

DIFFERENTIAL SELF  
PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE  
OFFENDERS

B. Kay, 1961

Published on demand by  
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS  
University Microfilms Limited, High Wycombe, England  
A Xerox Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

16254

**This is an authorized facsimile  
and was produced by microfilm-xerography  
in 1975 by  
Xerox University Microfilms,  
Ann Arbor, Michigan,  
U.S.A.**

This dissertation has been 62-782  
microfilmed exactly as received

KAY, Barbara Ann, 1929-  
DIFFERENTIAL SELF PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE  
OFFENDERS.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1961  
Sociology, general

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

DIFFERENTIAL SELF PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE OFFENDERS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate  
School of The Ohio State University

By

Barbara Ann Kay, B.Sc., M.A.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Ohio State University  
1961

Approved by

*Walter C. Hochstetler*

Adviser

Department of Sociology and  
Anthropology

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

N. Jeane Hartman has assisted me in ways too multifarious to enumerate and is more than appreciated.

Raymond F. Sletto has taught me the meaning of parsimony.

Walter C. Reckless has directed my graduate studies and truly earned my homage.

Martha E. Wheeler, superintendent of The Ohio Reformatory for Women, has given her full support to this research.

The National Institutes of Health Fellowship awarded me has made the research experience fruitful.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. PROBLEM . . . . .	1
II. METHOD . . . . .	11
III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE . . . . .	20
IV. FINDINGS OF INTRA-SAMPLE COMPARISON . . . . .	28
V. FINDINGS OF INTER-SAMPLE COMPARISON . . . . .	38
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	44
APPENDIX	
A. Sample Copy of Instruments Utilized in Collecting Data. .49	
B. Tables . . . . .	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	100
AUTOBIOGRAPHY . . . . .	103

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Legal Offenses for which Inmates Were Sentenced . . . . .	23
2. Age in Relation to Various Aspects of Self . . . . .	30
3. Length of Incarceration on Present Sentence and Institutional Impact . . . . .	34
4. Pearsonian Intercorrelation for Measures of Aspects of Self . . . . .	37
5. Age of Study Populations . . . . .	62
6. Race of Study Populations . . . . .	63
7. Scores on Ohio Penal Classification Test . . . . .	64
8. Levels Attained on Ohio Penal Classification Test . . . . .	66
9. Grade-Level Attained through Formal Education of Study Population. . . . .	67
10. Marital Status of Study Population . . . . .	68
11. Marital Status of Study Populations . . . . .	68
12. Religious Preference of Study Populations . . . . .	69
13. Occupation of Study Population . . . . .	69
14. Offenses for which the Study Populations Were Committed . . .	70
15. Delinquency (Arrests under Eighteen Years of Age) . . . . .	71
16. Onset Age of Delinquency. . . . .	72
17. Number of Arrests Prior to Being Committed . . . . .	73
18. Number of Felonies Committed by the Study Population (Including Present Offense) . . . . .	74
19. Number of Months Served on Present Offense. . . . .	74
20. Number of Years Incarceration Prior to Commission for Present Offense . . . . .	75

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
21. Socialization Scale Scores of Study Populations . . . . .	76
22. Cross-Validating Data for the Socialization Scale of the California Psychological Inventory . . . . .	77
23. Evans Powerlessness Scale Scores . . . . .	79
24. Evans Normlessness Scale Scores . . . . .	81
25. Srole (Social Isolation) Scale Scores . . . . .	83
26. Nettler Estrangement Scale Scores . . . . .	84
27. Age and Socialization Scores . . . . .	85
28. Age and Powerlessness Scores . . . . .	85
29. Age and Normlessness Scores . . . . .	85
30. Age and Social Isolation Scores . . . . .	86
31. Age and Estrangement Scores . . . . .	86
32. Age and Institutional Expectation Scores . . . . .	86
33. Age and Institutional Self Image Scores . . . . .	87
34. Age and Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores . . . . .	87
35. Age and Institutional Self Appraisal Scores . . . . .	87
36. Age and Concept of the Institution Scores . . . . .	88
37. Age and Concept of Institutional Impact Scores . . . . .	88
38. Total Arrests and Socialization Scores . . . . .	88
39. Total Arrests and Powerlessness Scores . . . . .	89
40. Total Arrests and Normlessness Scores . . . . .	89
41. Total Arrests and Social Isolation Scores . . . . .	89
42. Total Arrests and Estrangement Scores . . . . .	90
43. Total Arrests and Institutional Expectation Scores . . . . .	90

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
44. Total Arrests and Institutional Self Image Scores . . . . .	90
45. Total Arrests and Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores . . . . .	91
46. Total Arrests and Institutional Self Appraisal Scores . . . . .	91
47. Total Arrests and Concept of the Institution Scores . . . . .	91
48. Total Arrests and Concept of Institutional Impact Scores . . . . .	92
49. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Socialization Scores . . . . .	92
50. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Powerlessness Scores . . . . .	92
51. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Normlessness Scores . . . . .	93
52. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Social Isolation Scores . . . . .	93
53. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Estrangement Scores . . . . .	93
54. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Institutional Expectation Scores . . . . .	94
55. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Institutional Self Image Scores . . . . .	94
56. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores . . . . .	94
57. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Institutional Self Appraisal Scores . . . . .	95
58. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Concept of the Institution Scores . . . . .	95
59. Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense) and Concept of Institutional Impact Scores . . . . .	95
60. Age of Delinquency Onset and Socialization Scores . . . . .	96

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
61. Age of Delinquency Onset and Powerlessness Scores . . . . .	.96
62. Age of Delinquency Onset and Normlessness Scores . . . . .	.96
63. Age of Delinquency Onset and Social Isolation Scores. . . . .	.97
64. Age of Delinquency Onset and Estrangement Scores . . . . .	.97
65. Age of Delinquency Onset and Institutional Expectation . . Scores. . . . .	.97
66. Age of Delinquency Onset and Institutional Self Image Scores. . . . .	.98
67. Age of Delinquency Onset and Projected Ideal Institu- tional Role Scores . . . . .	.98
68. Age of Delinquency Onset and Institutional Self Ap- praisal Scores. . . . .	.98
69. Age of Delinquency Onset and Concept of the Institu- tion Scores . . . . .	.99
70. Age of Delinquency Onset and Concept of Institutional Impact Scores . . . . .	.99

## CHAPTER I

### PROBLEM

Female offenders are a long neglected criminal population. Most criminologists have had little to say about the etiology, treatment, institutional impact, and outcome of female offenders. This study proposes to fill at least part of that void. Perhaps, the deficiency in explanations of female criminality is centered in the assumption by many that theories of male criminality are applicable to females.

Reckless calls attention to some of the specifics that characterize female criminality:

To think of criminality of women in the same order of phenomena as crime in general is to cloud the issue.

Although crime as a behavior problem or a social problem is complicated and not easily understood or controlled, the criminality of women is even more complicated and less understood and not subject to easy control. If the criminologist, before propounding or accepting any theory of crime or delinquency would pause to ask whether that theory applied to women, he would probably discard it because of its inapplicability to women. One therefore should be prepared to have current theories, explanatory formulations, hypotheses, or compilations of causative factors fall far shorter in explaining criminal behavior of women than in accounting for criminal behavior of men. The reason for this is to be found to some extent in the biological make-up of women and still more in the social role women play in societies of male dominance. It is almost as if the woman must play her own self and play up to, for, or with men, with the latter role adding a second self to an

initial self. In other words, in most countries of the world a man can more nearly play himself.<sup>1</sup>

The pioneer work on the female offender was done by Lombroso, the Italian physician, and anthropologist, who contended that the female offender including the prostitute, is less likely to be a born criminal type than the male criminal, and is more likely to display the characteristics of an occasional criminal. In other words, the majority of female criminals, according to Lombroso are occasional criminals, which today might be termed situational offenders, or offenders of opportunity.<sup>2</sup>

The "origin of her reluctant crime" is suggestion by a lover, husband, father, or occasionally a female associate.<sup>3</sup> The occasional criminal has an absence of anomalies, or signs of degeneration, and she possesses good moral character.<sup>4</sup>

Excessive temptations were thought to account in part for the property crimes of occasional female criminals; shoplifters, domestic servants, and others who are placed in the way of excessive temptation while playing their female roles.<sup>5</sup> Parental neglect, and desertion

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter C. Reckless, The Crime Problem (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 3rd Edition, 1961), p. 78.

<sup>2</sup>Cesare Lombroso and William Ferrero, The Female Offender (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1916), pp. 109-147.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 196.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 192-193.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 206-207.

during infancy, and childhood were recognized by Lombroso as important causative factors, leading to early thieving, and prostitution on the part of the female, more than on the part of the male.<sup>6</sup>

There are often local patterns of female crime, due to customs, and conditions of various countries, that are avenues of criminality for the occasional rather than the born female criminal. Lombroso observed that infanticide in Sweden, abortions in the United States, and shoplifting in the big stores of Paris, are representative of such local patterns of crime.<sup>7</sup>

Perhaps, the next important study of female offenders is the one by Fernald in 1920, using the inmates (mainly prostitutes) of the New York Reformatory for Women as its sample. This work presented no theory. It merely emphasized the impoverished backgrounds of the women.

. . . two lines of influence which seem to have a bearing on the problem of delinquency among women, namely: (1) poor economic background with few advantages or opportunities, including such conditions as poor homes, very limited school opportunity, early age at starting work and meager industrial training; and (2) a somewhat inferior mentality.<sup>8</sup>

In a much less factual, but more systematic way, Thomas viewed the sexually delinquent girl as an unadjusted girl, somewhat on the amoral

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., pp. 210-211.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 213.

<sup>8</sup>Mabel Fernald, et al., A Study of Women Delinquents in New York State (New York, The Century Company, 1920), p. 525.

side, who is attempting by using sex as capital to satisfy her dominant wishes for recognition, new experience, and response. At the time, Thomas contended that human motives could be reduced to four basic wishes which are generated by the social situation, and defined by the individual's definition of the situation. The wishes are for the most part on the conscious level. In applying his formulation of motives to delinquent behavior Thomas stipulated several relationships between wishes, and delinquent behavior.

- . . . individuals turn directly to delinquency or stumble into it to get their wishes satisfied.
- . . . individuals may resort to delinquency as a result of blockages in the satisfaction of wishes in normal channels.
- . . . more or less as compensation, or behavior of protest.
- . . . failure to get the wishes satisfied in some measure often results in extreme unrest and demoralization.
- . . . concrete wishes of the same class or type may have a totally different moral quality, depending on the modes of realization.
- . . . the predominance of any type of wishes in persons depends on temperament, which in turn represents the chemical organization of the body.
- . . . the expression of wishes is influenced by the ordinary devices of control and regulation in society, such as gossip, approval, and punishment.<sup>9</sup>

An ambitious piece of research on women offenders was done by the Gluecks in 1934, in which they assembled case folder information on a consecutive sample of 500 women admitted to the Massachusetts Reformatory for Women.

The Gluecks' did not proceed on the basis of testing any theory or hypothesis about the female offender. They did, however, single out five factors bearing the highest association to non-recidivism.

<sup>9</sup>William I. Thomas, The Unadjusted Girl (Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1923), pp. 1-69.

. . . the following five pre-Reformatory factors in the careers of our women were utilized in the construction of the prognostic tables: retardation in school, neighbourhood influences within a year of commitment, steadiness of employment, economic responsibility, mental condition (abnormality).<sup>10</sup>

. . .  
The women are themselves on the whole a sorry lot. Burdened with feeble-mindedness, psychopathic personality, and marked emotional instability, a large proportion of them found it difficult to survive by legitimate means.<sup>11</sup>

. . .  
This swarm of defective, diseased, antisocial misfits, then, comprises the human material which a reformatory and a parole system are required by society to transform into wholesome, decent, law-abiding citizens! Is it not a miracle that a proportion of them were actually rehabilitated?<sup>12</sup>

In 1943, Kemp summarized the case history findings of 530 prostitutes treated in a Copenhagen Clinic. They were found to be socially, medically, and psychologically below par. He contended that,

Prostitution may be produced by external causes having nothing to do with congenital and inherited characteristics of the prostitutes themselves. Again it may be due almost entirely to hereditary factors.<sup>13</sup>

Psychiatric examinations revealed that these prostitutes had the following attributes:

Most of them who could not be classed as abnormal had limited mental capacity or difficult characters. Among both the normal and abnormal were found alcoholism, criminality, work-shyness, "Wanderlust," mental instability, weakness of

<sup>10</sup>Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, Five Hundred Delinquent Women (New York, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1934), p. 288.

<sup>11</sup>Glueck, loc. cit., p. 299.

<sup>12</sup>Glueck, loc. cit., p. 303.

<sup>13</sup>Tago Kemp, Physical and Psychological Causes of Prostitution: A Study of Measures Adapted or Under Consideration Particularly with Regard to Minors (Geneva, League of Nations Advisory Committee on Social Questions, PT IV, Official, No. 26, May 26, 1943), p. 53.

character or rudimentary sentiment development. In a few cases, hypersexuality and other sexual abnormalities were observed; but these were not particularly characteristic or frequent.<sup>14</sup>

Kemp assigned causation to depressed social, physical, and psychological conditions through which these semi-criminal women had found their way into prostitution. No theory was proved or disproved by this study.

The most recent definitive work (1950) on the female offender was executed by Pollak, an American sociologist who undertook in a systematic way to explain why female criminality was so much less reported than male criminal behavior. Pollak found that female criminality is under-reported, especially such offenses as, shoplifting, thefts by prostitutes, thefts by domestic servants, abortions, perjury, disturbance of the peace, offenses against children, and homicide. Offenses such as homosexuality, and exhibitionism go practically undetected, if committed by women. Men victims protect female offenders. In view of the fact that women play a much less active role in society than men, they are often instigators of crimes committed by men; as instigators they are hard to detect. The female role as homemaker, rearer of children, nurse, wife, mistress, and other related roles, place her in the position to commit crimes, and yet screen those crimes from public view. Law enforcement officers, as well as, judges, and jurors, are much more lenient in dealing with women than with men. These assumptions lead Pollak to state that the criminality of women is "largely

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

masked criminality." Consequently, crime reports would be expected to under-report female criminality. The real measure of female criminality must be sought from unofficial sources.<sup>15</sup>

Women offenders use deceit and indirection in the commission of their offenses. Sexual mores dictate concealed female behavior. Female offenders have a restricted focus on victims, such as children, husbands, lovers - - those who are close to them. Such a focus on victims is consistent with the various roles that woman plays in society.<sup>16</sup>

Cohen has touched on the female delinquent incidentally in his analysis of delinquent (male) subculture.

Authorities on delinquency are agreed that female delinquency, although it may appear euphemistically in the records as "un-governability" or "running away" is mostly sex delinquency.<sup>17</sup>

Implicit to this theory is the theme that the female delinquent is much more likely to be involved in delinquency because of her adjustment to males, as the bulk of her behavior is "sex-connected" rather than the stealing and/or the "malicious hell-raising" of her male counterpart.<sup>18</sup>

The occasional offender theory (Lombroso), the wish satisfaction theory (Thomas), the masked behavior theory (Pollak), and the man's woman, or boy's girl theory (Cohen) represent the principal attempts to

<sup>15</sup>Otto Pollak, The Criminality of Women (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1950), pp. 1-7.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., pp. 8-14.

<sup>17</sup>Albert K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang (Chicago, Illinois, The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1955), p. 45.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., pp. 44-48.

explain female criminality. None of these was supported by data expressly collected to test an hypothesis. This study is designed to test certain hypotheses regarding female criminality.

Obviously, none of the studies of female criminality, whether or not it had a theoretical orientation, has attempted to understand how she conceives herself. This study will address itself to (1) the direction of the female offender's socialization, (2) the extent of her feelings of alienation, (3) and the effect upon her of being institutionalized (i.e., institutional impact).

Probably female offenders arrested, but not booked and held for court, are different from those booked and held. Those sent to the workhouse probably differ from those sent to prisons or reformatories, and from those placed on probation. It was decided to limit this study to adult female offenders sentenced to a state reformatory (prison).

This exposition will be limited to differential self perceptions of female offenders committed to a state prison or reformatory, usually as felons, most frequently receiving a sentence of more than one year for offenses considered by the criminal code as more serious than drunkenness, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, prostitution, petty theft, and so forth.

Having in mind a study of certain aspects of the way the female offenders view themselves, and more particularly the direction of their socialization, the extent to which they feel alienated, and the perceived impact of the institution itself, 12 major hypotheses suggest themselves.

1. Youth is inversely associated with socialization.
2. Youth is inversely associated with alienation.
3. Youth is associated with institutional impact.
4. A greater number of arrests is inversely associated with socialization.
5. A greater number of arrests is associated with alienation.
6. A greater number of arrests is inversely associated with institutional impact.
7. A shorter length of incarceration on the present sentence is inversely associated with socialization.
8. A shorter length of incarceration on the present sentence is inversely associated with alienation.
9. A shorter length of incarceration on the present sentence is associated with institutional impact.
10. An early age of onset into illegal behavior as juveniles is associated with socialization.
11. An early age of onset into illegal behavior as juveniles is associated with alienation.
12. An early age of onset into illegal behavior as juveniles is inversely associated with institutional impact.

A recent study by Clark of male prisoners at The Ohio Penitentiary included data on socialization, and alienation; it will, therefore, be possible to make comparisons between female and male offenders at those points where the Clark study and the present study collected comparable data.<sup>19</sup> To this extent, the present study will contain the first systematic comparisons between a comparable group of female and male

---

<sup>19</sup>John Pradbee Clark, "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960.

offenders (felony prisoners) on self perceptions. Two major hypotheses which test these comparisons are:

1. Female offenders are less negative in socialization than male offenders.
2. Female offenders are more alienated than male offenders.

## CHAPTER II

### METHOD

The data for this study of female offenders were secured from 324 inmates available on February 5, 1961, and who were able to complete the schedule at The Ohio Reformatory for Women, Marysville, Ohio. This sample comprised practically the entire inmate population of the institution.

The Ohio Reformatory for Women is an open facility (no fence) which receives all committed female felons from the common pleas courts of the State of Ohio, as well as, a limited number of "contributing" cases (i.e., contributing to abuse, delinquency or neglect of a minor), from counties where facilities are inadequate to hold those prisoners who receive a flat one year sentence.

#### Procedure

Data were collected from two sources: from the responses of each inmate to a standard schedule, and from individual case records (official reformatory files). On February 5, 1961 the schedule was administered to the entire available population by testing three consecutive groups in the auditorium at the institution. The inmates were seated in alternate seats, so that communication among them was minimal. Slow readers, semi-literates, and illiterates were removed from their living areas prior to schedule administration to the first group, and taken to

a recreation lounge to prevent contact between them and the groups returning from the testing area. The remainder of the population was taken in two convenient groups of approximately equal size, consecutively.

A written announcement was read in the living units early in the morning of February 5th, informing the inmate population that they were to have the unusual opportunity of participating in a study of the female offender that afternoon. It was further stated that only through this type of procedure, and their full cooperation would it be possible to gain a better understanding of the needs of female inmates, and that this was the first study of its type. In general the population appeared to be cooperative, relaxed, and seriously interested in the project.<sup>1</sup>

In order to standardize the testing procedure, the writer read each item to each group, answering questions of interpretation where necessary. This appeared to be an effective procedure throughout the test administration. The slow readers were taken as the last group, in order to give them sufficient time, and attention. Interestingly enough, not one schedule was discarded from this special (slow) group because of incomplete or erroneous response.

On the date of schedule administration the total inmate population was 352. The study population of 324 represents 92.1 per cent of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Four persons were chosen to assist the writer with administration of the schedule by circulating through the groups: Miss Wheeler, superintendent, Mr. Straubing, institutional psychologist, Mr. Troesch, director of education, and Miss Hartman, assistant professor at Wittenberg University. These individuals demonstrated excellent ability to gain rapport without being threatening to the inmates.

total. The 28 cases not in the study population were lost for the following reasons: One inmate was in maximum security, two were in hospital isolation, one had her eyes bandaged, three were totally illiterate or uncomprehending, and there were 21 schedules incompletely, and/or erroneously answered. The 28 individuals lost to the study population possess no known bias which would distort the analysis of data.

The inmates' case folders were scrutinized for data not available from the individuals themselves. A "Data Sheet" was used to standardize the transposition of data, as well as, to insure accuracy (Appendix A).

#### Schedule

The schedule consisted of 180 items designed to elicit data relevant to the testing of the stated hypotheses. Items were constructed after consultation with reformatory personnel, criminologists, and several inmates.

The schedule consisted of nine parts in addition to a cover sheet, explaining the project, and its origins (Appendix A). The first part, items 1 through 53, was the Socialization Scale (SO) from the California Psychological Inventory by Harrison Gough. This scale was designed to measure the degree of "social maturity, probity, and rectitude" which the individual has attained.<sup>2</sup> High scores indicate a high degree of

<sup>2</sup>Harrison G. Gough and Donald Peterson, "The Identification and Measurement of Predispositional Factors in Crime and Delinquency," Journal of Consulting Psychology, Vol. 16, (June 1952), pp. 207-212. (One item of the original scale was omitted because of its obvious lack

socialization, while low scores indicate a veering toward deviancy, delinquency, or poor socialization. The Socialization Scale has been tested for reliability, and validity on a wide range of samples (Table 22, Appendix B).

The second part of the schedule, items 54 through 65, was the Evans Alienation Scale (Powerlessness) which was designed to measure feelings of "power-control" over the external environment.<sup>3</sup> High scores indicate feelings of powerlessness.

The third part of the schedule, items 66 through 77, was the Evans Alienation Scale (Normlessness) which was designed to measure the degree to which individuals thought it necessary to use socially disapproved means to reach socially approved goals (ends). Evans' two Scales were constructed on a sample of 591 tubercular out-patients in Columbus, Ohio.<sup>4</sup> High scores indicate alienation/in the normlessness sense.

The fourth part of the schedule, items 78 through 82, was designed by Srole to measure the socio-psychological concept of anomie, which he refers to as the "individual eunomia-anomia" continuum. This Srole Scale is conceived as referring to the individual's generalized, pervasive sense of "self-to-others belongingness" at one extreme,

---

<sup>2</sup>of discriminating power: "I have never been in trouble with the law." Scores were corrected upward so that statistics might be comparable to other studies).

<sup>3</sup>John W. Evans, "Stratification: Alienation and the Hospital Setting: A Study in the Social Psychology of Chronic Illness" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960.

<sup>4</sup>Evans, op. cit.

compared with "self-others distance," and "self-to-others alienation" at the other pole of the continuum.<sup>5</sup> Many researchers have found this scale to be reliable. Perhaps, as has been suggested by Nettler,<sup>6</sup> and Meier and Bell,<sup>7</sup> these scale items measure despair, that is, utter hopelessness, and discouragement. Despair, however, can be a function of personal disorganization. The higher the score the stronger the feelings of social isolation.

The fifth part of the schedule, items 83 through 96, was Nettler's Scale of Estrangement from our society.

The common aspect of the estranged ones includes a consistent maintenance of unpopular, and averse attitudes toward familism, the mass taste, current events, popular education, conventional religion, and the telic view of life, nationalism, and the voting process.<sup>8</sup>

The lower the score the greater the feeling of estrangement. In correspondence with Dr. Nettler, it was decided to modify the original scale for use with the present study population.

The sixth part of the schedule contained items 97 through 160 (excepting items 144, 153, and 160). These items were designed by Reckless

<sup>5</sup>Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, Vol. 21 (December, 1956), pp. 709-716.

<sup>6</sup>Gwynn Nettler, "A Measure of Alienation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 22 (December, 1957), pp. 670-677.

<sup>7</sup>Dorothy L. Meier and Wendell Bell, "Anomia and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals," American Sociological Review, Vol. 24 (April, 1959), pp. 189-202.

<sup>8</sup>Nettler, op. cit.

and his students to measure institutional expectations. For the purposes of this research the items were modified considerably, and were utilized as a measure of institutional impact (expectation-impact being a function of time). The administered schedule contained 61 institutional impact items. Twenty non-discriminatory items, that did not differentiate inmates who had been incarcerated for a lengthier period of time, above the 75 per cent-25 per cent level were discarded from further analysis.

Subsequently, the 41 discriminating items were sub-grouped into sets or clusters of items known by the following titles:

Institutional Expectation

Do you think you deserved to be sent to Ohio Reformatory for Women?  
 Do you think your stay here will help you?  
 Do you think the staff here give the women a square deal?  
 Will the other women here make you worse?  
 While here, do you expect to find out why you got into trouble?  
 Would you volunteer to come to Ohio Reformatory for a whole year?

Institutional Self Image

Now that you are here, do you look upon yourself as:

lucky  
 normal person who just got caught  
 Since coming to Ohio Reformatory, do you feel:  
 bitter  
 caught  
 outcast  
 about same as always  
 relaxed  
 untroubled

Projected Ideal Institutional Role

Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to:  
 stay out of the way of the staff  
 keep to yourself  
 show you are really sorry for what you did  
 make friends with the staff  
 talk about yourself to some staff member  
 run errands or do favors for the staff members  
 Most women are just interested in getting by while they are here.

Institutional Self Appraisal

At the present time, do you think of yourself as:

- someone who has a lot of problems
- someone who knows how to play it cool
- someone who won't let anybody push her around
- someone who is misunderstood
- someone who got a bad deal

Does a place like Ohio Reformatory help women?

Concept of the Institution

Ohio Reformatory seems to be a place where:

- a person waits around for others to tell her what to do
- a person feels guilty most of the time
- a person is just another number
- a person learns good daily habits
- a person will never get a break
- nothing makes much sense

Concept of Institutional Impact

Will any of the following things do you any good:

- be left alone
- be told what to do
- some staff member take an interest in you

Will you have a tough time getting along in the future because you have been here?

Do you have a lot of things worrying you?

Do you think you will learn how to get along with people better while you are here?

Will you volunteer for jobs while here?

Will you like yourself better by the time you get out?

High scores were in the direction of favorable institutional impact.

The seventh part of the schedule consisted of items 144, 153, and 160, which are summary Blame Scale items, developed by Clark, to indicate direction of blame placement.<sup>9</sup> These summary items were interspersed with items in part six to shield their intent. High scores indicate self blame, while low scores indicate projection of blame onto others.

<sup>9</sup>Clark, op. cit.

Part eight of the schedule consisted of items 161 and 162, included by the writer to indicate the feelings the inmates have in regard to the appropriate length of sentence for themselves, and others within the institutional population.

Part nine of the schedule was entitled "Some Facts About You." It consisted of items 163 through 180, and was designed to elicit social background data and institutional participation information. This section was placed last in order to avoid arousing suspicion by the personal nature of the information requested.

#### Data Sheet

Background data, grade level completed, intelligence test score, offense, length of sentence, and official Federal Bureau of Investigation arrest record were taken from inmates' case folder records, and summarized on the individual data sheets.

The Ohio Penal Classification Test (OPCT) constructed by Sell is used to test intelligence of adult felons in Ohio. This test has been found to be correlated  $+0.79$  with the Wechsler-Bellevue, and  $+0.73$  with the Revised Beta on similar subjects. The test retest method revealed a reliability coefficient of  $+0.87$ . The median for this test is 100.14, and the mean is 100.0 for the standardizing populations, including prison groups, high school students, and the members of several adult social clubs.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup>Dewitt E. Sell, Manual for the Ohio Penal Classification Test (Chicago, Illinois: Psychometric Affiliates, 1952), pp. 2-5.

Analytical Design

The case number for identification purposes, the scale scores, history, and/or background data were recorded, coded, and double checked. This information was then punched on International Business Machine cards, and verified.

The data were analyzed in terms of total scale scores, and their relationship to background items. Comparisons between male and female penal populations were made where possible.

## CHAPTER III

### CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

#### Background Variables

Background data were taken from the schedule responses of the women's reformatory population, as well as from the official case folder records at the institution.

1. Age. A distribution of 18 through 78 was found, an age range of 60 years. The mean age was 34.8 years, and the median was 33.1 (Table 5, Appendix B).

2. Race. Whites comprised 52.5 per cent of the study population; Negroes comprised the remaining 47.5 per cent (Table 6, Appendix B). Negroes represented 8.1 per cent of the Ohio population in 1960.<sup>1</sup> This clearly demonstrates the overrepresentation of Negroes in The Ohio Reformatory for Women. However, Negroes are overrepresented in densely populated, deprived urban areas from which comes a high proportion of all criminal offenders.

3. Intelligence. Early researchers found intelligence and criminal behavior to be associated.<sup>2</sup> The mean intelligence test score of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960 (80th ed.: Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Government Printing Office).

<sup>2</sup>Charles Goring, The English Convict (London, His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1913), in which "weak mindedness" was the primary cause of crime.

female offender study population as measured by The Ohio Penal Classification Test was 90.3, while the median was 91.7 (Table 7, Appendix B). This indicates that the study population falls below the mean of 100.0 for the population on which the test was standardized.

4. Grade-Level Attained through Formal Education. The range of formal education was from no education for two persons in the study population through two years of formal education beyond high school graduation for two persons in this sample of female offenders. The mean was 8.4 years, and the median was 8.7 years of formal education (Table 8, Appendix B).

5. Marital Status. The marital status of the study population was distributed fairly evenly among the several categories: 22.2 per cent single, 23.8 per cent married, 21.9 per cent separated, 21.0 per cent divorced, and 11.1 per cent widowed (Table 10-11, Appendix B).

6. Religion. Almost 74 per cent of the study population claimed affiliation with Protestant denominations, while 20.1 per cent were classified as Roman Catholic, some .6 per cent were Jews, and 5.5 per cent claimed no church affiliation (Table 12, Appendix B).

7. Occupation. It is particularly difficult to classify occupations for a female offender population satisfactorily. Because no known classification of occupations appeared adequate for the purposes of this study, the writer undertook a classification of her own. The purpose of the classification was to describe the occupational skills of the study population.

The category of specifically educated is demarcated from all other categories on the basis of special educational qualifications for

positions held; only 16 per cent of the sample were thus classified. The skilled classification referred to those with a high level of coordinated skills, usually achieved without formal higher education; 8.6 per cent were so classified. Semi-skilled, 32.4 per cent, and unskilled, 20.4 per cent were differentiated on the basis of the reading, and/or mathematical requirements of the job. The housewife category included 29.3 per cent of the study population. Since there was no constancy of reporting the husbands' occupation in the reformatory records, and there was no other factor appropriate to the classification process, this category is descriptive of women who kept house, and who were not otherwise gainfully employed. There were 2.2 per cent of the sample who claimed they did absolutely nothing, while 6.5 per cent were engaged in occupations which are illegal (i.e., shoplifting, prostitution, keeping a bawdy house) (Table 13, Appendix B).

#### Criminal Variables

Criminal variables include those that refer to the nature and/or extent of the offenders' involvement in official crime.

1. Type of Offense. The 324 female inmates at The Ohio Reformatory for Women were committed on a diverse range of legally stipulated crimes (44 offenses). Inspection of Table 1, below, provides a delineation of the variability of offenses as legally stipulated for the study sample.

The offenses most frequently committed by this population of criminal women were: Manslaughter (13.0 per cent), Forgery (11.4 per cent), Drug Violations (10.8 per cent), Murder 2nd degree (10.5 per cent), Contributing to Abuse, Delinquency, or Neglect (6.2 per cent).

Table 1.- Legal Offenses for which Inmates Were Sentenced

Legal Offense	Number	Per Cent
Abortion (performed)	1	.3
Aiding in attempt to use explosives	1	.3
Aiding Escape and Harboring a Felon	1	.3
Armed Robbery	10	3.1
Assault with intent to Rape (accessory)	1	.3
Assault to Rob	4	1.2
Attempt to burn property	2	.6
Auto Theft	3	.9
Breaking and Entering	7	2.2
Burglary	8	2.5
Burning property of another	1	.3
Contributing to Abuse, De- linquency, or Neglect	20	6.2
Cutting with intent to kill or wound	5	1.5
Defrauding Innkeeper	1	.3
Drawing a check without credit to defraud	1	.3
Drug Violations	35	10.8
Embezzlement	7	2.2
Escape (from reformatory)	2	.6
Forgery	37	11.4
Grand Larceny	24	7.4
Housebreaking	2	.6
Incest and Sodomy	1	.3
Issuing Checks with insuffi- cient funds	10	3.0

Table 1 (continued)

Legal Offense	Number	Per Cent
Keeping place for prostitution	1	.3
Kidnapping	1	.3
Larceny by trick	2	.6
Malicious Entry	1	.3
Manslaughter	42	13.0
Murder 1st degree	10	3.0
Murder 2nd degree	34	10.5
Obtaining property under false pretenses	3	.9
Operating Motor Vehicle with- out owner's consent	1	.3
Pandering and Procuring	3	.9
Pocket Picking	3	.9
Poor Relief Fraud	1	.3
Possession of Narcotics	1	.3
Prostitution	2	.6
Receiving Stolen Goods	6	1.9
Robbery	14	4.3
Shooting with intent to kill or wound	1	.3
Stabbing with intent to kill or wound	1	.3
Throwing acid to maim	1	.3
Unarmed Robbery	1	.3
Uttering checks	11	3.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Some of the least frequently committed offenses were: Abortion, Burning property of another, Defrauding Innkeeper, Incest and Sodomy, Keeping place for prostitution, Poor Relief Fraud, and Unarmed Robbery.

2. Arrest Record. The extent of the inmates' criminal involvement is indicated in their case folders by the magnitude of their records. Seventy-one per cent of the inmates in this study population had never been in contact with police or court authorities as juveniles (Table 15, Appendix B). If these data are accurate the theory of progression into crime (i.e., the bulk of adult offenders have juvenile delinquency records) should be seriously reconsidered.

Frum found that 54 per cent of 319 randomly selected recidivists in the Indiana Reformatory and Prison had had no juvenile delinquency record.<sup>3</sup> Fradkin reported that 51 per cent of the white property offenders (300 inmates consecutively admitted to The Ohio Penitentiary) claimed they had had no court contacts as juveniles for their delinquent behavior.<sup>4</sup> Reckless contends that,

The general assumption that delinquency is the precursor of adult crime overlooks the fact that adults who have had officially clear records as juveniles can and do get involved in fraud, swindle, theft, check forging, murder, gambling, desertion, alcoholism, drug offenses, sex offenses, and so forth.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup>Harold Frum, "Adult Criminal Offense Trends following Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 49, No. 1 (1958), p. 48.

<sup>4</sup>Howard E. Fradkin, "Criminal Background and Self Concept as Prognostic Factors in the Lives of Prisoners," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1958, p. 21.

<sup>5</sup>Reckless, op.cit., p. 365.

The mean age of onset of contact with legal authorities for delinquency as juveniles for the 28.4 per cent of the female sample population who had had such contact was 13.6 years, while the median age of onset was 14.7 years (Table 16, Appendix B).

After the age of seventeen, the arrest records more nearly resemble chance expectations for female offenders. Almost 44 per cent of this sample had had no prior contact with legal authorities for reasons involving their illegal (delinquent) behavior (Table 17, Appendix B).

Over 75 per cent of these female inmates were serving time on their first felony (while 3 per cent of the contributing cases had never even been sentenced for a felony). As few as 7.7 per cent had had, as many as nine arrests, while 99.1 per cent had been committed no more than three times for felonies in their entire lives (Table 18, Appendix B).

These data were taken from the FBI clearance records, and corroborated by the responses to items requesting this information in the administered schedule. Rarely was a discrepancy discovered. This leads the writer to believe that the data are accurate.

3. Incarceration Record. The mean length of incarceration of the 324 inmates who make up this study sample on their Ohio Reformatory sentences was a little less than three years (34.2 months), while the median was a little less than one and one-half years (16.3 months) (Table 19, Appendix B).

The number of years of incarceration prior to this sentence would measure "duration of contact", according to Sutherland's Differential

Association Theory.<sup>6</sup> Approximately one-third of the population had been in jail, workhouse, prison, or reformatory for prior offenses. (Table 20, Appendix B). The inmates' self perception as criminal women may be affected by their incarceration experiences.

#### Attitudinal Variables

This study incorporates three major dependent variables: socialization, alienation, and institutional impact.

In view of the fact that one of these variables is measured by a scale (Socialization Scale of the Gough Psychological Inventory) which has been standardized on widely diverse criteria groups, it is interesting to note how the women criminals in this sample compare with other criteria groups (Table 21, Appendix B).

The Ohio Reformatory for Women sample had a mean score of 28.2 on the Socialization Scale, which indicates a slightly greater veering toward criminal disposition than the criteria groups of "Young Delinquents, California" or "Prison Inmates, New York," but less veering toward criminal disposition than "Prison Inmates, California," "Ohio Penitentiary Inmates," or "Ohio Property Offenders" (Table 22, Appendix B). These data indicate that the Socialization Scale was able to establish a gradient for these high scoring delinquent and criminal populations.

---

<sup>6</sup>Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1947), pp. 3-9.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS OF INTRA-SAMPLE COMPARISONS

This chapter's principal emphasis will be with testing the hypotheses concerned with intra-sample comparisons on the three measures of self perceptions: socialization, four facets of alienation, and six aspects of institutional impact.

#### Age

Data presented first are those testing the initial hypotheses, namely, that,

1. Youth is inversely associated with socialization.
2. Youth is inversely associated with alienation.
3. Youth is associated with institutional impact.

To test these hypotheses the sample of 324 adult female inmates at The Ohio Reformatory for Women was split into two groups on the basis of their median age (33.1 years). Thus, 161 women were above the median (34 years old, or more), and 163 women were below the median (33 years old, or less). A comparison was made between the younger and older groups in relation to the dependent variables pertaining to the several aspects of self measured in this research, using the Chi-square test. The dependent variables were measured by standardized scales, and tallied sub-grouped items. The frequency distributions of scores

for these scales, and sub-grouped items were split using the median as the basis of division. High scorers on the Socialization Scale were in the direction of favorable socialization; high scorers on the Evans Alienation (Powerlessness and Normlessness) Scales, and the Srole Alienation (Social Isolation) Scale were in the direction of being most alienated; high scorers on the modified Nettler Alienation (Estrangement from our society) Items were in the direction of being least alienated; high scorers on the six institutional impact item sets (institutional expectation, institutional self image, projected ideal institutional role, institutional self appraisal, concept of the institution, and concept of institutional impact) indicated favorable or socially acceptable attitudes and values (Tables 27-37, Appendix B).

Out of eleven associations of socialization, four facets of alienation, and six aspects of institutional impact for younger and older aged inmates, only five were significant at the .05 level of confidence or better. Inspection of Table 2, below, reveals the five significant Chi-square associations between age and socialization, age and institutional expectation, age and institutional self image, age and projected ideal institutional role, and age and concept of institutional impact.

As can be seen by inspection of the original Chi-square working table (See Table 27, Appendix B), the younger inmates more often than expected by chance alone were veering toward a criminal disposition (i.e., they were lacking in "social maturity, probity, and rectitude"), while the older inmates more often than expected tended to be more favorably socialized. The first hypothesis, that Youth is inversely associated with socialization is established by these data.

Table 2.- Age in Relation to Various Aspects of Self

Scale or Sub-grouped Items	X <sup>2</sup>	P
Socialization Scale	9.00	.01
Institutional Expectation	5.48	.02
Institutional Self Image	6.79	.01
Projected Ideal Institutional Role	4.31	.05
Concept of Institutional Impact	7.73	.01

Inspection of Tables 28-31, Appendix B, demonstrates the necessity of rejecting the second hypothesis, that Youth is inversely associated with alienation.

As indicated in Table 32, Appendix B, the younger inmates had unfavorable institutional expectations much more than expected. The younger aged inmates saw the reformatory as affecting them in a deleterious way.

As shown in Table 33, Appendix B, the younger female offender more often had an unfavorable institutional self image, while the older prisoner had a favorable institutional self image more often than expected. The younger inmates were more frequently negative in their feelings about themselves, as they perceived themselves as inmates.

The data in Table 34, Appendix B, show the younger inmates viewed themselves as taking an anti-social role, more often than expected, while the older inmates were more favorable than expected toward their projected ideal roles within The Ohio Reformatory for Women.

As indicated in Table 37, Appendix B, the younger female inmates more often than expected have a poorer perception of the affect of the

institution upon them, while the older inmates apparently felt that the institution would have little effect upon them.

Inspection of Tables 32-37, Appendix B, indicate that the third hypothesis, that Youth is associated with institutional impact is largely upheld.

It, therefore, appears that poor socialization is a more frequent attribute of the younger contingent of female offenders. Similarly, unfavorable views of institutional expectation, institutional self image, projected ideal institutional role, and concept of institutional impact are more likely to be concentrated among the younger offenders.

#### Arrests

Secondly, it was hypothesized that,

4. A greater number of arrests is inversely associated with socialization.
5. A greater number of arrests is associated with alienation.
6. A greater number of arrests is inversely associated with institutional impact.

The median number of arrests was 1.6 per inmate in this sample of adult female felony prisoners. Consequently, two prior arrests were taken as the cutting point for this analysis. One-hundred-twenty-six inmates were above the median having had two or more arrests, while 198 inmates were below the cutting point having had less than two arrests.

Out of eleven instruments used in this study socialization (1), alienation (4), and institutional impact (6), only one measure was

found to be significantly associated with frequency of arrest, namely, institutional self image. Table 44, Appendix B, shows that the less frequently arrested inmates had a slightly more favorable institutional self image, while the more frequently arrested female offender of this sample was more often unfavorable in her view of herself as a reformatory inmate.

Actually, the previous arrest history of female reformatory inmates should not be expected to differentiate these criminal women on various socio-psychological components of self, because the reformatory population is too homogeneous with reference to previous arrests. For example, almost 44 per cent of this sample had had no previous arrest history. Only .1 per cent of this inmate study population had been found guilty of more than three felonies (including their present offense), and more than 75 per cent were sentenced to the reformatory for their first felony conviction (Table 18, Appendix B).

Relationships between 10 variables pertaining to self yielded an insufficient level of confidence when subjected to the Chi-square test. The Chi-square tables showing the associations related to the fourth, fifth, and sixth hypotheses are Tables 38-46, Appendix B.

On the basis that only one of the eleven measures was associated with extensiveness of previous arrests, the fourth hypothesis, that A greater number of arrests is inversely associated with socialization; the fifth hypothesis, that A greater number of arrests is associated with alienation; and the sixth hypothesis, that A greater number of arrests is inversely associated with institutional impact, must be rejected.

Length of Incarceration

Thirdly, it was hypothesized that,

7. A shorter length of incarceration on the present sentence is inversely associated with socialization.
8. A shorter length of incarceration on the present sentence is inversely associated with alienation.
9. A shorter length of incarceration on the present sentence is associated with institutional impact.

In order to test the hypotheses, therefore, the presence of a relationship between the length of incarceration on the present sentence, and the eleven dependent variables pertaining to socialization (1), alienation (4), and institutional impact (6), the inmate sample was divided into two groups, using the median number of months (16.3) of incarceration as the cutting point (Table 19, Appendix B).

Out of the eleven dependent variables, three were found to be associated with the length of stay at the institution (Tables 49-59, Appendix B). No association was found for socialization, the four alienation measures, and three institutional impact item sets with duration of stay at the reformatory. Table 3 gives the Chi-square values for three of the six institutional impact item clusters found to be significantly related with length of stay at the reformatory. It will be noted that these three are: institutional expectation, institutional self appraisal, and concept of the institution.

While there is a significant relation between the three institutional impact item clusters and length of incarceration, this relationship is the converse of that which was hypothesized. In other words, the relationship that showed up was that the female reformatory inmates

who had been there for the longer period of time, more often than expected reacted unfavorably, whereas the female who had served the shorter length of time on her sentence reacted more favorably.

Table 3.- Length of Incarceration on Present Sentence and Institutional Impact

Sub-grouped Items	$\chi^2$	P
Institutional Expectation	7.95	.01
Institutional Self Appraisal	6.96	.01
Concept of the Institution	14.89	.01

The reason originally for stating the hypotheses in terms of longer stay being associated with favorable measures was the expected beneficial effects resulting from a favorable atmosphere and program in this women's reformatory. Evidently, the duration of stay at the reformatory has no effect on eight measures and an adverse effect on three institutional impact measures.

Since eight of the eleven dependent variables showed no relation to the length of incarceration, and three showed a reverse relationship the seventh hypothesis, that A shorter length of incarceration on the present sentence is inversely associated with socialization; the eighth hypothesis, that A shorter length of incarceration on the present sentence is inversely associated with alienation; and the ninth hypothesis, that A shorter length of incarceration on the present sentence is associated with institutional impact, must be rejected.

Age of Onset

Finally, it was hypothesized that,

10. An early age of onset into illegal behavior as juveniles is associated with socialization.
11. An early age of onset into illegal behavior as juveniles is associated with alienation.
12. An early age of onset into illegal behavior as juveniles is inversely associated with institutional impact.

Almost 72 per cent of the inmate study population had had no contact with the police or court as juveniles because of their illegal (delinquent) behavior. Consequently, the test of the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth hypotheses had to be made on only the 28 per cent of the women inmates whose official records indicated contact with police or court as juveniles. Of the 28 per cent of the sample (89 women in all) who had come to the attention of the police or court as minors, the median age of onset (court involvement) was 14.7 years. These 89 inmates who had come to the attention of police or court as juveniles were divided into two groups; early starters (57 of them), and late starters (32 of them), using the median age of onset (14.7 or 15.0 years) as the basis of division (Table 16, Appendix B).

In order to test the hypotheses, Chi-square tests of relationship between early (14 years and younger), and late (15 years and older) onset of illegal behavior as juveniles were made between measures of socialization (1), alienation (4), and institutional impact (6) (Tables 60-70, Appendix B).

More often than expected the early starters scored low on the Socialization Scale (demonstrating a veering toward criminal disposition, poor socialization, or serious delinquency), while the late

starters scored high (in a favorable direction) more frequently than expected. This test of relationship yielded a Chi-square value of 3.89, a statistically significant relationship at the .05 level of confidence. However, the direction of significance is the reverse of the proposed direction of the hypothesis. The ten other variables showed no relation with age of onset of delinquent behavior. Since ten of the eleven dependent variables demonstrated no relationship with age of onset, and one showed a reverse relationship, the tenth hypothesis, that An early age of onset into illegal behavior as juveniles is associated with socialization; the eleventh hypothesis, that An early age of onset into illegal behavior as juveniles is associated with alienation; and the twelfth hypothesis, that An early age of onset into illegal behavior as juveniles is inversely associated with institutional impact, must be rejected.

#### Correlation of Dependent Variables (Measures of Several Aspects of Self)

In order to test the relative independence of the eleven variables (scales and indices) used in the study, a correlation matrix was prepared. In Table 4, below, it will be observed that out of 55 inter-correlations, 35 were at or above the .01 level of confidence, and 45 were above the .05 level of significance. In only 15 out of 55 instances were the coefficients above .40. None of the 15 correlations exceeds +.55. In general it can be said that the eleven measures used in this research assess fairly independent components of self.

Table 4.- Pearsonian Intercorrelation for Measures of Aspects of Self

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Socialization	—										
2 Powerlessness	-.11	—									
3 Normlessness	-.12	.45	—								
4 Social Isolation	-.17	.55	.51	—							
5 Estrangement	.15	-.40	-.48	-.43	—						
6 Institutional Expectation	.12	-.22	-.29	-.22	.29	—					
7 Institutional Self Image	.12	-.18	-.20	-.23	.24	.47	—				
8 Projected Ideal Institutional Role	.11	-.21	-.25	-.20	.28	.49	.34	—			
9 Institutional Self Appraisal	.10	-.35	-.34	-.30	.34	.42	.27	.32	—		
10 Concept of the Institution	.10	-.25	-.31	-.32	.28	.50	.36	.46	.44	—	
11 Concept of Institutional Impact	-.12	-.11	-.34	-.25	.31	.50	.41	.46	.26	.36	—

## CHAPTER V

### FINDINGS OF INTER-SAMPLE COMPARISONS

In this chapter comparisons will be made between 336 male felony prisoners at The Ohio Penitentiary, as studied by Clark in 1960, and the present sample of 324 female prisoners at The Ohio Reformatory for Women. This aspect of the study purports to be the first systematic comparison of male and female felony inmates.

#### Socialization

The first hypothesis regarding sex differences was as follows:

Female offenders are less negative in socialization than male offenders.

The Socialization Scale scores of 324 female inmates and 336 male inmates are arrayed in frequency distributions in Table 21, Appendix B. The mean score for the women is 28.15, while that for the men is 26.88.

A critical ratio test of mean differences demonstrated the female offenders of these study populations to be significantly less anti-social in their socialization than the male offenders. The critical ratio value of 2.65 indicates that the difference in mean socialization scores is statistically significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Hence, the first hypothesis, that Female offenders are less negative in socialization than male offenders, was established. Both male

and female inmates' scores display poor socialization. Their mean scores are within the range of mean scores for various criterion groups of offenders on which the Socialization Scale was standardized (Table 22, Appendix B).

The significant difference in socialization mean scores may indicate that correctional programs geared to the rehabilitation of female offenders need a different emphasis from those aimed at the rehabilitation of male offenders.

#### Alienation

Secondly, it was hypothesized that:

Female offenders are more alienated than male offenders.

Inter-sample comparisons of female and male offenders' alienation scale scores are presented in Tables 23-25, Appendix B. The mean scores for these alienation measures are: Powerlessness, women 17.88, men 17.29; Normlessness, women 17.04, men 16.97; and Social Isolation, women 8.74, men 7.89.

Critical ratio tests of mean differences between women and men showed that both the powerlessness and social isolation aspects of alienation, as measured by the scales used in this study, were significantly different beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Since two of the three measures of alienation used demonstrate a statistically significant difference between the higher mean score of the female offenders and the comparatively lower score of the male inmates, the second hypothesis, that Female offenders are more alienated than male offenders was largely upheld.

**CONTINUED**

**1 OF 3**

The combination of more positive socialization and greater alienation of female offenders indicates the need for a relatively more personalized program for them, than for their male counterparts, if they are to be better integrated into society.

#### Inter-Sample Comparisons of Social and Criminal Background Data

From this point on comparisons between the inmates of The Ohio Penitentiary and of The Ohio Reformatory for Women will be made outside any framework of hypotheses. The comparisons concern differences in social and criminal background.

#### Marital Status

The female felony prisoners studied retained their single marital status 5.8 per cent more often than the male sample studied by Clark at The Ohio Penitentiary. The male inmates considered themselves married, and were recorded as married (sometimes common law, which is considered legally a contract in the state of Ohio) 17.8 per cent more often than the female inmates. The females were classified as divorced, separated, or widowed 23.6 per cent more frequently than the male offenders (Table 11, Appendix B).

There is reason to believe that a good part of this discrepancy is due to recording error in the official files.

#### Intelligence

The Ohio Penal Classification Test, referred to earlier, is an intelligence test utilized within the penal institutions of Ohio. Frequency distributions of these test scores show the male offender

population to be generally higher scorers, than the female inmate population.

A critical ratio test reveals a statistically significant difference between the women's mean score of 89.82, and the men's mean score of 100.30 which is well beyond the .01 level of confidence (Table 7, Appendix B).

The explanation for these intelligence inequalities is not obvious, but perhaps females in the upper ranges of intelligence tests do not succumb to pressures of external environment as readily as men. Of course, substantiation of such a theory is necessary.

#### Offenses

Table 14, Appendix B, presents a comparison of types of offenses, using Lindesmith's classification. Nineteen per cent more of the female inmates were committed for crimes of violence than was true for their male counterparts. This is in line with the expectation that proportionately more female than male prisoners are committed for crimes against the person.

Little difference (.8 per cent) is found between the male and female inmate populations studied for the offense of Larceny. A larger proportion, 4.6 per cent more, of the female offenders in the sample had been committed for forgery and/or other check offenses than among male offenders in Clark's sample.

Non-support as an offense category is not applicable to the female, but contributing to abuse, delinquency or neglect of children, are all offenses against the family, as is non-support. Thus, contributing

offenses, when compared with non-support offenses, yield no significant difference between the sexes on the frequency with which offenders are sentenced for such crimes.

Nine per cent more of the inmates of The Ohio Reformatory for Women had been committed on narcotics offenses than the proportion found among the men in The Ohio Penitentiary.

#### Arrests under Eighteen Years of Age

Seventy-one and six-tenths per cent of the female offenders had never been arrested while under 18 years of age, while their male counterparts had avoided arrest as juveniles in 54.8 per cent of the cases, yielding a difference of 16.8 per cent.

Male offenders who had been arrested once or twice as juveniles were 8.9 per cent more frequent among the males' than among the females' study populations. Almost 8 per cent more males than females had been arrested three or more times as minors.

These differences all indicate greater involvement in juvenile delinquency on the part of male prison inmates, as measured by police and court contact, than by female reformatory inmates. This suggests that the forces which push males into prison operate earlier on them than do those which push females into prison (Table 15, Appendix B).

No apparent differences of significance may be seen in surveying the frequency data for age in Table 5, Appendix B, race in Table 6, Appendix B, or religious preference in Table 12, Appendix B, for female and male felony prisoner samples studied here. However, marital status,

intelligence test scores, types of offenses for which committed, and arrests under 18 years of age, all show significant differences when comparisons are made between male and female inmate samples.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this dissertation was to study several components of self, specifically the direction of socialization, the amount of alienation, and the perceptions of themselves, as held by female offenders in a penal institution. Eleven instruments were used to accomplish this goal: the Gough Socialization Scale, four scales to measure alienation, and six measures of institutional impact. The schedule was completed by 92 per cent of The Ohio Reformatory for Women population on February 5, 1961. The study sample included 324 inmates who were able to complete the instruments.

The analysis of schedule data was divided into two parts: the first part tests relationships for these 324 inmates between the several components of self, socialization, alienation and institutional impact, and age, number of previous arrests, length of incarceration on the present sentence, and onset age into illegal or delinquent behavior as gauged by police and court contacts; the second part involves a comparison between the 324 inmates of The Ohio Reformatory for Women and 336 male inmates of The Ohio Penitentiary studied by Clark in 1960.

The first part of the analysis in Chapter IV was facilitated through the formulation and testing of twelve hypotheses. Ten

relationships out of 44 tested were found to be statistically significant.

Relationships between poor socialization, and both younger age among female inmates and early onset of illegal behavior were found.

The sixteen associations between four facets of alienation, powerlessness, normlessness, social isolation and estrangement, and four social and criminal background characteristics, age, total arrests, length of incarceration, and onset age of illegal behavior as juveniles, revealed no statistically significant relationships.

Eight statistically significant relationships were found between institutional impact item sets and social background. The younger women inmates had,

1. more unfavorable institutional expectations,
2. more unfavorable institutional self images,
3. more unfavorable projected ideal institutional roles, and
4. more unfavorable concepts of institutional impact.

The less frequently arrested females had more favorable institutional self images than expected.

Inmates who had been incarcerated for a lengthier period had,

1. more unfavorable institutional expectations,
2. more unfavorable institutional self appraisals, and
3. more unfavorable concepts of the institution.

These ten relationships between various aspects of self and age, total arrests, length of incarceration, and onset of delinquency yielded statistically significant associations. Other studies,

preferably with more heterogeneous populations and instruments of greater sensitivity, are needed to validate these findings.

The hypothesis that an appropriate self concept would be associated with criminal activity, underlies the first part of this research. These differential self perceptions are thought to arise in part out of familial interaction and reactions to important others. According to this theory if there is a greater amount of anti-social identification and there are no figures available to the woman for positive behavioral emulation, she may be impaired in her attempts to define herself satisfactorily within the framework of the larger society.

Many aspects of self concept theory have not been tested in the present research. On a limited scale, this study has demonstrated that self concepts are related to age, total arrests, length of incarceration, and age of onset of illegal behavior. Further study of self concepts, using larger and less homogeneous samples, would probably provide more statistically reliable and valid tests of the hypotheses. The instruments could be improved by the addition of more discriminating items. This study indicates that instruments, such as were used in this research, may be developed into valid and reliable tools for prediction of outcome and perhaps ultimately may aid rehabilitative programs for female offenders.

The second part of the analysis in Chapter V compared scores on scales to measure various aspects of self, socialization, powerlessness, normlessness, and social isolation, of the 324 inmates at The Ohio Reformatory for Women with comparable data collected by Clark in his study of 336 male inmates at The Ohio Penitentiary.

The hypothesized differences between the female and male offenders' samples in socialization and alienation were found to exist at a statistically significant level of confidence. Female offenders were less negative in socialization, and more alienated than male offenders.

If the socialization scale is getting at internalization of norms, and the alienation scales are getting at the ways the individual perceives his or her integration into society, then female and male prisoners are much more different from one another than has been heretofore demonstrated in these aspects of self perception.

A comparison of the number of arrests under 18 years of age for these study populations suggests the idea that whatever activates the individual into crime, works earlier on the males than on the females. Likewise, these factors are working on a much better grade of intellectual material, since the male prisoners had a mean intelligence test score significantly higher at intake than the female prisoners.

The apparent similarity of female and male prisoners in the direction of poor socialization and of high alienation does not harmonize at first thought with their greater involvement in delinquency, and their much better level of intelligence. If the internalization of norms and feelings of identity with society (non-alienation) may be thought of as components of internal containment, we might say that on the socialization and alienation measures the female and male prisoners show significant differences in internal containment.

Perhaps, then, we might be justified in looking for differentials in external containment over both men and women prisoners. It might be

that the social structure of the male prisoners' world was not able to hold them as well or as long as the social structure of the female prisoners' world, in view of the fact that the male prisoners became involved in delinquency as younger persons, and had much superior intelligence. In other words, the social structure (i.e., the external containment or buffer around the individual) was able to hold on longer to the female offenders and not let them get involved so often, or so early in delinquency as adolescents. It was less able to hold onto individuals at inferior intellectual levels.

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE COPY OF INSTRUMENTS UTILIZED IN COLLECTING DATA

## DATA SHEET

50

- |   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| _____ 1. code number                              | _____ 26. FBI clearance   |
| _____ 2. CRW serial                               | _____ 27. Parole violator |
| _____ 3. date admitted                            |                           |
| _____ 4. county committed                         |                           |
| _____ 5. offense                                  |                           |
| _____ 6. longest minimum sentence                 |                           |
| _____ 7. age at time of offense                   |                           |
| _____ 8. age at present                           |                           |
| _____ 9. date of birth                            |                           |
| _____ 10. nativity                                |                           |
| _____ 11. race                                    |                           |
| _____ 12. occupation                              |                           |
| _____ 13. marital status                          |                           |
| _____ 14. church                                  |                           |
| _____ 15. education (last grade completed)        |                           |
| _____ 16. GPCT score                              |                           |
| _____ 17. number of times married                 |                           |
| _____ 18. number of children                      |                           |
| _____ 19. alcohol (admits use of)                 |                           |
| _____ 20. narcotics (admits use of)               |                           |
| _____ 21. number of siblings                      |                           |
| _____ 22. number who write to inmate              |                           |
| _____ 23. number who inmate writes to             |                           |
| _____ 24. number of visits (3 month period)       |                           |
| _____ 25. reformatory status (based on residence) |                           |

THE WAY YOU FEEL ABOUT THINGS

Sponsored by

The National Institutes of Health

Conducted by

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS PAPER. This is not a test. There are no 'wrong' answers on this survey. There are no angles. We only want to know how you really feel about things. The 'right' answer for you is your frank opinion, the way you really feel.

You have been selected to take part in a survey being conducted by The Ohio State University. We are interested in how women really feel about things.

Your answer sheets will be taken to my office at The Ohio State University at Columbus. The information will be put on statistical cards and tabulated, then the survey answer sheets will be destroyed.

THE WAY YOU FEEL ABOUT THINGS

These items are to be answered by drawing a circle around 'T' for 'True' or 'F' for 'False'. Remember this is not a test. We simply want to know how you really feel about things. Be sure to answer every item.

- T F 1. I get nervous when I have to ask someone for a job.
- T F 2. I often feel I made a wrong choice in deciding what kind of work to do.
- T F 3. I would never play cards with a stranger.
- T F 4. I think Lincoln was greater than Washington.
- T F 5. Life usually hands me a pretty raw deal.
- T F 6. A person is better off if he doesn't trust anyone.
- T F 7. Sometimes I used to feel that I would like to leave home.
- T F 8. If the pay was right, I would like to travel with a circus or carnival.
- T F 9. I would do almost anything on a dare.
- T F 10. As a youngster in school, I used to give the teachers lots of trouble.
- T F 11. Even when I have gotten into trouble, I was usually trying to do the right thing.
- T F 12. My parents never really understood me.
- T F 13. My home as a child was less peaceful and quiet than those of most other people.
- T F 14. I think that I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.
- T F 15. Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid.
- T F 16. It is very important to me to have enough friends and social life.
- T F 17. I never worry about my looks.
- T F 18. I hardly ever get excited or thrilled.
- T F 19. My parents have often disapproved of my friends.
- T F 20. My home life was always happy.
- T F 21. I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.

- T F 22. I seem to do things that I regret more often than other people do.
- T F 23. I would rather go without something than ask for a favor.
- T F 24. I have had more than my share of things to worry about.
- T F 25. I go out of my way to meet trouble rather than try to escape it.
- T F 26. When I meet a stranger, I often think that he is better than I am.
- T F 27. It is pretty easy for people to win arguments with me.
- T F 28. Before I do something, I try to consider how my friends will react.
- T F 29. In school, I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up.
- T F 30. I keep out of trouble at all costs.
- T F 31. I often think about how I look, and what impression I am making upon others.
- T F 32. I find it easy to 'drop' or 'break' with a friend.
- T F 33. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people.
- T F 34. I have often gone against my parents' wishes.
- T F 35. I have never done any heavy drinking.
- T F 36. I have been in trouble one or more times because of my sex behavior.
- T F 37. Most of the time, I feel happy.
- T F 38. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.
- T F 39. I know who is responsible for most of my trouble.
- T F 40. I get pretty discouraged with the law when a smart lawyer gets a criminal free.
- T F 41. I have used alcohol excessively.
- T F 42. When I was going to school, I played hookey quite often.
- T F 43. People often talk about me behind my back.
- T F 44. I often feel as though I have done something wrong or wicked.
- T F 45. I don't think I am quite as happy as others seem to be.
- T F 46. I used to steal sometimes when I was a youngster.

- T F 47. I am somewhat afraid of the dark.
- T F 48. I never cared much for school.
- T F 49. The members of my family were always very close to each other.
- T F 50. I sometimes wanted to run away from home.
- T F 51. With things going as they are, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something.
- T F 52. My parents have generally let me make my own decisions.
- T F 53. My home life was always very pleasant.

In this part of the study we want to know how you feel about some of the problems facing the average person in our country today. Each item below is made up of a pair of statements. Place an 'X' beside the one of each pair (and only one) which is closest to the way you feel. Be sure to check the one you actually believe to be true rather than the one you would like to be true.

54. \_\_\_ When I make plans, I am fairly sure that I can make them work.  
 \_\_\_ It is not wise to plan too far ahead because most things turn out to be a matter of good or bad luck anyhow.
55. \_\_\_ People are lonely because they don't try to be friendly.  
 \_\_\_ There's not much use in trying to please people; if they like you, they like you.
56. \_\_\_ What people call 'bad luck' usually results from the mistakes they make.  
 \_\_\_ Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.
57. \_\_\_ The average citizen can have an influence on the way the government is run.  
 \_\_\_ This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.
58. \_\_\_ Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.  
 \_\_\_ I do not believe that chance and luck are very important in my life.
59. \_\_\_ I have usually found that what is going to happen will happen, no matter what I do.  
 \_\_\_ Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a definite decision.
60. \_\_\_ One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don't take enough interest in politics.  
 \_\_\_ There will always be wars no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

61. \_\_\_ In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.  
 \_\_\_ Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.
62. \_\_\_ Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.  
 \_\_\_ Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
63. \_\_\_ What happens to me is my own doing.  
 \_\_\_ Most of the unhappy things in my life have been due to bad luck.
64. \_\_\_ If we try hard enough, we can get rid of crooked politicians.  
 \_\_\_ It is almost impossible to have much control over the things politicians do in office.
65. \_\_\_ Most people don't realize how much their lives are the result of accidental happenings.  
 \_\_\_ There is really no such thing as 'luck.'

In the following items we are interested in your opinion about what is necessary for success in different kinds of work. In answering these questions, think about how things really are, rather than how they should be. Circle 'Y' for "Yes" or true, and 'N' for "No" or false, circle the one that best fits the way you feel about it.

- Y N 66. In order to get elected to public office, a person must make promises he does not intend to keep.
- Y N 67. If you try to be honest, you will never get anywhere in business.
- Y N 68. For a strike to be effective, picket-line violence is necessary.
- Y N 69. Most people have to do something dishonest almost every day.
- Y N 70. In order to get ahead in today's world, a person can't worry too much about what's right and wrong and fair play.
- Y N 71. If a person is going to be successful in business or politics, it is necessary to take advantage of people.
- Y N 72. In order to become movie stars, girls have to do wicked things.
- Y N 73. The Golden Rule is all right, but if you try to follow it in real life people will take advantage of you.
- Y N 74. It may not be nice, but the fact is you will never get anywhere if you try to tell the truth all the time.
- Y N 75. If they wish to stay in office, government officials have to hush-up things.
- Y N 76. If you're going to get ahead these days, you have to realize that rules are made to be broken.

- Y N 77. If you want to get ahead in today's world, you have to be willing to push people around.
- Y N 78. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse.
- Y N 79. It's hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.
- Y N 80. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
- Y N 81. These days a person doesn't really know who he can count on.
- Y N 82. There's little use writing to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.
- Y N 83. Do you vote in national elections? (Or would you if you were of voting age, and free to do so)
- Y N 84. Were you interested in the recent national elections?
- Y N 85. Do you think children are generally a nuisance to their parents?
- Y N 86. Are you interested in having children? (Or would you be at the right age)
- Y N 87. Do you like to participate in church activities?
- Y N 88. Do national spectator sports like football and baseball interest you?
- Y N 89. Do you think most married people lead trapped (frustrated) lives?
- Y N 90. Do you think you could just as easily live in another society, past or future?
- Y N 91. Do you think most politicians are more interested in themselves than in the public's welfare?
- Y N 92. Do you think religion is more myth than truth?
- Y N 93. Life, as most men live it is meaningless: Do you agree or disagree?
- Y N 94. For yourself, assuming you could carry out your decision or do things over again, do you think a single life would be more satisfactory than a married life?
- Y N 95. Do you believe human life is an expression of divine purpose, and not just the result of chance and evolution?
- Y N 96. Most people live lives of quiet desperation. Do you agree or disagree?

In this part of the study we want to know how you feel about being here. Be sure you answer every item. Circle 'Y' for "Yes" and 'N' for "No."

- Y N 97. Do you think you deserved to be sent to Ohio Reformatory for Women?

- Y N 98. Do you think your stay here will help you?
- Y N 99. Do you think the staff here give the women a square deal?
- Y N 100. Will the other women here make you worse?
- Y N 101. Will you have a better than fifty-fifty chance of going straight after you leave here?
- Y N 102. While here, do you expect to find out why you got into trouble?
- Y N 103. Would you volunteer to come to Ohio Reformatory for a whole year?

NOW THAT YOU ARE HERE, DO YOU LOOK UPON YOURSELF AS:

- Y N 104. lucky
- Y N 105. inmate in an institution
- Y N 106. normal person who just got caught
- Y N 107. a criminal
- Y N 108. someone who has learned her lesson

SINCE COMING TO OHIO REFORMATORY, DO YOU FEEL:

- Y N 109. bitter
- Y N 110. caught
- Y N 111. outcast
- Y N 112. about the same as always
- Y N 113. ready to make a fresh start
- Y N 114. hopeful for the future
- Y N 115. friendly
- Y N 116. relaxed
- Y N 117. untroubled
- Y N 118. Will you have a tough time getting along in the future because you have been here?
- Y N 119. Do you have a lot of things worrying you?

REGARDLESS OF WHAT THEY SAY, THE BEST WAY TO GET ALONG  
HERE IS TO:

- Y N 120. play it cool
- Y N 121. stay out of the way of the staff
- Y N 122. keep to yourself
- Y N 123. show you are really sorry for what you did
- Y N 124. try to figure yourself out
- Y N 125. keep your mouth shut
- Y N 126. make friends with the staff
- Y N 127. talk about yourself to some staff member
- Y N 128. run errands or do favors for the staff members
- Y N 129. Most women are just interested in getting by while they are here.

AT THE PRESENT TIME, DO YOU THINK OF YOURSELF AS:

- Y N 130. someone who has made a mistake
- Y N 131. someone who has a lot of problems
- Y N 132. someone who knows how to play it cool
- Y N 133. someone who won't let anybody push her around
- Y N 134. someone who wishes she hadn't done it
- Y N 135. someone who is misunderstood
- Y N 136. someone who would do it all over again
- Y N 137. someone who got a bad deal
- Y N 138. someone who will straighten out
- Y N 139. Does a place like Ohio Reformatory help women?
- Y N 140. Do you think that you will change for the better while here?
- Y N 141. Do you think that you will learn how to get along with people better while you are here?

- Y N 142. Will you volunteer for jobs while here?
- Y N 143. Will you like yourself better by the time you get out?
- Y N 144. Other things and not me are mostly to blame for me getting into trouble this time.

Y N

OHIO REFORMATORY SEEMS TO BE A PLACE WHERE:

- Y N 145. a person waits around for others to tell her what to do
- Y N 146. a person feels guilty most of the time
- Y N 147. a person can't figure out what is going to happen next
- Y N 148. a person is just another number
- Y N 149. a person has to keep her temper
- Y N 150. a person learns good daily habits
- Y N 151. a person will never get a break
- Y N 152. nothing makes much sense
- Y N 153. In looking back over the troubles I've had, it looks like they could be blamed mostly on me.

WILL ANY OF THE FOLLOWING THINGS DO YOU ANY GOOD:

- Y N 154. be left alone
- Y N 155. be told what to do
- Y N 156. some staff member take an interest in you
- Y N 157. make myself live within the rules
- Y N 158. watch your step
- Y N 159. If a person gets along here, she can get along on the outside.
- Y N 160. I am mostly to blame for my getting into trouble this time.

I THINK THAT (fill in answer):

- \_\_\_\_\_ 161. the right length of time for me to stay here is  
(use 'M' for "Month" and 'Y' for "Year")
- \_\_\_\_\_ 162. the right length of time for the average person to stay here is

163. Where were you born? \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_  
(City) (State)
164. Where did you live when you were committed? \_\_\_\_\_  
(City)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(County)
165. Where did you have your court trial? \_\_\_\_\_  
(City)
166. What is the date of your birth? \_\_\_\_\_  
(Month) (Day) (Year)
167. Present marital status: (check one)  
 Married  Separated  
 Single  Divorced  
 Widowed
168. What was the last grade you completed in school? \_\_\_\_\_
169. With whom did you live when committed? \_\_\_\_\_  
(relationship)
170. With whom will you live when released? \_\_\_\_\_  
(relationship)
171. Were you ever taken before the Court for delinquency?  Yes  
 No
172. If yes, how old were you the first time? \_\_\_\_\_ years old
173. If yes, how many times? \_\_\_\_\_ times
174. How much time have you spent in: (use 'M' for Month and 'Y' for Year)  
 Juvenile Institutions  Reformatories  
 Jails and Workhouses  Other (what)
175. Did you know Mrs. Firestone when she was a matron here?  Yes  
 No
176. Check the activities you participate in:  
 Choir  Furniture refinishing  List any o  
 Movies  Leathercraft  others!  
 Sports  Roller skating  
 AA  Use library  
 Dances  Calisthenics
177. Check the school activities you participate in:  
 Elementary remedial  
 Commercial (typing etc.)  
 Equivalency testing  
 Correspondence or TV classes, please specify what.
178. Which staff member would you show new picture's to? \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name)
179. Which staff member knows you the best? \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name)
180. Which staff member has helped you the most since you've been here?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name)

APPENDIX B

TABLES

Table 5.- Age of Study Populations

Age	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
50 and over	26	8.0	100.0	22	6.5	100.0
45 - 49	27	8.3	92.0	18	5.4	93.5
40 - 44	35	10.8	83.6	34	10.1	88.1
35 - 39	58	17.9	72.8	58	17.3	78.0
30 - 34	59	18.2	54.9	90	26.8	60.7
25 - 29	54	16.7	36.7	70	20.8	33.9
20 - 24	57	17.6	20.0	43	12.8	13.1
19 and under	8	2.5	2.5	1	.3	.3
Total	324	100.0	100.0	336	100.0	100.0
	Mean = 34.79			Median = 33.00		
	Median = 33.08					
	S.D. = 10.5					

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 74.

Table 6.- Race of Study Populations

Race	Female		Male*	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
White	170	52.5	212	63.0
Negro	154	47.5	118	35.0
Other	0	.0	6	2.0
Total	324	100.0	336	100.0

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Elane Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 74.

Table 7.- Scores on Ohio Penal Classification Test

Score	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
150 - 159	0	.0	100.0	1	.3	100.0
140 - 149	3	1.0	100.0	3	.9	99.7
130 - 139	2	.6	99.1	9	2.7	98.8
120 - 129	17	5.4	98.4	29	8.6	96.1
110 - 119	20	6.3	93.0	57	17.0	87.5
100 - 109	41	13.0	86.7	79	23.4	70.5
90 - 99	55	17.4	73.7	62	18.5	47.1
80 - 89	82	26.0	56.3	51	15.2	28.6
70 - 79	75	23.7	30.4	44	13.1	13.4

Table 7.- Continued

Scores	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
60 - 69	13	4.1	6.6	1	.3	.3
50 - 59	8	2.5	2.5	0	.0	.0
Total	316	100.0	100.0	336	100.0	100.0
	Mean = 89.82			Mean = 100.15		
	Median = 91.70			Median = 100.65		
	S.D. = 15.51			S.D. = 16.79		

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 76.

Table 8.- Levels<sup>1</sup> Attained on Ohio Penal Classification Test  
by Study Population

Level	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Superior (125 and over)	13	4.1	100.0
Bright Normal (110 - 124)	29	9.2	95.9
Normal (90 - 109)	96	30.4	86.7
Dull Normal (80 - 89)	82	26.0	56.3
Inferior (73 - 79)	59	18.6	30.3
Deficient (72 and under)	37	11.7	11.7
Total	315	100.0	100.0
	Mean = 90.32		
	Median = 91.70		

<sup>1</sup>Levels taken from, Dewitt E. Sell, Manual for the Ohio Penal Classification Test, (Chicago, Illinois, Psychometric Associates, 1952).

Table 9.- Grade-Level Attained through Formal Education  
of Study Population

Grade-Level	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
14	2	.6	100.0
13	3	1.0	99.4
12	37	11.9	98.4
11	19	6.1	86.5
10	34	10.9	80.4
9	52	16.7	69.5
8	67	21.5	52.8
7	42	13.5	31.3
6	30	9.7	17.8
5	8	2.6	8.1
4	7	2.3	5.5
3	4	1.3	3.2
2	3	1.0	1.9
1	1	.3	.9
0	2	.6	.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
	Mean = 8.43		
	Median = 8.73		

Table 10.- Marital Status of Study Population

Marital Status	Number	Per Cent
Single	72	22.2
Married	77	23.8
Separated	71	21.9
Divorced	68	21.0
Widowed	26	11.0
Total	324	100.0

Table 11.- Marital Status of Study Populations

Marital Status	Female		Male*	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Single	72	22.2	94	28.0
Married	77	23.8	140	41.6
Divorced, Widowed Separated	175	54.0	102	30.4
Total	324	100.0	336	100.0

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Elare Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 78.

Table 12.- Religious Preference of Study Populations

Religion	Female		Male*	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Protestant	239	73.8	238	71.0
Roman Catholic	65	20.1	70	20.9
Judaism	2	.6	2	.6
Other	0	.0	6	1.8
None	18	5.5	19	5.7
Total	324	100.0	335	100.0

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 78.

Table 13.- Occupation of Study Population

Occupation	Number	Per Cent
Specifically Educated	2	.6
Skilled	28	8.6
Semi-Skilled	105	32.4
Unskilled	66	20.4
Housewife	95	29.3
Nothing	7	2.2
Illeral	21	6.5
Total	324	100.0

Table 14.- Offenses<sup>1</sup> for which the Study Populations Were Committed

Offense	Female		Male*	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
Crimes of Violence <sup>2</sup>	99	30.5	38	11.3
Sex Offenses	6	1.9	21	6.2
Robbery	25	7.7	43	12.8
Burglary	15	4.6	91	27.1
Auto Theft	4	1.2	14	4.2
Larceny	32	9.9	36	10.7
Forgery <sup>3</sup>	66	20.4	53	15.8
Non-support <sup>4</sup>	20	6.2	22	6.5
Narcotics	36	11.1	7	2.1
Other	21	6.5	11	3.3
Total	324	100.0	326	100.0

<sup>1</sup>This 10 category typology of offenses is utilized here for comparative purposes. The typology was suggested by: Alfred R. Lindesmith and H. Warren Dunham, "Some Principles of Criminal Typology," *Social Forces*, Vol. 19, No. 3, March 1941, pp. 307-314.

<sup>2</sup>This category included murder, manslaughter, attempts to kill and wound, and all assaults.

<sup>3</sup>This category included all check offenses.

<sup>4</sup>Non-support for the male was equated with contributing to delinquency, neglect, or abuse for the female.

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Elane Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 31.

Table 15.- Delinquency (Arrests under Eighteen Years of Age)

Number of Arrests	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
10 and over	4	1.2	100.0	5	1.5	100.0
6 - 9	6	1.9	98.8	13	3.9	98.5
3 - 5	16	4.9	96.9	35	10.5	94.6
1 - 2	66	20.4	92.0	98	29.3	84.1
None	232	71.6	71.6	193	54.8	54.8
Total	324	100.0	100.0	334	100.0	100.0

Mean = 2.1  
Median = 1.6

\*John FraCbee Clark, "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 82.

Table 16.- Onset Age of

Age	Number	Per
18	2	
17	4	
16	10	11
15	16	18
14	19	22
13	13	15
12	12	14
11	6	7
10	2	2
9 and under	5	6
Total	89	100

Mean = 13.6  
Median = 14.7

<sup>1</sup>As many as, 232 inmates (71.6 per cent) were involved in some type of delinquency involvement, while 2 inmates failed to

Table 15.- Delinquency (Arrests under Eighteen Years of Age)

Number of Arrests	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
10 and over	4	1.2	100.0	5	1.5	100.0
6 - 9	6	1.9	98.8	13	3.9	98.5
3 - 5	16	4.9	96.9	35	10.5	94.6
1 - 2	66	20.4	92.0	98	29.3	84.1
None	232	71.6	71.6	183	54.8	54.8
Total	324	100.0	100.0	334	100.0	100.0
	Mean = 2.1					
	Median = 1.6					

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 82.

Table 16.- Onset Age of Delinquency<sup>1</sup>

Age	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
18	2	2.2	100.0
17	4	4.5	97.8
16	10	11.2	93.3
15	16	18.0	82.1
14	19	21.4	64.1
13	13	14.6	42.7
12	12	13.5	28.1
11	6	6.7	14.6
10	2	2.3	7.9
9 and under	5	5.6	5.6
Total	89	100.0	100.0

Mean = 13.6  
Median = 14.7

<sup>1</sup>As many as, 232 inmates (71.6 per cent) had had no delinquency involvement, while 2 inmates failed to respond to this item.

Table 17.- Number of Arrests Prior to Being Committed

Arrests	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
9	25	7.7	100.0
8	5	1.5	92.1
7	1	.3	90.6
6	14	4.3	90.3
5	15	4.6	86.0
4	13	4.0	81.4
3	27	8.3	77.4
2	26	8.0	69.1
1	56	17.3	61.1
0	142	43.8	43.8
Total	324	100.0	100.0

Mean = 2.07  
Median = 1.64

Table 18.- Number of Felonies Committed by the Study Population  
(Including Present Offense)

Number of Felonies	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
7	1	.3	100.0
6	0	.0	99.7
5	1	.3	99.7
4	1	.3	99.4
3	12	3.7	99.1
2	55	17.0	95.4
1	244	75.3	78.4
0	10	3.1	3.1
Total	324	100.0	100.0

Mean = 1.3  
Median = 1.4

Table 19.- Number of Months Served on Present Offense

Months Served	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Over 60	48	14.8	100.0
37 - 60	40	12.4	85.2
13 - 36	94	29.0	72.8
6 - 12	68	21.0	43.8
Less than 6	74	22.8	22.8
Total	324	100.0	100.0

Mean = 34.2  
Median = 16.25

Table 20.- Number of Years Incarceration Prior to Commission  
for Present Offense

Years of Prior Incarceration	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
9 and above	7	6.4	100.0
8	3	2.8	93.6
7	3	2.8	90.8
6	4	3.8	88.0
5	5	4.5	84.2
4	14	12.8	79.7
3	12	11.0	66.9
2	24	22.0	55.9
1	37	33.9	33.9
Total <sup>1</sup>	109	100.0	100.0
	Mean = 3.07		
	Median = 2.0		

<sup>1</sup>215 or 66.4 per cent of the study population had never spent time in an institution prior to being committed for their present offense.

Table 21.- Socialization Scale Scores of Study Populations

Score	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
40 - 44	6	1.8	100.0	5	1.5	100.0
35 - 39	41	12.7	98.2	29	8.6	98.5
30 - 34	89	27.5	85.5	81	24.1	89.9
25 - 29	103	31.8	58.0	98	29.2	65.8
20 - 24	60	18.5	26.2	93	27.7	36.6
15 - 19	21	6.5	7.7	22	6.5	8.9
10 - 14	4	1.2	1.2	7	2.1	2.4
5 - 9	0	.0	.0	1	.3	.3
Total	324	100.0	100.0	336	100.0	100.0
	Mean = 28.15			Mean = 26.88		
	Median = 28.10			Median = 27.82		
	S.D. = 6.30			S.D. = 6.12		

C.R. = 2.65 P => .01

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Elaine Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 86.

Table 22.- Cross-Validating Data for the Socialization Scale  
of the California Psychological Inventory<sup>1</sup>

Samples	N	M	S.D.
Nominated high school "best citizens"	90	39.44	4.95
"Insulated" boys in a high delinquency area <sup>2</sup>	125	39.43	6.42
Medical school applicants	70	39.27	4.82
Bank officers	71	39.06	4.61
City school officials	200	37.58	4.19
Business executives	116	37.67	4.72
College students	1 745	37.41	5.28
Electronic technicians	55	36.93	5.66
Correctional officers	620	36.74	5.47
Skilled and semi-skilled workers	108	36.62	5.17
High school students	4 474	36.46	5.56
Social work graduate students	182	36.40	4.82
Military officers	495	36.38	4.74
Machine operators	105	35.99	4.98
Psychology graduate students	89	34.24	4.25
Selective service inductees	139	32.83	6.71
Nominated potential delinquents <sup>2</sup>	101	31.40	7.68
High school disciplinary problems	91	31.25	5.40
County jail inmates	177	29.25	6.44
Young delinquents California	206	28.66	5.66

Table 22.- (Continued)

Samples	N	M	S.D.
Prison inmates New York	94	28.28	6.44
<u>Ohio Reformatory for Women inmates</u>	324	28.15	6.30
Prison inmates California	177	27.76	6.03
<u>Ohio Penitentiary inmates</u> <sup>3</sup>	336	26.88	6.12
Training school inmates, New York	100	26.53	4.69
<u>Ohio property offenders</u> <sup>4</sup>	300	26.50	6.01
<u>Total samples</u>	<u>10 590</u>		

<sup>1</sup>Taken from Harrison G. Gough, Manual of the California Psychological Inventory, (Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1957), p. 25. Except those samples footnoted below and the present study population of the Ohio Reformatory for Women.

<sup>2</sup>Barbara Ann Kay, "Differential Perceptions and Delinquency Vulnerability" (unpublished M.A. thesis), The Ohio State University, 1956.

<sup>3</sup>John Pradbee Clark, "Elane Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960.

<sup>4</sup>Howard E. Fradkin, "Criminal Background and Self-Concept as Prognostic Factors in the Lives of Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1952.

Table 23.- Evans Powerlessness Scale Scores

Score	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
24	1	.3	100.0	0	.0	100.0
23	7	2.3	99.7	6	1.8	100.0
22	18	5.9	97.4	12	3.6	98.2
21	33	10.8	91.5	24	7.2	94.6
20	40	13.2	80.7	34	10.1	87.4
19	38	12.5	67.5	42	12.5	77.3
18	37	12.2	55.0	40	11.9	64.8
17	34	11.2	42.8	42	12.5	52.9
16	29	9.5	51.6	50	14.9	40.4
15	26	8.6	22.1	23	6.9	25.5
14	17	5.6	13.5	32	9.6	18.6

Table 23.- Continued

Score	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
13	16	5.3	7.9	20	6.0	9.0
12	8	2.6	2.6	10	3.0	3.0
Total	304	100.0	100.0	335	100.0	100.0
	Mean = 17.89			Mean = 17.29		
	Median = 18.41			Median = 17.78		
	S.D. = 2.78			S.D. = 2.65		
	C.R. = 2.81 P => .01					

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Elame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 88.

Table 24.- Evans Normlessness Scale Scores

Score	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
24	3	.9	100.0	1	.3	100.0
23	6	1.9	99.1	12	3.6	99.7
22	15	4.7	97.2	15	4.5	96.1
21	23	7.2	92.5	27	8.0	91.6
20	22	6.9	85.3	32	9.5	83.6
19	39	12.2	78.4	28	8.3	74.1
18	31	9.7	66.2	24	7.1	65.8
17	41	12.8	56.5	37	11.1	58.7
16	35	10.9	43.7	37	11.1	47.6
15	34	10.6	32.8	32	9.5	36.5
14	24	7.5	22.2	39	11.6	27.0

Table 24.- Continued

Score	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
13	24	7.5	14.7	30	8.9	15.4
12	23	7.2	7.2	22	6.5	6.5
Total	320	100.0	100.0	336	100.0	100.0
	Mean = 17.04			Mean = 16.97		
	Median = 17.51			Median = 17.22		
	S.D. = 2.98			S.D. = 3.11		
	C.R. = .291 N.S.					

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 90.

Table 25.- Srole (Social Isolation) Scale Scores

Score	Female			Male*		
	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
10	128	39.8	100.0	61	18.2	100.0
9	84	26.2	60.2	67	19.9	81.8
8	49	15.2	34.0	76	22.7	61.9
7	27	8.4	18.8	67	19.9	39.2
6	22	7.0	10.4	36	10.7	19.3
5	11	3.4	3.4	29	8.6	8.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
	Mean = 8.74			Mean = 7.89		
	Median = 9.39			Median = 8.47		
	S.D. = 1.38			S.D. = 1.52		

C.R. = 7.73 P =>.01

\*John Pradbee Clark, "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation), The Ohio State University, 1960, p. 91.

Table 26.- Nettler Estrangement Scale Scores

Score	Number	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
28	3	.9	100.0
27	26	8.1	99.1
26	29	9.0	91.0
25	46	14.3	82.0
24	59	18.3	67.7
23	41	12.7	49.4
22	45	14.0	36.7
21	32	10.0	22.7
20	20	6.2	12.7
19	8	2.5	6.5
18	4	1.2	4.0
17	8	2.5	2.8
16	1	.3	.3
Total	322	100.0	100.0

Mean = 23.25

Median = 24.96

Table 27.- Age and Socialization Scores

Age	Socialization Scores		Total
	28 and under	29 and above	
33 and under	95	68	163
34 and above	67	94	161
Total	162	162	324

$\chi^2 = 9.00$        $P = >.01$

Table 28.- Age and Powerlessness Scores

Age	Powerlessness Scores		Total
	18 and under	19 and above	
33 and under	83	73	156
34 and above	84	64	148
Total	167	137	304

$\chi^2 = .386$       N.S.

Table 29.- Age and Normlessness Scores

Age	Normlessness Scores		Total
	18 and under	19 and above	
33 and under	108	55	163
34 and above	104	53	157
Total	212	108	320

$\chi^2 = .000$       N.S.

**CONTINUED**

**2 OF 3**

Table 30.- Age and Social Isolation Scores

Age	Social Isolation Scores		Total
	9 and under	10 and above	
33 and under	97	66	163
34 and above	96	62	158
Total	193	128	321

$\chi^2 = .052$       N.S.

Table 31.- Age and Estrangement Scores

Age	Estrangement Scores		Total
	24 and under	25 and above	
33 and under	108	55	163
34 and above	110	49	159
Total	218	104	322

$\chi^2 = .314$       N.S.

Table 32.- Age and Institutional Expectation Scores

Age	Institutional Expectation Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
33 and under	103	60	163
34 and above	81	80	161
Total	184	140	324

$\chi^2 = 5.48$        $P = >.02$

Table 33.- Age and Institutional Self Image Scores

Age	Institutional Self Image Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
33 and under	91	59	150
34 and above	67	80	147
Total	158	139	297

$$\chi^2 = 6.79 \quad P = >.01$$

Table 34.- Age and Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores

Age	Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
33 and under	109	49	158
34 and above	90	66	156
Total	199	115	314

$$\chi^2 = 4.31 \quad P = >.05$$

Table 35.- Age and Institutional Self Appraisal Scores

Age	Institutional Self Appraisal Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
33 and under	94	63	157
34 and above	107	50	157
Total	201	113	314

$$\chi^2 = 2.34 \quad N.S.$$

Table 36.- Age and Concept of the Institution Scores

Age	Concept of the Institution Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
33 and under	86	74	160
34 and above	82	79	161
Total	168	153	321
	$\chi^2 = 256$	N.S.	

Table 37.- Age and Concept of Institutional Impact Scores

Age	Concept of Institutional Impact Scores		Total
	15 and under	16 and above	
33 and under	113	47	160
34 and above	89	71	160
Total	202	118	320
	$\chi^2 = 7.73$	$P = >.01$	

Table 38.- Total Arrests and Socialization Scores

Arrests	Socialization Scores		Total
	28 and under	29 and above	
1 and under	92	106	198
2 and above	70	56	126
Total	162	162	324
	$\chi^2 = 2.55$	N.S.	

Table 39.- Total Arrests and Powerlessness Scores

Arrests	Powerlessness Scores		Total
	18 and under	19 and above	
1 and under	108	79	187
2 and above	59	58	117
Total	167	137	304
	$\chi^2 = 1.56$	N.S.	

Table 40.- Total Arrests and Normlessness Scores

Arrests	Normlessness Scores		Total
	18 and under	19 and above	
1 and under	135	62	197
2 and above	77	46	123
Total	212	108	320
	$\chi^2 = 1.19$	N.S.	

Table 41.- Total Arrests and Social Isolation Scores

Arrests	Social Isolation Scores		Total
	9 and under	10 and above	
1 and under	123	74	197
2 and above	70	54	124
Total	193	128	321
	$\chi^2 = 1.14$	N.S.	

Table 42.- Total Arrests and Estrangement Scores

Arrests	Estrangement Scores		Total
	24 and under	25 and above	
1 and under	136	61	197
2 and above	82	43	125
Total	218	104	322
	$\chi^2 = .412$	N.S.	

Table 43.- Total Arrests and Institutional Expectation Scores

Arrests	Institutional Expectation Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
1 and under	104	94	198
2 and above	80	46	126
Total	184	140	324
	$\chi^2 = 3.77$	N.S.	

Table 44.- Total Arrests and Institutional Self Image Scores

Arrests	Institutional Self Image Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
1 and under	90	95	185
2 and above	68	44	112
Total	158	139	297
	$\chi^2 = 4.08$	$P = >.05$	

Table 45.- Total Arrests and  
Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores

Arrests	Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
1 and under	119	73	192
2 and above	80	42	122
Total	199	115	314

$$\chi^2 = .415 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

Table 46.- Total Arrests and  
Institutional Self Appraisal Scores

Arrests	Institutional Self Appraisal Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
1 and under	124	68	192
2 and above	77	45	122
Total	201	113	314

$$\chi^2 = .069 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

Table 47.- Total Arrests and Concept of the Institution Scores

Arrests	Concept of the Institution Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
1 and under	101	95	196
2 and above	67	58	125
Total	168	153	321

$$\chi^2 = .131 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

Table 48.- Total Arrests and  
Concept of Institutional Impact Scores

Arrests	Concept of Institutional Impact Scores		Total
	15 and under	16 and above	
1 and under	123	72	195
2 and above	79	46	125
Total	202	118	320

$\chi^2 = .000$       N.S.

Table 49.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Socialization Scores

Months of Incarceration	Socialization Scores		Total
	28 and under	29 and above	
16 and under	77	86	163
17 and above	85	76	161
Total	162	162	324

$\chi^2 = 1.00$       N.S.

Table 50.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Powerlessness Scores

Months of Incarceration	Powerlessness Scores		Total
	18 and under	19 and above	
16 and under	84	70	154
17 and above	83	67	150
Total	167	137	304

$\chi^2 = .019$       N.S.

Table 51.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Normlessness Scores

Months of Incarceration	Normlessness Scores		Total
	18 and under	19 and above	
16 and under	113	47	160
17 and above	99	61	160
Total	212	108	320

$\chi^2 = 2.74$       N.S.

Table 52.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Social Isolation Scores

Months of Incarceration	Social Isolation Scores		Total
	9 and under	10 and above	
16 and under	95	66	161
17 and above	98	62	160
Total	193	128	321

$\chi^2 = .169$       N.S.

Table 53.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Estrangement Scores

Months of Incarceration	Estrangement Scores		Total
	24 and under	25 and above	
16 and under	103	59	162
17 and above	115	45	160
Total	218	104	322

$\chi^2 = 2.53$       N.S.

Table 54.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Institutional Expectation Scores

Months of Incarceration	Institutional Expectation Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
16 and under	80	83	163
17 and above	104	57	161
Total	184	140	324

$$\chi^2 = 7.95 \quad P \Rightarrow .01$$

Table 55.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Institutional Self Image Scores

Months of Incarceration	Institutional Self Image Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
16 and under	72	77	149
17 and above	86	62	148
Total	158	139	297

$$\chi^2 = 2.86 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

Table 56.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores

Months of Incarceration	Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
16 and under	94	63	157
17 and above	105	52	157
Total	199	115	314

$$\chi^2 = 1.66 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

Table 57.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Institutional Self Appraisal Scores

Months of Incarceration	Institutional Self Appraisal Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
16 and under	88	67	155
17 and above	113	46	159
Total	201	113	314
$\chi^2 = 6.96$		$P \Rightarrow .01$	

Table 58.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Concept of the Institution Scores

Months of Incarceration	Concept of the Institution Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
16 and under	67	94	161
17 and above	101	59	160
Total	168	153	321
$\chi^2 = 14.88$		$P \Rightarrow .01$	

Table 59.- Length of Incarceration (on Present Offense)  
and Concept of Institutional Impact Scores

Months of Incarceration	Concept of Institutional Impact Scores		Total
	15 and under	16 and above	
16 and under	95	66	161
17 and above	107	52	159
Total	202	118	320
$\chi^2 = 2.36$		N.S.	

Table 60.-- Age of Delinquency Onset and Socialization Scores

Onset Age	Socialization Scores		Total
	28 and under	29 and above	
14 and under	45	12	57
15 and above	19	13	32
Total	64	25	89

$\chi^2 = 3.89$        $P = > .05$

Table 61.-- Age of Delinquency Onset and Powerlessness Scores

Onset Age	Powerlessness Scores		Total
	18 and under	19 and above	
14 and under	27	30	57
15 and above	15	14	29
Total	42	44	86

$\chi^2 = .146$       N.S.

Table 62.-- Age of Delinquency Onset and Normlessness Scores

Onset Age	Normlessness Scores		Total
	18 and under	19 and above	
14 and under	40	17	57
15 and above	18	13	31
Total	58	30	88

$\chi^2 = 1.31$       N.S.

Table 63.- Age of Delinquency Onset and Social Isolation Scores

Onset Age	Social Isolation Scores		Total
	9 and under	10 and above	
14 and under	32	25	57
15 and above	18	13	31
Total	50	38	88

$$X^2 = .030 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

Table 64.- Age of Delinquency Onset and Estrangement Scores

Onset Age	Estrangement Scores		Total
	24 and under	25 and above	
14 and under	41	16	57
15 and above	20	11	31
Total	61	27	88

$$X^2 = .518 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

Table 65.- Age of Delinquency Onset and Institutional Expectation Scores

Onset Age	Institutional Expectation Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
14 and under	43	14	57
15 and above	23	9	32
Total	66	23	89

$$X^2 = .136 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

Table 66.- Age of Delinquency Onset  
and Institutional Self Image Scores

Onset Age	Institutional Self Image Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
14 and under	37	18	55
15 and above	14	14	28
Total	51	32	83

$\chi^2 = 2.37$       N.S.

Table 67.- Age of Delinquency Onset  
and Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores

Onset Age	Projected Ideal Institutional Role Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
14 and under	38	19	57
15 and above	25	6	31
Total	63	25	88

$\chi^2 = 1.93$       N.S.

Table 68.- Age of Delinquency Onset  
and Institutional Self Appraisal Scores

Onset Age	Institutional Self Appraisal Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
14 and under	37	20	57
15 and above	18	14	32
Total	55	34	89

$\chi^2 = .634$       N.S.

Table 69.- Age of Delinquency Onset  
and Concept of the Institution Scores

Onset Age	Concept of the Institution Scores		Total
	13 and under	14 and above	
14 and under	35	22	57
15 and above	13	18	31
Total	48	40	88

$$\chi^2 = 3.07 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

Table 70.- Age of Delinquency Onset  
and Concept of Institutional Impact Scores

Onset Age	Concept of Institutional Impact Scores		Total
	15 and under	16 and above	
16 and under	40	17	57
17 and above	21	11	32
Total	61	28	89

$$\chi^2 = .197 \quad \text{N.S.}$$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Clark, John Pradbee. "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners." Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1960.
- Cohen, Albert K. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. Chicago: The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1955.
- Evans, John W. "Stratification: Alienation and the Hospital Setting: A Study in the Social Psychology of Chronic Illness." Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1960.
- Fernald, Mabel, et al. A Study of Women Delinquents in New York State. New York: The Century Company, 1920.
- Fradkin, Howard E. "Criminal Background and Self Concept as Prognostic Factors in the Lives of Prisoners." Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1958.
- Frum, Harold. "Adult Criminal Offense Trends following Juvenile Delinquency." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science. 49:1 (1958).
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Five Hundred Delinquent Women. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1934.
- Goring, Charles. The English Convict. London: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1913.
- Gough, Harrison G. and Donald Peterson. "The Identification and Measurement of Predispositional Factors in Crime and Delinquency." Journal of Consulting Psychology. 16:207-212 (June 1952).
- Gough, Harrison G. Manual of the California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1957.
- Kay, Barbara Ann. "Differential Perceptions and Delinquency Vulnerability." M.A. thesis, The Ohio State University, 1956.
- Kemp, Tage. Physical and Psychological Causes of Prostitution: A Study of Measures Adapted or Under Consideration Particularly with Regard to Minors. Geneva: League of Nations Advisory Committee on Social Questions, PT IV, Official, 26:53 (May 1943).
- Lindesmith, Alfred R. and Warren Dunham. "Some Principles of Criminal Typology." Social Forces. 19:3:307-314 (March 1941).
- Lombroso, Cesare and William Ferrero. The Female Offender. New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, 1916.

- Meier, Dorothy and Wendell Bell. "Anomia and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals." American Sociological Review. 24:189-202 (April 1959).
- Nettler, Gwynn. "A Measure of Alienation." American Sociological Review. 22:670-677 (December 1957).
- Pollak, Otto. The Criminality of Women. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1960.
- Reckless, Walter C. The Crime Problem. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 3rd Edition, 1961.
- Sell, DeWitt E. Manual for the Ohio Penal Classification Test. Chicago: Psychometric Affiliates, 1952.
- Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study." American Sociological Review. 21:709-716 (December 1956).
- Sutherland, Edwin H. Principles of Criminology. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1947.
- Thomas, William I. The Unadjusted Girl. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1923.
- Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960, 80th Edition.: Washington: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, U.S. Government Printing Office.

## AUTOBIOGRAPHY

I, Barbara Ann Kay, was born in Suffern, New York, March 2, 1929. I received my secondary school education in the public schools of Ridgewood, New Jersey, and my undergraduate training at The Ohio State University which granted me the Bachelor of Science degree (Social Administration) in 1955. From The Ohio State University, I received the Master of Arts degree (Sociology) in 1956. While in residence there, I was research assistant to Professor Walter C. Reckless for a period of two years. In 1957 I was appointed teaching assistant in The Department of Sociology and Anthropology, The Ohio State University. Wittenberg College appointed me instructor for the academic year of 1958. In 1959 I was appointed assistant instructor at The Ohio State University. The National Institutes of Health awarded me a Fellowship in 1960 which I held while completing the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree.

**END**