually calculated for **each** of the nine SI scales **every time** a test is scored. The Truthfulness Scale establishes how truthful the client was while completing the SI. Correlations between the Truthfulness Scale and all other scales have been statistically determined. This procedure enables the SI to identify and add back into each scale score the amount of error variance associated with a person's untruthfulness, resulting in "truth-corrected" scores. **Raw scores may only reflect what the client wants you to know. Truth-corrected scores reveal what the client is trying to hide.** Truth-corrected scale scores are more accurate than raw scores because they account for the measured amount of untruthfulness of the client while completing the SI. Yet for maximum screening effectiveness, test results and prior court-related records should be used jointly.

Professionals across the country have endorsed the benefits of truth-corrected scores, calling it a "high tech solution to a very common, down-to-earth need." This methodology is easy to use because the computer does all the work, actually calculating these truth-corrected scores every time a test is given. In the past, many evaluators were "turned off" on self-report tests because they were too easy to fake. Truthfulness Scales and Truth-Corrected scores have addressed this problem. They are considered by many as essential in any self-report test.

DELETE CLIENT NAMES

You have the option to delete client names from the diskette before returning it. This is optional. **If you want to use this option, remember that once you delete the client name from a diskette -- they are gone and can not be retrieved.** We recommend you only use this option before returning the used diskette. Deleting client names does not delete demographic information or test data. It only deletes client names when you use this option. **This option is provided for you to protect client confidentiality.** This option is discussed in the Computer Operating Guide.

TEST DATA INPUT VERIFICATION

This procedure allows the person that is inputting the test data from the answer sheet to verify the accuracy of their data input. In brief, the test data is input twice and any inconsistencies between the first and second data entry are highlighted until corrected. When the first and second data entries match (or are the same) you may continue. This data verification feature is optional.

You may enter client test data and print reports continuously until the diskette is filled, or if you wish, you may check to verify that data entries from the answer sheet were accurate. You have the option of verifying any data that you enter, whether you wish to verify all tests or randomly pick one or a few tests that were entered from a diskette. The choice is yours! There are two ways in which you may perform the test data input verification procedure: 1) after a new test has been entered, or 2) by choosing the option from the Supervisor Options menu. The verification procedure compares test items entered the first time with entries made the second time. If the test data entry is the same the first and second (verification) times -- then the test data was accurately entered. However, if there is a discrepancy between the first and second (verification) data entries -- then there is a data error or input discrepancy that should be checked. Keep in mind that an error could be made either time, i.e., the first or second time data was entered. To know which is the correct data you will need to refer to the answer sheet.

Judges, court staff, treatment agencies and parole department officers made Risk & Needs Assessment, Inc. psychologist aware of the need for an automated (computer scored) assessment instrument designed specifically for shoplifter evaluation. Risk & Needs psychologists then explored the types of information needed with Municipal and County Court judges, probation officers, treatment personnel and alternatives to incarceration program staff. The Shoplifter Inventory incorporates the suggestions made by these experienced professionals.

As the Shoplifter Inventory (SI) was conceptualized it became clear that Risk & Needs Assessment, Inc. could utilize some measures (scales) it had already developed for court, probation, prison and treatment evaluation. These included the Truthfulness Scale, Antisocial Scale, Self-Esteem Scale, Alcohol Scale and the Drug Scale. Studies reflecting these scales statistical properties had already been completed. Some of these studies are summarized herein. However, for more comprehensive discussion of these early studies, the reader is referred to the Substance Abuse Questionnaire (and SAQ-Adult Probation), Treatment Intervention Inventory (TII) and Prison Inmate Inventory (PII) research summaries. No attempt was made to include all available research on those tests in this document. Rather, an attempt was made to incorporate representative research relating to Shoplifting Inventory reliability and validity. Then as research utilizing the Shoplifting Inventory to evaluate shoplifters evolved it has been included chronologically -- or as it occurred.

This document summarizes Shoplifting Inventory research as it occurred - chronologically - so the reader can observe the evolution of the Shoplifting Inventory (SI) into a state-of-the-art shoplifter assessment instrument or test. Some testing companies select three or four favorable studies and tout them as "proof" of their tests qualities. In contrast, the research contained in this document is incorporated as it occurred. Consequently early studies may not be as impressive as more recent studies, yet all contribute to the establishment of the Shoplifting Inventory as a reliable, valid and accurate assessment instrument or test.

It should also be kept in mind that the Shoplifting Inventory (SI) is a relatively new test. Consequently, Shoplifting Inventory (SI) research actually began in 1997. Prior research was on Shoplifting Inventory (SI) scales (or measures). The Shoplifting Inventory (SI) research -- on the complete test -- began in late 1996 and continues to the present.

Initially three psychologists met with judges, probation officers, court personnel, treatment staff and alternatives to incarceration personnel to discuss and clarify desirable areas of inquiry. A large item pool was then developed representing areas of inquiry not incorporated by selected existing scales. Consensual agreement among psychologists and experienced staff reduced the item pool considerably. Items were then tried and their statistical properties established. Final item selection was empirical - selecting scale items with the best statistical properties. Then statistically related item configurations were applied to known shoplifter groups. This developmental procedure was followed with both established and new scale configurations. And final item selection was based on the best statistical properties.

Seventy-eight Arizona State University college students (1985) enrolled in an introductory psychology class were divided into two groups. One group was instructed to complete the SAQ honestly or truthfully, whereas the other group was instructed to lie or fake good - but don't get caught. Mean scores were: honest=2.71; fakers=15.7. The Truthfulness Scale successfully

measures and predicts how truthful the person is while completing the SAQ. This is shown in the highly significant (beyond chance) negative correlation ($r=0.27$) between these two groups.

Concurrent validity correlates the scales of the test being validated with similar scale measures from an established test. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) was selected for these studies because it is the most researched, validated and widely used objective personality test in the United States. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations were calculated between MMPI scales and comparable SAQ scales. These results for the Truthfulness Scale are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. PEARSON CORRELATIONS: SAQ - MMPI

	<u>Chemical Dependency Inpatients</u>		
	1985 (N=100)	1987 (N=212)	1991 (N=74)
	<u>Truthfulness</u>	<u>Truthfulness</u>	<u>Truthfulness</u>
MMPI L Scale:	.72	.62	.49

The Truthfulness Scale correlated highly significantly (0.001 level of significance) with the MMPI L (Lie Score) scale. The L-Scale detects respondents attempting to present an unusually good front (fake good).

In these same SAQ - MMPI studies the Alcohol Scale and Drug Scale of the SAQ were compared to the corresponding MMPI scales. These findings are summarized in Table 2 and 3.

Table 2. PEARSON CORRELATIONS: SAQ - MMPI

	<u>Chemical Dependency Inpatients</u>		
	1985 (N=100)	1987 (N=212)	1991 (N=74)
	<u>Alcohol</u>	<u>Alcohol</u>	<u>Alcohol</u>
MacAndrews:	.58	.35	.30

The Alcohol Scale correlates highly significantly (.001 level of significance) in predicted directions with the MMPI MacAndrews scale.

Table 3. PEARSON CORRELATIONS: SAQ - MMPI

	<u>Chemical Dependency Inpatients</u>		
	1985 (N=100)	1987 (N=212)	1991 (N=74)
	<u>Drug</u>	<u>Drug</u>	<u>Drug</u>
Psychopathic Deviate:	.54	.33	.29
MacAndrews:	.62	.37	.15 (N.S.)

The Drug Scale correlates highly significantly (.01 level of significance) in predicted directions with the MMPI Psychopathic Deviate (Pd) scale, and significantly in two of the three sample with the MacAndrews alcohol scale. There is no drug scale per se in the MMPI.

The Aggressiveness Scale was compared with corresponding MMPI scales. These finding are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. PEARSON CORRELATIONS: SAQ - MMPI

	<u>Chemical Dependency Inpatients</u>		
	1985 (N=100)	1987 (N=212)	1991 (N=74)
	<u>Aggressiveness</u>	<u>Aggressiveness</u>	<u>Aggressiveness</u>
Taylor Manifest Anxiety	.48	.34	.55
Hypomania (MA)	.28	.25	.35

The Aggressiveness Scale correlates significantly (.01 level of significance) with the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and the Hypomania Scale. The Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale measures free floating anxiety. The Hypomania Scale measures hyperactivity, psychomotor excitement, etc.

Reliability refers to consistency of test results regardless of who uses the test. The Cronbach Coefficient Alpha is considered the most important measure of internal consistency or reliability. Many reliability studies are reported in the SAQ research summary. Two will be reported here for reference.

A 1996 study (N=15,203) on probationers reports Cronbach Alpha coefficients for several Shoplifting Inventory (derived from the SAQ-Adult Probation II) scales. These coefficients are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Reliability (1996, N=15,203) Probationers

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Cronbach Alpha</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.89	P<.001
Alcohol Scale	.95	P<.001
Drug Scale	.92	P<.001

These results clearly support the reliability (internal consistency) of the Truthfulness Scale, Alcohol Scale and Drug Scale. Detailed information on this study is reported in the SAQ research summary document.

Another 1996 probationer study (N=9,247) independently reports Cronbach Alpha Coefficients for some Shoplifting Inventory (SI) scales. These findings are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Internal Consistency (1996, N=9,247)

	<u>Probationers Administered the SAQ Adult Probation</u>	
<u>Scale</u>	<u>Cronbach Alpha</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.89	P<.001
Alcohol Scale	.96	P<.001
Drug Scale	.93	P<.001

These results support the internal consistency (reliability) of the Truthfulness Scale, Alcohol Scale and Drug Scale. As noted earlier these scales were included in the Shoplifter Inventory.

In 1986 a study involved correlating polygraph results with Truthfulness Scale scores. One hundred and eighty nine (189) job applicants were administered the Truthfulness Scale and the polygraph examination. Tests were given in counterbalance order. The intent was to determine which applicants were truthful or honest while being tested. The Truthfulness Scale significantly related to polygraph finding as shown in the significance Pearson correlation ($r=0.23$, $P<.001$). This study supports the validity of the TII Truthfulness Scale.

In 1987 (N=563) a study demonstrated the relationship between Treatment Intervention Inventory (TII) scale scores and substance (alcohol and other drug) abuse tests. The MAST and Court Procedures are two alcohol and drug scales. The MAST and Sandler results were compared with the Alcohol Scale and Drug Scale in the TII and these results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7. Correlation Coefficients (N=563) DWI Offenders

<u>Scale</u>	<u>MAST</u>	<u>Court Procedures</u>
Alcohol Scale	.68	.80
Drug Scale	.38	.32

These coefficients demonstrate impressive validity between the Alcohol Scale and Drug Scale and other indices (MAST, Court Procedures) or tests. The Alcohol Scale and Court Procedure are essentially measuring the same thing. The Court Procedure involved a review of court records (DUI priors, BAC level, substance abuse convictions, MAST results, Sandler score and an interview). These findings are discussed in more detail in the TII research document and support the validity of the Alcohol and Drug Scales.

In another study (1988, N=1,299) Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients were calculated between Mortimer-Filkins total scores and TII Alcohol and Drug Scale scores. These DWI offenders results are summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Correlation Coefficients, (1996, N=1,299) DWI Offenders

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Correlation Coefficients</u>
Alcohol Scale	.45
Drug Scale	.24

The Mortimer-Filkins total score correlates highly significantly ($P<.001$) with the Alcohol Scale and Drug Scale. The findings support the validity of the Alcohol and Drug Scales.

Another study (1989, N=154) compared the SAQ with the TII. Both instruments contain a Truthfulness, Alcohol and Drug Scale. These agreement coefficients are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. Correlation Coefficients (1989, N=154)

SAQ Versus TII Scales, Outpatients

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Agreement Coefficients</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.64	$P<.001$
Alcohol Scale	.35	$P<.001$
Drug Scale	.34	$P<.001$

These results support the relationship between independent, but analogous scale scores. These concurrent validity findings support the validity of the Truthfulness, Alcohol and Drug Scales.

Another study (1990, N=89) evaluated the relationship between experienced counselors and the TII Self-Esteem Scale (which is used in the Shoplifter Inventory). These counselors had at least 8 years experience and an MA degree in counseling. Two counselors rated each clients self-esteem. They reviewed client outpatient files, court records, progress notes, diagnoses, MMPI results, incomplete sentence materials and a minimum 30 minute interview. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated for each rater and are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. Correlation Coefficients (N=89)
Staff Ratings and TII Self-Esteem Scale

<u>Rating</u>	<u>First Rater</u>	<u>Second Rater</u>
Self-Esteem	.11	.18

Even though this study was completed over a six month period, all comparisons were significant. This study supports the validity of the Self-Esteem Scale.

Another study (1995, N=887) explored the reliability (internal consistency) of the TII scales. These results are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Internal Consistency (1995, N=887)
Outpatients taking the TII

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Cronbach Alpha</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.89	P<.001
Alcohol Scale	.90	P<.001
Drug Scale	.91	P<.001
Self-Esteem Scale	.91	P<.001

Several of the Shoplifting Inventory (SI) scales have been analyzed in earlier studies. For example the Prison Inmate Inventory contains ten scales. Of these ten scales the Truthfulness Scale, Antisocial Scale, Self-Esteem Scale, Alcohol Scale and Drug Scale are analogues to Shoplifting Inventory scales.

In 1985 one hundred chemical dependency inpatients were administered the Prison Inmate Inventory and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Pearson Product Moment correlations were calculated between PII scales and comparable MMPI scales. These results are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12. Pearson Correlations (1985, N=100)
Between PII and MMPI Scale

<u>PII Scale</u>	<u>L Scale</u>	<u>Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory</u>		
		<u>MacAndrews</u>	<u>Psych. Deviate</u>	<u>Taylor Anxiety</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.72	-.40	-.37	-.58
Alcohol Scale	-.38	.58	.52	.47
Drug Scale	-.41	.62	.54	.46

The Truthfulness Scale demonstrates a highly significant positive correlation with the MMPI L scale. The L scale is a lie scale and a high L scale on the MMPI invalidates other MMPI scale scores. This helps in understanding why the Truthfulness Scale is significantly but negatively correlated with other MMPI scales. The MMPI L scale and PII Truthfulness Scale correlate significantly in the predicted direction.

The Alcohol scale correlates significantly with the MMPI MacAndrews Scale (ALC, $r=0.58$) and the MMPI and Psychopathic Deviate scale are often indicative of substance (alcohol and other drug) abuse.

The Drug Scale correlates highly significantly with the MacAndrews MMPI scale (ALC, $r=0.62$) and the Psychopathic Deviate scale (Pd, $r=0.54$). As noted earlier, the MMPI MacAndrews and Psychopathic Deviate scales are often indicative of substance (alcohol and other drugs) abuse.

Another study (1994) involved Australian prison inmates (N=402) completing the Prison Inmate Inventory after they had been admitted to prison and processed. Most of these inmates were incarcerated for more than six months and all participants were males. Analogous Shoplifting Inventory scales internal consistency or reliability is summarized in Table 13.

Table 13. Australian Inmates (1994, N=402)

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>	<u>Significance</u>
	<u>Alpha</u>	<u>Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.86	P<.01
Self-Esteem Scale	.93	P<.01
Alcohol Scale	.85	P<.01
Drug Scale	.84	P<.01

No attempt was made to adjust the PII test booklet to Australian terminology. Yet, these results still support the reliability (internal consistency) of the scales represented herein. Some cultural differences may have resulted in somewhat lower significance levels. It was at this time that the Antisocial Scale was developed and included in subsequent PII studies.

Another study (1994) involved administering the PII (with the Antisocial Scale) to 692 USA prison inmates. Internal consistency for this sample is presented in table 14.

Table 14. USA Inmates (1994, N=692)

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Coefficient</u>	<u>Significance</u>
	<u>Alpha</u>	<u>Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.85	P<.01
Antisocial Scale	.84	P<.01
Alcohol Scale	.89	P<.01
Drug Scale	.90	P<.01
Self-Esteem Scale	.88	P<.01

This study demonstrates the reliability (internal consistency) of the represented scales. This study introduced the Antisocial Scale. This study further supports the reliability of these selected scales.

A study (1995, N=1,454) involving prison inmates that completed the PII was completed in 1995. Reliability of analogous Shoplifting Inventory scales are reported in Table 15.

Table 15. Selected PII Scales (1995, N=1,454)

<u>Cronbach Alpha Correlation Coefficients</u>		
<u>Scale</u>	<u>Cronbach Alpha</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.88	P<.001
Antisocial Scale	.85	P<.001
Alcohol Scale	.95	P<.001
Drug Scale	.94	P<.001
Self-Esteem Scale	.94	P<.001

These results support the reliability (internal consistency) of the above represented scales. Reliability reflects the degree to which measurements are free from random error. These results demonstrate impressive internal consistency.

Another study (1995, N=1,782) was conducted to evaluate the reliability of PII scales. The scales represented in the following table are analogous to Shoplifting Inventory scales. Cronbach Alpha was calculated for each scales measure of internal consistency and these results are summarized in Table 16.

Table 16. Internal Consistency (1995, N=1,782)

<u>Cronbach Alpha Correlation Coefficients</u>		
<u>Scale</u>	<u>Cronbach Alpha</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.89	P<.001
Self-Esteem Scale	.94	P<.001
Alcohol Scale	.94	P<.001
Drug Scale	.95	P<.001
Antisocial Scale	.85	P<.001

These results support the reliability of the scales represented. These scales have impressive internal consistency (reliability). As noted earlier, analogous scales were represented in studies involving the Substance Abuse Questionnaire, SAQ-Adult Probation II, Treatment Intervention Inventory and the Prison Inmate Inventory. Consequently, the Shoplifting Inventory scales have been studied on normals, college students, probationers, inpatients, outpatients and incarcerated inmates.

The following studies involve the Shoplifting Inventory being administered to adjudicated shoplifters.

SHOPLIFTING INVENTORY (SI)

A study (1997) was done to assess the reliability of the Shoplifting Inventory (SI). This sample included 55 males (51.4%) and 52 females (48.6%). All participants were convicted of shoplifting. Demographics are summarized as follows: Age is reported by ranges: 19 and under (42, 39.3%); 20 - 29 (29, 27.1%); 30 - 39 (20, 18.7%); 40 - 49 (11, 10.3%); 50 - 59 (4, 3.7%), and 60+ (1, 0.9%). Ethnicity: Caucasian (93, 86.9%); Black (7, 6.5%); Hispanic (6, 5.6%); and American Indian (1, 0.9%). Education: 8th grade or less (2, 1.9%); Partially Completed High School (46, 43.0%); G.E.D. (6, 5.6%); High School Graduate (41, 38.3%); Partially Completed College (11, 10.3%); and College Graduate (1, 0.9%). Marital Status: single ((69, 64.5%); Married (24, 22.4%); Divorced (12, 11.2%); Separated (1, 0.9%); and Widowed (1, 0.9%). Cronbach Alpha Coefficients are reported for each Shoplifting Inventory (SI) scale in Table 17.

Table 17. Shoplifting Inventory (N=107)
Reliability (Internal Consistency) 1997

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Cronbach Alpha</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.87	P<.001
Entitlement Scale	.83	P<.001
Shoplifting Scale	.86	P<.001
Antisocial Scale	.85	P<.001
Peer Influence Scale	.87	P<.001
Impulsiveness Scale	.88	P<.001
Alcohol Scale	.91	P<.001
Drug Scale	.87	P<.001
Self-Esteem Scale	.93	P<.001

These results support the reliability (internal consistency) of the Shoplifting Inventory (SI). Results were significant and in expected directions.

Another Shoplifting Inventory (SI) study (1997) involved 119 convicted shoplifters. This sample consisted of 63 (52.9%) males and 56 (47.1%) females. Age is summarized as follows: 19 years and younger (32, 26.9%); 20 - 29 (43, 36.1%); 30 - 39 (24, 20.2%); 40 - 49 (14, 11.8%); 50 - 59 (2, 5.0%) and 60+ (3, 2.5%). Ethnicity: Caucasian (19, 16.0%); Hispanic (87, 73.1%); American Indian (5, 4.2%); Other (8, 6.7%). Education: 8th grade or less (6, 5.0%); Partially Completed High School (35, 29.4%); G.E.D. (4, 3.4%); High School Graduate (44, 37.0%); Partially Completed College (13, 10.9%); College Graduate (6, 5.0%); Professional/Graduate School (1, 0.8%) and Missing (10, 8.4%). Marital Status: Single (68, 57.1%); Married (26, 21.8%); Divorced (7, 5.9%); Widowed (1, 0.8%) and Missing (17, 14.3%). Cronbach Alpha Coefficients are reported for each Shoplifting Inventory scale in Table 18.

**Table 18. Shoplifting Inventory
Internal Consistency, N=119, 1997**

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Cronbach Alpha</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.87	P<.001
Entitlement Scale	.84	P<.001
Shoplifting Scale	.85	P<.001
Antisocial Scale	.86	P<.001
Peer Influence Scale	.85	P<.001
Impulsiveness Scale	.86	P<.001
Alcohol Scale	.91	P<.001
Drug Scale	.90	P<.001
Self-Esteem Scale	.95	P<.001

This study supports the internal consistency (reliability) of the Shoplifting Inventory (SI). Reliability refers to a test producing similar results upon re-admission.

Another study (1997) involved 153 convicted shoplifters. There were 82 males (53.6%) and 71 females (46.4%). Age is summarized as: 19 and younger (32, 53.6%); 20 - 29 (46, 30.1%); 30 - 39 (36, 23.5%); 40 - 49 (25, 16.3%); 50 - 59 (4, 2.6%); 60+ (8, 5.2%) and Missing (2, 1.3%). Ethnicity: Caucasian (75, 49.0%); Black (10, 6.5%); Hispanic (60, 39.2%); American Indian (2, 1.3%); Other (2, 1.3%) and Missing (4, 2.6%). Education: 8th grade or less (5, 3.3%); Partially Completed High School (30, 19.6%); G.E.D. (10, 6.5%); High School Graduate (49, 32.0%); Partially Completed College (34, 22.2%); Technical/Business School (1, 0.7%); College Graduate (5, 3.3%); Professional/Graduate School (1, 0.7%) and Missing (18, 11.8%). Shoplifting Inventory scales reliability coefficients are reported in Table 19.

**Table 19. Shoplifting Inventory
Reliability (1997) N=153 Shoplifters**

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Cronbach Alpha</u>	<u>Significance Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.87	P<.001
Entitlement Scale	.84	P<.001
Shoplifting Scale	.85	P<.001
Antisocial Scale	.85	P<.001
Peer Influence Scale	.85	P<.001
Impulsiveness Scale	.87	P<.001
Alcohol Scale	.93	P<.001
Drug Scale	.86	P<.001
Self-Esteem Scale	.94	P<.001

These results support the internal consistency (reliability) of the Shoplifting Inventory (SI). Similar results can be expected upon retest.

Another study (1997) involved convicted shoplifters being administered the Shoplifting Inventory (SI). This sample (N=378) consisted of 200 males (52.8%) and 180 females (47.2%). Age is summarized as follows: 19 and younger (105, 27.7%); 20 - 29 (118, 31.1%); 30 - 39 (80, 21.1%); 40 - 49 (50, 13.2%); 50 - 59 (11, 2.9%); 60+ (12, 3.2%) and Missing (3, 0.8%). Ethnicity: Caucasian (187, 49.3%); Black (17, 4.5%); Hispanic (153, 40.4%); American Indian (8, 2.1%); Other (5, 1.3%) and Missing (9, 2.4%). Education: 8th grade or less (13, 3.4%); Partially Completed High School (111, 29.3%); G.E.D. (20, 5.3%); High School Graduate (134, 35.4%); Partially Completed College (58, 15.3%); Technical/Business School (1, 0.3%); College Graduate (12, 3.2%); Professional/Graduate School (2, 0.5%) and Missing (28, 7.4%). Marital Status: Single (223, 58.8%); Married (86, 22.4%); Divorced (31, 8.2%); Separated (2, 0.5%); Widowed (5, 1.3%) and Missing (33, 8.7%). Reliability coefficients for the Shoplifting Inventory scales are presented in Table 20.

Table 20. Shoplifting Inventory
Internal Consistency (1997, N=378)

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Cronbach</u> <u>Alpha</u>	<u>Significance</u> <u>Level</u>
Truthfulness Scale	.87	P<.001
Entitlement Scale	.84	P<.001
Shoplifting Scale	.85	P<.001
Antisocial Scale	.84	P<.001
Peer Influence Scale	.86	P<.001
Impulsiveness Scale	.87	P<.001
Alcohol Scale	.92	P<.001
Drug Scale	.88	P<.001
Self-Esteem Scale	.94	P<.001

These results support the reliability (internal consistency) of the Shoplifting Inventory (SI). The SI is a reliable, valid and accurate self-report assessment instrument. The studies contained herein are reported chronologically, so that readers can observe the evolution of the SI into a state of the art automated (computer scored) assessment instrument. The Shoplifting Inventory (SI) is designed for shoplifter assessment.

Donald Davignon, Ph.D.
Senior Research Analyst

091598