VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS AND DIFFERENCES

ON RECALLED PARENTAL CONTROL PRACTICES

By

BARRY W. HANCOCK

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1977

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
Master of Science
July, 1980

Name: Barry W. Hancock   Date of Degree: July, 1980

Institution: Oklahoma State University   Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS AND DIFFERENCES ON RE-
                   CALLED PARENTAL CONTROL PRACTICES

Pages in Study: 88   Candidate for Degree of Master of Science

Major Field: Corrections (Sociology)

Scope of Study: The present study is an attempt to assess violent and
     non-violent offenders for differences in recalled parental control
     practices. Eighty-two trustees in a maximum security prison at
     McAlester, Oklahoma participated in the study. Of the 82 subjects,
     43 had been convicted of violent crimes, while 39 had been convict-
     ed of non-violent crimes. The total sample was nearly equal on
     white and non-white subjects. The two samples are compared by age,
     race, size of town where the offender lived, and if the offender
     lived, and if the offender lived with his parents at the time of
     the first offense. The data was gathered by use of a questionnaire,
     and contained sections concerning demographics, and a five scale in-
     dicator of parental control pactices. The five scales included
     physical punishment (PPS), home environment (HES), positive rewards
     (PRS), neighborhood milieu (NMS), and prisoner attitudes (PAS).
     Data was analyzed using factor analysis, t-test, and analyses of
     variance.

Findings and Conclusions: Analysis of the data revealed that no signifi-
     cant difference at the .05 level existed between the two groups with
     regard to parental control practices when controlling for age, race,
     size of town where the offender lived, and whether or not the of-
     fender was living with his parents at the time of his first offense.
     Violent offenders are found to be better acquainted with their vic-
     tims. The majority of respondents said it did not hurt a child to
     spank them as often as 2 or 3 times daily. The majority of respond-
     ents recalled parental love and that their parents were justified
     for using physical punitive measure, and yet concurrently recalled
     having bruises and harder physical punition than was necessary. The
     indications are that physical abuse for children may not be perceiv-
     ed by them if they feel that parents are justified and love them,
     when child abuse has, in fact, occurred.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL *Harjit S Sandhu*

1062930

VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS AND DIFFERENCES

ON RECALLED PARENTAL CONTROL PRACTICES

Thesis Approved:

Harjit S. Sandhu
_____
Thesis Adviser

_____

Richard H. Dodder
_____

Norman N. Durham
_____
Dean of the Graduate College

ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As I draw near to the completion of a phase of my graduate work, it is befitting that I acknowledge several of the individuals who have given me guidance along the way.

I express my thanks and appreciation to my parents John and Vera, whose support and love have always been with me.

To my brother Bob, his wife Ann, and my sister Tamalie, who for years have put up with a kid brother are extended my admiration.

Dr. Harjit S. Sandhu, who as my committee chairman always added new insights concerning corrections with each opportunity I had to confer with him.

Dr. Richard Dodder, whose friendly attitude and knowledge of research design contributed immensely to this research.

Dr. Werner Gruninger, to whom a special thanks is extended for my initial acceptance to graduate study and for a chance to succeed. I salute you.

Paul Sharp, for his friendship and humor in dealing with the daily hurdles. Thanks for being real and alive.

Charlene Fries, for her skills with the technical aspects of this thesis. She's one of a very few.

And finally, to the men of McAlester State Prison, McAlester, Oklahoma, whose time was spent helping me achieve my goals. There are, indeed, those of us who care for your welfare and are seeking to help you in your dilemma. Thank you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW OF THE THESIS

Introduction

Currently theories of violence and aggression focus on biological and environmentally based explanations. Social learning theory rests with the environmentalist camp stating that aggression is a learned pattern of behavior which depends entirely on the cultural, social, political, and economic conditions surrounding an individual (Watson & Johnson, 1972). That children are learning aggression which extends into adult life, is a concept which forces a great deal of attention to parent-child relations, the environment of the home, and the surrounding community.

America is characterized as a culture of violence and being such child abuse presently has reached levels of alarming proportion. As these levels of child mishandling increase, can we expect the number of violent offenders to increase as a result of learned aggression. Physical punishment by parents does not inhibit violence and most likely encourages it. Punishment both frustrates a child and gives them a model from which to imitate and learn. The learning of violence applies to more than just parental behavior. It is also relevant to examples set by mass media, peer and other reference groups, and local and national leaders (Frank, 1970). The idea that violence breeds violence has drawn support from many studies. One such study focuses on adolescents that have killed someone, finding that they had a tendency to identify with aggressive

parents and to pattern after their behavior (Curtis, 1963). Socialization experiences do not mold children against violence. Violence, in fact, may be enhanced. Few groups can make the claim that their rearing and social control techniques focus entirely on peaceful behaviors. People learn that violence can be useful and that many get away with it. They also learn the various gradations of violence, fitted to different types of people, situations, frustrations, or insults (Goode, 1969). A study covering three generations of families of abused children supports the theme that violence breeds violence and that a child who experiences violence as a child has the potential of becoming a violent member of society in the future (Silver, Dublin & Lourie). Known violent offenders, according to studies of childhood aggression, would probably have been subjected to more aggressive encounters as children than any other group of offenders. These individuals would be expected to show differences in their parent-child relations and social conditions surrounding their childhood.

With the current interest in criminal justice and theories of violence, all areas of aggression causation are receiving a new emphasis. Environmental approaches such as social learning theory are being expanded and altered as new research on aggression becomes available. A interest in research aimed at directly confronting the known aggressive offender may provide new insights as to the sources of aggression.

Purpose of the Study

Learned childhood aggression and the continuance of violent patterns into adult life indicate that if this is the case with child abuse increasing, society will have to deal with more violence and

offenders in the future. Research which can possibly help increase the knowledge of violence and aggression is of urgent importance.

The purpose of this study is to assess the backgrounds of violent and non-violent offender groups from a maximum security prison for trends in childhood aggression and detect differences which are common to only one of these groups. These groups will be asked to recall and respond to an inventory designed for measuring their aggressive childhood experiences. The nature of this study is investigative, seeking only to contribute support or refute the social learning context of childhood aggression developing into adult aggression. Because of the focus on recollection, perception of childhood aggression will be the general direction of this study covering physical punishment, home environment, positive rewards, neighborhood milieu, and prisoner attitudes.

It is the hope of the researcher that regardless of the results, new knowledge may be obtained concerning violence, parent-child relations, violent and non-violent offenders, and the cirumstances surrounding childhood aggression as preceived by those individuals who are known violent offenders presently in the care of the criminal justice system.

CHAPTER II

AGGRESSION AND SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY

The theory of social learning (socialization) has an effect on all human beings. No animal differs as much between childhood and adulthood as humans. Man learns empirical facts, social norms, skills, values, and language through a process of socialization. The principal socializing agents are parents, peers, teachers, siblings, and other important individuals in each person's life.

Social learning theory is not an easily defined approach to human behavior. The emphasis of many social learning theorists varies a great deal. Sears (1959) gave a historical characterization of learning theory. He wrote:

> It did not stem from the work of any one person. It has not been monolithic, nor has it suffered the stultification of possessing an orthodoxy. Rather, it is the cumulation of that distinctively American behavioral theory that began with Thorndike, became 'istic' with Watson, technically sophisticated with Tolman, Guthrie, and Hull, and more precise with Miller, Skinner, and Spence. Stimulus response theory is as good a name as any for it (p. 65).

So it is apparent that while social learning theory has evolved through years, the impetus of importance in this area has changed with the theorists.

The area of social learning theory consists of three major strains. They are the Neo-Hullian, Skinnerian, and vicarious learning by Bandura and Walters.

The Neo-Hullians are probably the most influential group. Their

theories consist of the belief in the general applicability of general behavior theory, a tension reduction approach to the problem of motivation which emphasizes the external reinforcement, and intervening variables such as motive needs or expectancies (Sears, 1959).

Skinnerian learning-theory approach to socialization is probably the most mechanistic of the stimulus-response theories. Social behavior is viewed as being completely shaped by reinforcement histories. The only aspects of the child thought to be important in determining the functional relationship between a stimulus and a response are the child's past reinforcement trials and the satiation the reinforcer is producing. Conditioning is given total explanative powers for all behavior. Krasner and Ullmann (1965) have conducted several investigations on children and their acquisition of behavior, particularly those behaviors important to socialization.

Bandura and Walters (1963) differ from Hullian theorists. Although continuing to note the importance of external reinforcement in learning they tend to emphasize modeling, imitation and vicarious learning somewhat independent of external reinforcement. Even the way in which these theorists carry out their investigations differs from Hullian tradition on learning. As Bronfenbrenner (1963) pointed out, they have "socialized" learning experiments in that they emphasize the social aspect of learning and deviate from tradition in attending explicitly to the sex, age, and occupation of the experimenter and to the experimenter's attitudes toward the subjects.

Social learning has many aspects. Some of these include behavior modification through operant conditioning, modeling, identification, and role learning. The focus of this view will be on modeling and imitation.

Campbell (1961) has noted two types of modeling. In one, the learner observes the outcomes of the model. That is whether or not the model is rewarded or punished for particular behaviors. In the other type of observational learning, the learner observes the actions of the model. The model is not necessarily rewarded for the action, but the learner is rewarded for exhibiting the model's behavior. This is imitation. Miller and Dollard (1941) describe this as a matched dependent behavior. Laboratory studies indicate that witnessing agrression particularly when one is frustrated, leads to an increased amount of the expression of aggression (Bryan & Schwartz, 1971).

Bandura (1973) and his social learning theory expressed the importance of parental models and the imitative behavior of children as a determining factor for negative and positive social adjustment:

> During early childhood years, perhaps the most salient of parental modeling of interpersonal behavior occurs in the context of disciplinary activities. Here the children are furnished with vivid examples of how one might attempt to influence and control the behavior of others. Children often draw on parental practices in coping with their interpersonal problems they encounter in daily interactions (p. 58).

That witnessing violence increases the propensity for aggression finds support with three possible intervening mechanisms. First, the observer learns to react violently by watching another person respond in the same way. Second, aggression reduces one's previously acquired inhibitions against expressing violence. And third, certain cues in the environment play an eliciting role, in determining how much aggression a subject expresses after seeing a violent event under frustrating conditions (Bandura & Walters, 1963).

Social learning theory holds that a large amount of human behavior and learning is done vicariously through observing another person making

the skilled responses and then trying to imitate the response of the
model. The observer can often learn and incorporate responses into a re-
pertoire, using them at a later time without ever receiving reinforcement
for them. A model's behavior is more often imitated when the model has
been rewarded rather than punished. This reward punishment variable ef-
fects the subject's performance of imitative responses but not the learn-
ing of them. That is, if an individual observed punishments for an
aggressive act their behavior would be affected. No imitation or perfor-
mance would occur. However, learning has still taken place. If attrac-
tive rewards are given in the place of punishment, the individual will
perform the aggression. They have learned the aggressive response even
though they would not perform them until the incentives to do so are of-
fered (Bandura & Walters, 1963). Whether aggressive behavior occurs as
a result of direct reinforcement or modeling and imitation of observed
aggressive behavior, learning is nevertheless continuous.

The influence of positive reinforcement on the acquisition and
maintenance of aggressive behavior has been investigated in several labo-
ratory experiments. It has been demonstrated that positive reinforcement
in the form of verbal approval or material rewards will increase the fre-
quency of children's aggressive responses. The reinforcement of one set
of aggressive responses may be carried over to many other situations.
Rewarding a child for aggression in relatively impersonal play situations,
subsequently lead to transferal of aggression to new social situations
in which interpersonal aggression is displayed (Bandura & Walters, 1963).

Straus (1971) studied social antecedents in a recent experiment
with university students. More than half of the 229 students in the
survey reported actual or threatened use of physical punishment during

their last year in high school. There were no differences in the amounts
middle class or working class parents used physical punishment. Physical
punishment did vary with sex of the child and with the traits which par-
ents valued in their children. The findings supported the "linkage
theory" explanation of physical punishment. That is, the use of aggres-
sion by parents with their children and between themselves is influenced
by their conception of how child and adult roles are to be played. In a
subsequent paper by Owens and Straus (1973), social learning and role
modeling are considered. The conclusions follow: (1) the more violence
that is present in the social structure during childhood, the more the
person learns to use violence; (2) for any set of behaviors which is
characteristic of a population there will develop a normative counterpart
which rationalizes and justifies that behavior; (3) the culture of vio-
lence characterizing American society is, at least in part, attributable
to the high level of violence experienced during the formative years of
childhood.

It seems reasonable then, to look at the family as a primary so-
cializing agent and reference group for learned patterns of behavior.
Particularly, learned aggression. Social learning has its greatest ef-
fect in teaching the child that aggression can satisfy a number of needs.
As McNeil (1959) has pointed out:

> Since a child will learn whatever responses are rewarded
> by others or bring ratification of his needs, it is easy to see
> how he can grow in sophistication in the use of aggressive de-
> vices. When other individuals are blocking the child's way and
> frustrating him he can, by accident, learn that an aggressive
> attack will remove them and free the path to gratification. . . .
> When the child discovers the benefit of hurting others and he
> gains experience and learns more about the motivation of others,
> he will become more and more skilled in using this knowledge of
> motivation as a means of controlling them and getting what he
> wants (p. 227).

As applied to aggression, then, the responses exhibited are overt rather than a drive. A modeling approach understanding as related to aggressive responses, consist of models to which an individual has been exposed and to the history of the positive and negative reinforcers which followed previous aggressive acts of the person. Observation of aggressive social models, either in real life or in fantasy productions, increases the probability that the observers will behave in an aggressive manner if the model is rewarded or does not receive punishment for aggressive behavior.

Violent and Non-Violent Crime

There is a discrepancy that occurs between experts with respect to the constitution of violent and non-violent crimes. In the Federal Bureau of Investigation's uniform crime report, the index of violent crime includes murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault. The property crimes include burglary, larceny, theft, and motor vehicle theft (F.B.I. Uniform Crime Report, 1976). Less than 10 percent of the total number of these crimes were reported violent crimes. Nearly half were robberies in which the threat of violence was used only as a technique. As to whether robbery and rape are always violent, is questionable because of the intensions and situation of both the victims and the offender. Admittedly these two crimes can be violent, cause physical damage, and even death. However, these crimes are highly variable in how they occur. Because of the wide use of uniformed crime reports an index for crime rates, this research will maintain these as a criteria for the differentiation of violent and non-violent crime.

What is precisely meant by murder? According to the crime index

reports, murder includes all willful killings without due process and is scored on the basis of police investigations as opposed to any decision of the court, coroner, jury, or any other judicial body. Deaths by negligence are not included in this category (child abuse) but are counted as manslaughter by negligence.

All attempts to kill or assaults to kill are scored as aggravated assualt, not as murder. The classification of murder also excludes suicides, accidental deaths and justifiable homocides (F.B.I. Uniformed Crime Reports, 1970).

Aggravated assault is defined as an unlawful attack by one person upon another for the purpose of inflicting severe bodily injury usually accompanied by the use of a weapon or other means likely to produce death or seriously bodily harm. Attempts are included since it is not necessary that an injury result when a gun, knife, or other weapon is used which could and probably would result in serious personal injury if the crime were successfully completed (F.B.I. Uniform Crime Report, 1970).

Forcible rape is the carnal knowledge of a female through the use of force. Assaults to commit forcible rape are also included; however, statutory rape (without force) is not counted in this catagory (F.B.I. Uniform Crime Report, 1970).

Robbery is a vicious type of crime which takes place in the presence of the victim to obtain property or a thing of value from a person by use of force or threat of force. Assault to commit robbery and attempts are included (F.B.I. Uniform Crime Report, 1970).

Spencer (1966) studied seven types of violent offenders, as identified originally by John P. Conrad in 1963, who was chief of the research division of the California Department of Corrections.

The seven types follow:

1. The culturally violent offenders are those "who grew up in a subculture where violence is an accepted way of life."

2. The criminally violent offenders are those, "who will commit violence if necessary to gain some end, as in robber."

3. The pathologically violent offenders are those, "who are mentally ill or have suffered brain damage."

4. The situationally violent offenders are those, "who under extreme provocation commit a rare act of violence."

5. The accidentally violent offenders are those, "who injure others accidentally."

6. The institutionally violent offenders are those, "who commit violence while incarcerated."

7. The non-violent offenders are those, "who have no indication of violent behavior on their records" (p. 33).

In view of the previous typologies presented by Spencer, it becomes apparent that the constitution of a violent offense has effects that are situational, and thus could be indexed by the circumstances surrounding each offense. It is important to point out that the F.B.I. Crime index does not make such distinctions. However, the crime index still remains at this time, the best indicator available for offenses.

In reference to non-violent offenses or property crimes, it is known that the majority of these crimes are occurring in the absense of the victim. In 1976, property crimes accounted for 10,318,200 of the reported offenses. This is 90 percent of all crimes known to the police in the United States. Eighteen percent of these crimes were solved by police while 82 percent of the perpetrators of these offenses remains unknown. If force or threat had been used in these crimes, they would have been classified as robbery. This is why the percentage of solved cases is so low. In crimes of violence the victim is likely to know the accused or at least to have seen them long enough for identification.

In property offenses this is very seldom the case (Haskell & Yablonsky, 1978, p. 102).

Burglary is generally accepted as a crime of stealth and opportunity. It is committed by both amateur and professional. Non-resident offenses accounted for 37 percent of total burglary in 1976. Residential burglaries accounted for 63 percent. Night time burglary accounts for 60 percent of all burglaries (F.B.I. Uniform Crime Report, 1976).

Larceny theft is the lawful taking or stealing of property or articles of value without the use of force, violence or fraud. It includes crimes such as shoplifting, pocket picking, purse snatching, thefts from autos, auto parts, accessories, bicycles, etc. This category according to the Uniform Crime Reporting index does not include embezzlement, "con" games, forgery, and worthless checks. Value of property stolen in each larceny theft in 1976 was 184 dollars. In 1976, the average value of goods and property reported stolen from victims of pickpockets was $135, by purse snatchers $92, by shoplifters $39, of motor vehicles $207 and by miscellaneous thefts from buildings $283 (F.B.I. Uniform Crime Report, 1976). Most of the people arrested and convicted of larceny are poor people who need the money to support themsleves, supplement meager incomes, or support drug habits. In 1971, police estimated that more than half the inmates of the Rikers Island Penitentiary were drug addicts. Most of these were sent to prison for burglary and larceny (Haskell,& Yablonsky, 1978, p. 104). Whether or not drug addiction is an accurate analysis for the motives for larceny is in question. The motives for property crimes are highly variable with place of residence, area of the country, income, race, even religious preference.

The violent and non-violent offenses as indexed by the uniform

crime reports (Uniform Crime Report) can only provide a weak indication of the actual crime occurrence. Offenses committed by organized crime are generally not included in the Uniform Crime Report. According to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, organized crime takes about twice as much income from gambling and other illegal goods and services as criminals derive from all other kinds of criminal activity combined (President's Commission, 1967). Five-sixths of property loss is chargeable to white collar and organized crime (President's Commission, 1967).

So the development of typologies of violent and non-violent offenders has little validity, it would seem, if based only on crime statistics. Finally, the classification of violent and non-violent offenses seems reasonably founded even though the actual statistics are contained in the Uniform Crime Report are questionable.

Corporal Punishment and Child Abuse

The most universal type of physical violence is corporal punishment by parents. Studies in England and the United States show that between 84 and 97 percent of all parents use physical punishment at some point of their child's life. Moreover, the use of physical force to maintain parental authority is not confined to childhood, with as many as half of the parents threatening high school seniors with physical punishment. Although social scientists are still far from a full understanding of the causes of violence, in light of the foregoing research, it is realistic to think that children are learning violence, and that the home is a front for this instruction.

Glueck and Glueck (1950), in studying juvenile delinquency, found

that the most marked difference occurring between delinquent's parents and non-delinquent's parents were that the delinquent's parents resorted to more physical punishment and reasoned less with the juvenile. The effects of this type of training, when modeled by the child, results in later aggression. Thompson (1957) in a replicative study of the Glueck's previous research obtained similiar findings. McCord, McCord, and Zola (1959) found that the sons of violent criminals tend to become criminals themselves especially if their fathers were cruel and negligent, where-as similar adverse treatment was associated with a lower rate of crimi-nality in families where the father did not provide a grossly deviant model of behavior.

Which parents are abusive of children? It seems to be a problem across all social classes. A physically abused child can be defined as any child who receives non-accidental injuries as a result of acts or accidental injuries as a result of acts or omissions on the part of their guardians. Ninety percent of the people who physically abuse their chil-dren are mentally and intellectually normal. While no one social class tends to batter more than any other, the upper classes can more readily afford to take their children to private physicians who will keep quiet, while lower-class parents must take their children to public clinics. No index of reporting, then, could focus accurately in on the social class of physically abusing parents (Caffey, Silverman, Kempe, Venters & Leonard, 1972).

It is estimated that one or two children are being killed each day at the hands of their parents. The abusing parents usually manifest at least some of the following traits: Impulsive personality, a low frustra-tion level, immaturity, lack of affect, psychosis, alcoholism, drug

addition, and a history of abuse in their own childhood. A large number

of these parents were battered by their own parents, and the battered

child of today often becomes the child batterer of the future, thereby

creating a vicious cycle of violence breeding violence (Fontana, 1971).

Not only does a battered child tend to become a battering parent, but

family patterns of violence can develop in which a battered child batters

younger children. Kempe and Silverman (1962) commented on abusive parents

> There is some suggestion that the attacking parent was
> subjected to similar abuse in childhood. It would appear that
> one of the most important factors to be found in families where
> parental assault occurs is 'to do unto others as you have been
> done by' (p. 41).

There is a great deal of debate over whether or not child abuse is

a psychological "sickness" or a reaction to social factors, or both.

Physical abuse of children does not seem to be a rare or unusual occur-

rence in American society. This abuse appears to be endemic in this

society since cultural norms of child rearing do not preclude the use of

a certain measure of physical force toward children by adults caring for

them. Rather, such use tends to be encouraged in subtle ways by profes-

sional experts in child rearing, education, medicine, by the press, radio

and television, and by professional and popular bulications. Moreover,

the dominant religious trends in America condone abuse (Gil, 1979). It

is not mystifying to expect that extreme incidents occur in the course of

"normal" childrearing practices. People, then, of every socioeconomic,

educational, religious and geographical background abuse the children

for whom they are supposedly caring (Helfer & Kempe, 1968). Because of

the cultural acceptance of physical child abuse, and corporal punishment,

the abusers of children may have little or no idea that their behavior

towards their children is overtly or covertly malicious.

Another study by (Zalba, 1971) reveals in a conservative estimate that between 200,000 and 250,000 children in the United States need protective services each year, 20,000 to 37,500 of whom may have been badly hurt. These parents come from the complete range of socioeconomic classes.

Corporal punishment and child abuse, then, seem to be a complex function of several factors including psychopathological disorders, cultural acceptance, certain family structural patterns, socially induced patterns of violence, learned behavior, and lack of self-control. Traditionally, severe physical punishment was considered essential to the learning process. Many parents believed that "if you spare the rod you spoil the child." In colonial America, for instance, a statute even provided for the execution of sons who were "stubborn and rebellious" and failed to follow parental authority (Steinmetz & Straus, 1974).

It is not an onerous task trying to understand child abuse if one considers all of the contributing factors. Historically, politically, economically, and culturally America has been a place of continued violence. To point to one single cause of child abuse would be highly presumptious, for even after a selected review of child abuse literature is obtained the extreme complexities of this problem become apparent.

Summary of the Review of Literature

In a summation of the literature on social learning theories, violent crime, non-violent crime, corporal punishment, and child abuse, an overall understanding of violence leading to more violence can be conceived.

After studying three generations of families of abused children, it

was concluded battered children may become tomorrow's murderers. The battered child has an unusual degree of hostility toward parents and toward the world in general (Silver, Dublin & Lourie, 1969). If behavior can be learned by modeling, imitation, and vicarious means, particularly from primary groups, then after considering the amounts of child abuse in the United States, can we reasonably believe that violent criminals were more battered as children than non-violent offenders? It is the author's opinion that this is a reasonable argument; although, as has been stated, this is a complex problem. Some significant differences should show between two groups of offenders, namely violent and non-violent. If such a difference can be shown, it may help to improve the attitudes of the public at large toward parents, children, and convicted offenders.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

In order to assess the differences between violent and non-violent criminal offenders, trustees at an Oklahoma State correction facility were asked to respond to a questionnaire.

Preliminary permission was sought from Warden Norman Hess to enter the prison grounds to conduct this research. It was decided in a discussion with Warden Hess that Jack Brannon, the deputy warden in charge of the trustees at the prison, would work directly with the author in setting up the research.

Sample Information

The state prison at McAlester is a maximum security institution with approximately 800-900 inmates. It was suggested that one-tenth of the total population of this institution be used as the sample size for this study. When working with correctional institutions, control problems may often arise, creating problems of access to large groups of inmates, particularly the more dangerous individuals. Therefore, permission for this study was granted, for contact with only the trustees of the institution.

The present research began with a listing of 300 trustees, provided by the deputy warden through the mail. The listing included race, prison number, names, and the offense for which the inmate was incarcerated. Previous to the actual testing date, the list was used to select 100

respondents for the administration of a questionnaire. Approximately, equal numbers of violent and non-violent offenders were selected, as well as white and non-white respondents.

Upon arrival at the trustee building contact was made with the Captain of the guard, who called the trustees down to a counseling room on the premises by groups of four. Because the participation in the research project was totally voluntary, 82 of the 100 asked to respond, did in fact cooperate by filling out questionnaires. Those who chose not to participate in the study were free to leave the testing area after the initial information was given concerning the questionnaire. Subsequent to the administration of the questionnaire, the respondents were asked not to divulge any information to other individuals who had not answered a questionaire until the testing had been totally completed.

Of the 82 respondents, who participated in this study, 39 were non-violent offenders and 43 of the offenders were convicted of violent offenses. Those convicted of a non-violent offense were charged with either grand larceny, buglary or forgery. Those convicted of violent offenses were charged with either rape, murder, manslaughter, assault, or robbery.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire which was constructed, consisted of three parts (see Appendix A). The first part, questions 1-17, concern the offenders' background information. Some of these items were demographic, while others covered personal information relative to victims and the offenders family structure. The second part, questions 18-19, was the actual inventory for responses concerning the inmates' recollection about their childhood. The third section covered by the questionnaire dealt with questions

directed at the offender, relative to their attitudes on punitive measures by parents in general.

The inventory portion of the questionnaire was designed to assess five scales, four of which asked for recollection. These four scales included a physical punishment scale (PPS), a home environment scale (HES), a positive reward scale (PRS), and a neighborhood milieu scale (NMS). The fifth scale asked for the attitude of the offender at the time of testing towards the punitive measures of parents in general. The fifth scale is a prisoner attitude scale (PAS). While other areas may have been included, the majority of the literature on learned childhood aggression focused most basically on these areas.

Data Organization and Procedures
of Analysis

Data Organization

The questionnaires were divided by non-violent and violent offense groups subsequent to the test date, before any analysis was undertaken. It was the goal of this study to search for any significant differences that may have existed between non-violent and violent offenders pertaining to the recalled perceived childhood punition by the offenders parents.

The questionnaire was designed by the author; however, no standardized scales of child abuse or aggression inventories were used as models. The individual items many times were revised for clarity, or because the specific wording was thought to be too complex for the research poplulation to understand. Several students at Oklahoma State University were

given the questionnaire, then asked to react and write comments concerning any alterations which might prove helpful.

The results of this research are presented in three sections. The first section contains descriptive and comparative data about the two test groups. The second section will be the factor analysis scores on the various items as a means to determine which of the items are the best determinants of any particular scale. Finally, the third section will consist of the t-scores, or the differences in the mean values between groups based on various demographic and the offenders personal criteria.

The original proposal for research sought to use correlation as a method of analysis. However, the correlation of so many variables was found to produce extensive pages of data which could not be well defined or interpreted. It was decided that a simpler method of analysis would be to study mean differences between non-violent and violent offenders using one variable at a time. Thus, a t-test was instituted as the primary method for analysis.

<center>Procedures of Analysis</center>

Frequencies

By utilizing the statistical analysis system (S.A.S.), of generalized computer programs, a frequency of the respondents' scores was made by categorical variables. Frequencies are the number of objects in sets and subjects. In this case the variables were those of the respondents demographic data, and the frequency of responses to the five scale inventory on childhood punition. The data obtained from this procedure will be used in the next chapter for a data description.

Factor Analysis

This statistical procedure helps determine which items in a set or scale are, in fact, measuring the same things. Furthermore, by numerical values it tells how much different items in a given scale relate to each other. Factor Analysis, then, is a method for determining the number and nature of the underlying variables among larger numbers of measures, by extracting common factor variances from sets or scales of measure (Keilinger, 1973). By statisically assigning a numeric to the various scale items, those items with the highest values may be retained as measures of the same information, particularly if the factor loadings can be reduced to three or less factor differences. It is by this means that a researcher may simplify data and obtain a higher degree of accuracy prior to any further analysis.

Difference in Means Test

The student's t distribution is a theoretical sampling distribution. The t distribution differs from the normal curve distribution. That is, the t distribution is determined by degrees of freedom not by sample size. Only when the degrees of freedom equals infinity can a distribution form a standard normal curve. Therefore, a t distribution varies according to the size of a sample statistic. Through utilization of the Statistical Analysis System of generalized computer programs, various variables were dichotomized by violent and non-violent groups. It is expected that a difference in the mean score will exist on demographic data as well as differences occurring on the scaled inventory items.

Analysis of Variance

Analysis of variance can be used to test for differences among the means of more than two samples. Thus, it represents an extension of the difference-of-means test and can generally be used whenever we are testing for a relationship between a nominal scale or any higher order scale. A two-way analysis of variance stratifies the variables used for measurement to give a more specific relation analysis between two-sampler.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of the research is to assess differences between and within violent and non-violent groups, and their recollection of parent-childhood relationships based on physical punishment, home environment, positive rewards, neighborhood milieu, and to assess the present attitude of the prisoner on parental punition. The nature of the research is investigative and seeks only to show that differences occurred between violent and non-violent offenders as children. Thus, acknowledging or refuting the notion that "violence begets violence" or that violence is a learned behavior transmitted from parent to child.

The data analysis section is concerned with four analytical techniques. These are descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages), factor analysis, difference in means test (t-test), and analysis of variance. Though the researcher sought to obtain complete demographic and inventory datum, several portions of data could not be utilized because of the lack of responses. The tables included in the data analysis section, therefore, in term of their N-values may vary from table to table.

Descriptive Statistics

This section is concerned with analyzing the differences between a

sample of non-violent inmates and a sample of violent inmates in terms of demographic data and the scaled inventory items. We want not only to describe the two samples, but to determine if there are significant differences between and within the two samples means on several variables which may indicate that more or less punitive measures were taken by parents of the inmates composing the two groups.

The non-violent group consists of those inmates who were convicted of grand larceny, burglary, or forgery. The violent group consists of those inmates who were convicted of rape, murder, manslaughter, assualt, or robbery.

Descriptive data in Table I consists of the demographic data supplied by the violent and non-violent inmates, and the frequencies of responses for the total group. It should be noted that much of the demographic data is insufficient for analysis. Regardless of the efforts to obtain complete data collection the inmates failed to answer particular items concerning demographics. This will be discussed in the next chapter concerning limitations. Table I, therefore, consists of those demographic variable in which more complete data was obtained.

The raw percentages (Table I) reveal that non-whites and whites were nearly equal when representing the violent offender category. However, there are 61.5 non-whites and 38.4 percent whites in the non-violent category. Another difference of significant degree that may be assessed from Table I includes the offenders acquaintance with the victim. 64.9 percent of the violent offenders knew their victim before the commission of a violent crime, as compared to only 16.2 percent of the property or non-violent offenders having any acquaintance with their victims. The education of fathers of violent offenders was lower

TABLE I

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Characteristic	Categories	Non-violent Offenders	Violent Offenders	Total Sample
Age	≤ 30 years of age	46.1*	34.8	41.4**
	≥ 31 years of age	53.8	65.1	58.5
Race	White	38.4	53.4	47.5
	Non-White	61.5	46.5	52.5
Religious Preference	Catholic	10.5	11.6	11.1
	Jewish	0	0	0
	Muslim	2.6	4.6	3.6
	Protestant	63.1	62.7	62.9
	Other	10.5	6.9	8.6
	None	13.1	13.9	13.5
Size of Town	Rural	15.3	11.6	13.4
	Small town	28.2	25.5	29.2
	Small city < 25,000	15.3	16.2	15.8
	City < 100,000	12.8	20.9	15.8
	Large city > 100,000	28.2	25.5	25.6
Crime Convicted of	Grand Larceny	35.8	0	17.0
	Burglary	58.9	0	26.7
	Forgery	5.0	0	1.2
	Murder	0	48.8	25.6
	Rape	0	23.2	13.3
	Assault	0	16.2	8.5
	Robbery	0	11.6	7.3
Victim	Spouse	0	6.9	5.0
	Close friend	10.8	13.9	11.2
	Acquaintance	5.4	44.1	27.5
	Stranger	83.7	34.8	56.0

TABLE I (Continued)

Characteristic	Categories	Non-Violent Offenders	Violent Offenders	Total Sample
Living with parents at the time of the first offense	Yes	56.4	39.5	46.9
	No	43.5	60.4	53.0
Fathers education completed	Elementary	30.5	39.4	36.4
	Middle School	30.5	26.3	28.3
	High School	30.5	31.5	29.7
	College	8.3	2.6	5.4
	Other			

*Numbers are percentages.

**N = 82.

overall than the educational level of fathers of offenders who were in the non-violent groups.

Tables II-VII contains descriptive statistics for the 5 scale inventory on parental punition. Listed are the frequencies and percentages of the inmates responses.

Generally, every item on the inventory scales had persons which gave no response. These were recorded in the no response category, and thus no percentages were produced in the computation and data analysis. Notations should be made that the inventory items did not appear in the order as listed in Tables II-VI, but were arranged randomly so as not to satiate the respondants answering patterns (see Appendix A).

Two items were designed into the inventory scales as check questions concerning demography as on indication of response accuracy. The response frequencies and percentages appear in Table VII.

When a cross check is made between the responses to the check questions and the responses to the demographic data set, the cumulative frequencies of the responses correspond to the frequencies of agreement and disagreement with both items.

Summary

In this section we have examined frequencies and percentages on both demograhic data and five scales included in the inventory concerning several areas which effect learned violent behavior. In creating the present research design, it seemed important to include descriptive statistics as a means for discovering any particular overall trends before further analysis was carried out. Those respondents which gave no answer or a "don't know" answer were relatively few, which seems very

TABLE II

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR PHYSICAL
PUNISHMENT SCALE (PPS)

		Frequency	Percentage
1. My parents spanked me whether I deserved it or not.	0*	3	0
	1	35	44.3
	2	27	34.1
	3	5	6.3
	4	5	6.3
	5	7	8.8
2. I was spanked more, by my parents, than were my other friends, by their parents.	0	3	0
	1	17	21.5
	2	21	26.5
	3	20	25.3
	4	12	15.1
	5	9	11.3
3. When I broke something my parents would spank me without question.	0	3	0
	1	17	21.5
	2	37	46.8
	3	5	6.3
	4	12	15.1
	5	8	10.1
4. I was spanked 5 or 10 times every week.	0	1	0
	1	26	32.0
	2	34	41.9
	3	12	14.8
	4	5	6.1
	5	4	4.9
5. As a child, I had bruises on me, after being punished.	0	0	0
	1	28	34.1
	2	25	30.4
	3	6	7.3
	4	18	21.9
	5	5	6.0

TABLE II (Continued)

		Frequency	Percentage
6. Each spanking, by my parents, seemed to last a long time.	0	0	0
	1	10	12.1
	2	31	37.8
	3	12	14.6
	4	19	23.1
	5	10	12.1
7. My parents beat all of the children in my family.	0	3	0
	1	32	40.5
	2	33	41.7
	3	4	5.0
	4	8	10.1
	5	2	2.5
8. In my home, as a child, my parents didn't hit me.	0	5	0
	1	21	27.2
	2	36	46.7
	3	2	2.5
	4	9	11.6
	5	9	11.6
9. My mother hit me more than my father.	0	4	0
	1	13	16.6
	2	26	33.3
	3	5	6.4
	4	23	29.4
	5	11	14.1
10. My father would come home and hit me for no reason.	0	3	0
	1	31	39.2
	2	40	50.6
	3	3	3.7
	4	4	5.0
	5	1	1.2
11. When my parents argued they would become angry with me, and hit me.	0	2	0
	1	31	38.7
	2	42	52.5
	3	3	3.7
	4	3	3.7
	5	1	1.2

TABLE II (Continued)

			Frequency	Percentage
12.	I had an older brother who often hit me.	0	3	0
		1	24	30.3
		2	46	58.2
		3	0	0
		4	8	10.1
		5	1	1.2
13.	I had an older sister who often hit me.	0	3	0
		1	27	34.1
		2	46	58.2
		3	0	0
		4	5	6.3
		5	1	1.2
14.	When my parents spanked me, it was harder than it needed to be.	0	2	0
		1	9	11.2
		2	38	47.5
		3	10	12.5
		4	15	18.7
		5	8	10.0
15.	My parents spanked me when I asked too many questions.	0	4	0
		1	24	30.7
		2	47	60.2
		3	3	3.8
		4	1	1.2
		5	3	3.8
16.	When my parents spanked me, I always knew the reason.	0	2	0
		1	4	5.0
		2	16	20.0
		3	1	1.2
		4	45	56.2
		5	14	17.5
17.	Besides spanking me, my parents often beat me.	0	6	0
		1	32	42.1
		2	31	40.7
		3	6	7.8
		4	5	6.5
		5	2	2.6

TABLE II (Continued)

		Frequency	Percentage
18. I was spanked more than my other brothers and sisters.	0	3	0
	1	20	25.3
	2	26	32.9
	3	10	12.6
	4	17	21.5
	5	6	7.5

*0 = No Response, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree,
3 = Don't Know, 4 = Agree, 5 = Stongly Agree.

TABLE III

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR HOME
ENVIRONMENT SCALE (HES)

		Frequency	Percentage
1. As a child, my parents would try to reason and talk over problems with me.	0*	3	0
	1	4	5.0
	2	15	18.9
	3	2	2.5
	4	34	43.0
	5	24	30.3
2. My parents would listen to my explanation, when I got into trouble.	0	3	0
	1	8	10.1
	2	10	12.6
	3	3	3.7
	4	45	56.9
	5	13	16.4
3. My parents helped me with school work.	0	0	0
	1	5	6.0
	2	33	40.2
	3	4	4.8
	4	29	35.3
	5	11	13.4
4. My parents spent some time with me every day.	0	1	1.2
	1	5	6.0
	2	25	30.4
	3	4	4.8
	4	37	45.1
	5	10	12.1
5. I was an important part of my family.	0	0	0
	1	3	3.6
	2	13	15.8
	3	9	10.9
	4	45	54.8
	5	12	14.6

TABLE III (Continued)

		Frequency	Percentage
6. My parents helped me with many hobbies, as a child.	0	1	1.2
	1	9	11.1
	2	36	44.4
	3	2	2.4
	4	26	32.0
	5	7	8.6
7. My parents "went out" often in the evening without me.	0	4	0
	1	19	24.3
	2	30	38.4
	3	3	3.8
	4	17	21.7
	5	9	11.5
8. My father often beat up my mother.	0	1	0
	1	35	43.2
	2	28	34.5
	3	6	7.4
	4	8	9.8
	5	4	4.9
9. My parents beat up my brothers and sisters, but not me.	0	3	0
	1	36	45.5
	2	37	46.8
	3	4	5.0
	4	0	0
	5	2	2.5
10. My parents would scold me for doing something wrong.	0	1	0
	1	4	4.9
	2.	5	6.1
	3	5	6.1
	4	42	51.8
	5	25	30.8
11. My father bruised my mother when he beat her.	0	2	0
	1	34	42.5
	2	27	33.7
	3	4	5.0
	4	6	7.5
	5	9	11.2

TABLE III (Continued)

		Frequency	Percentage
12.	My mother has gone to the hospital before, after my father beat her up.	0 1 2 3 4 5	3 40 30 3 2 4	0 50.6 37.9 3.7 2.5 5.0
13.	I had fun when I was a child.	0 1 2 3 4 5	3 1 5 1 57 15	0 1.2 6.3 1.2 72.1 18.9
14.	My mother often hit my father.	0 1 2 3 4 5	4 20 36 9 11 2	0 25.6 46.1 11.5 14.1 2.5
15.	The members of my family often hit each other.	0 1 2 3 4 5	3 18 40 2 15 4	0 22.7 50.6 2.5 18.9 5.0
16.	When I saw my father hitting my mother, I felt bad.	0 1 2 3 4 5	9 15 14 16 17 11	0 20.5 19.1 21.9 23.2 15.0
17.	I often saw my mother hitting my father.	0 1 2 3 4 5	4 29 35 4 7 3	0 37.1 44.8 5.1 8.9 3.8

TABLE III (Continued)

			Frequency	Percentage
18.	I had fist fights with many of the other children.	0	2	0
		1	10	12.5
		2	33	41.2
		3	1	1.2
		4	33	41.2
		5	3	3.7
19.	Playing by myself was more fun than in a group with my friends.	0	2	0
		1	16	20.0
		2	41	51.2
		3	1	1.2
		4	18	22.5
		5	4	5.0
20.	As a child, I kept busy working around the house.	0	2	0
		1	6	7.5
		2	24	30.0
		3	2	2.5
		4	36	45.0
		5	12	15.0
21.	I was left with a babysitter much of the time.	0	4	0
		1	22	28.2
		2	42	53.8
		3	1	1.2
		4	10	12.8
		5	3	3.8
22.	I liked to help my mother with chores around the house.	0	3	0
		1	5	6.3
		2	20	25.3
		3	6	7.5
		4	38	48.1
		5	10	12.6
23.	My family went on "outings" together. (Camping, fishing, etc.).	0	5	0
		1	5	6.4
		2	33	42.8
		3	4	5.1
		4	26	33.7
		5	9	11.6

TABLE III (Continued)

		Frequency	Percentage
24. I liked to help my father with chores around the house.	0	5	0
	1	5	6.4
	2	16	20.7
	3	4	5.1
	4	43	55.8
	5	9	11.6
25. My mother punished me more than my father.	0	3	0
	1	15	18.9
	2	25	31.6
	3	6	7.5
	4	23	29.1
	5	10	12.6

*0 = No Response, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree,
3 = Don't Know, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

TABLE IV

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE POSITIVE
REWARD SCALE (PRS)

		Frequency	Percentage
1. As a child, my parents would give me candy or treats for doing what they asked.	0	1	0
	1	10	12.3
	2	36	44.4
	3	5	6.1
	4	22	27.1
	5	8	9.8
2. My parents loved me.	0	0	0
	1	2	2.4
	2	1	1.2
	3	4	4.8
	4	38	46.3
	5	37	45.1
3. When my parents were happy with me, they told me so.	0	3	0
	1	2	2.5
	2	14	17.7
	3	5	6.3
	4	48	60.7
	5	10	12.6
4. My parents treated me fairly, even when they punished me.	0	5	0
	1	3	3.8
	2	11	14.2
	3	0	0
	4	46	59.7
	5	17	22.0

TABLE V

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD
MILEAU SCALE

		Frequency	Percentage
1. Many people I knew, as a child broke the law.	0	4	0
	1	5	6.4
	2	29	37.1
	3	6	7.6
	4	28	35.8
	5	10	12.8
2. Where I grew up, many laws were broken.	0	4	0
	1	10	16.6
	2	19	33.3
	3	8	6.4
	4	30	29.4
	5	11	14.1
3. Breaking the law was common where I grew up.	0	2	0
	1	9	11.2
	2	30	37.5
	3	8	10.0
	4	25	31.2
	5	8	10.0
4. I had many fist fights, as a child.	0	2	0
	1	11	13.7
	2	29	36.2
	3	2	2.5
	4	33	41.2
	5	5	6.2
5. In the town where I grew up, laws were often being broken.	0	2	0
	1	6	7.5
	2	22	27.5
	3	8	10.0
	4	34	42.5
	5	10	12.5

TABLE VI

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR PRISONER
ATTITUDE SCALE (PAS)

			Frequency	Percentage
1.	Physical punishment is the best way to correct a child.	0*	5	0
		1	27	35.0
		2	33	42.8
		3	7	9.0
		4	8	10.3
		5	2	2.5
2.	When a parent spanks a child they really don't need to give them any reason.	0	5	0
		1	35	45.4
		2	33	42.8
		3	4	5.1
		4	1	1.2
		5	4	5.1
3.	Trying to reason with a child is better than scolding them.	0	5	0
		1	2	2.5
		2	7	9.0
		3	8	10.3
		4	38	49.3
		5	22	28.5
4.	Spanking is harmful to children.	0	5	0
		1	3	3.8
		2	30	38.9
		3	9	11.6
		4	19	24.6
		5	16	20.7
5.	Children should be reward- ed for being good.	0	5	0
		1	1	1.2
		2	17	22.0
		3	3	3.8
		4	38	49.3
		5	18	23.3

TABLE VI (Continued)

		Frequency	Percentage
6. Children deserve the spanking they receive.	0	6	0
	1	3	3.9
	2	16	21.0
	3	23	30.2
	4	28	36.8
	5	6	7.8
7. Children should have a chance to explain before they are punished.	0	5	0
	1	0	0
	2	4	5.1
	3	0	0
	4	54	70.1
	5	19	24.6
8. To learn a lesson, a child should be physically punished.	0	5	0
	1	23	29.8
	2	39	50.6
	3	7	9.0
	4	4	5.1
	5	4	5.1
9. Children will learn if they are always rewarded for doing what they are asked.	0	3	0
	1	25	31.6
	2	37	46.8
	3	6	7.5
	4	10	12.6
	5	1	1.2
10. It doesn't hurt children to spank them as often as 2 or 3 times a day.	0	2	0
	1	1	1.2
	2	10	12.5
	3	6	7.5
	4	38	47.5
	5	25	31.2

*0 = No Response, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree,
3 = Don't know, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

TABLE VII

CHECK QUESTIONS FOR DEMOGRAPHICS

		Frequency	Percentage
1. Other adult relatives besides	0*	4	0
my parents lived in my home.	1	29	37.1
	2	29	37.1
	3	1	1.2
	4	14	17.9
	5	5	6.4
2. I was the only boy in my	0	4	0
family (I had no brothers).	1	31	39.7
	2	33	42.3
	3	0	0
	4	9	11.5
	5	5	6.4

*0 = No Response, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree
3 = Don't Know, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

favorable in light of carrying out research at a maximum security institution.

Factor Analysis of Scaled Items

This section is concerned with evaluating each scale used in the inventory for this research by means of a factor analysis. The inventory is composed of five scales which totals 63 questions. The respondents were asked to recall, when answering the inventory items, that period of their lives previous to twelve years of age or middle school. The five scales sought to measure physical punishment, home environment, positive rewards, neighborhood milieu, and prisoner attitudes towards punishment.

Scale One

Scale one was constructed to determine the amount of perceived childhood corporal punishment of the offender, by his parents. The scale originally consisted of eighteen questions. All of the scale items with the exception of five were used in the final data analysis. By means of factor analysis, using the statistical analysis system (S.A.S.), the five deleted questions were shown to be poorly related as scale items for determining corporal punishment trends. Factor one of the remaining thirteen items generally produced high loadings with the lowest being .42 and the highest being .74. Table VIII contains a listing of the stated scale item and the corresponding factor loadings. The original factor loadings represent those items which were retained for further analysis.

Scale Two

Scale two consists of questions concerning home environment. The

TABLE VIII

PHYSICAL PUNISHMENT SCALE BY UNROTATED
FACTOR PATTERN VALUES

Item	Original	Final
1. My parents spanked me whether I deserved it or not.	.56	.60[*]
2. I was spanked more, by my parents than were my other friends by their parents.	.51	.57
3. When I broke something my parents would spank me without question.	.65	.68
4. I was spanked 5 or 10 times every week.	.60	.63
5. As a child, I had bruises on me after being punished.	.66	.66
6. Each spanking by my parents seemed to last a long time.	.40	.43
7. My parents beat all of the children in my family.	.55	.55
8. In my home, as a child, my parents didn't hit me.	.15	
9. My mother hit me more than my father.	.44	.42
10. My father would come home from work and hit me for no reason.	.55	.46
11. When my parents argued they would become angry with me and hit me.	.64	
12. I had an older brother who often hit me.	.21	

TABLE VIII (Continued)

Item	Original	Final
13. I had an older sister who often hit me.	.33	
14. When my parents spanked me, it was harder than it needed to be.	.72	.72
15. My parents spanked me when I asked too many questions.	.73	.74
16. When my parents spanked me, I always knew the reason.	-.25	
17. Besides spanking me, my parents often beat me.	.74	.73
18. I was spanked more than my other brothers and sisters.	.42	.48

*Retained scale items for further analysis.

original number of items for this scale was twenty-five. By utiliz-

ing factor analysis, eleven items were retained as the best indicators

of the home environment. It is important to note that the respondants

were eighteen years of age and older, so the answers to all of the scale

items are subject to individual recollection and perception. Of the

eleven items retained the factor pattern produced three factors. The

itmes in the factor one column for the house environment scale ranged

from a low of .47 to a high of .81. Table IX consists of the factor

loadings for the eleven retained items. The original factor values are

listed for all twenty-five items, after which the final factor values

are listed for the retained scale items.

Scale Three

The third scale on the inventory consist of questions concerning

positive rewards from parents towards the respondent as a child. Factor

analysis was employed on the three item scale. The loadings for each

item were found to be high. The factor pattern produced only 1 factor

column with a range of .62 being the lowest to a high of .72. Table X

lists the original and final factor values. As apparent in Table X the

values remained unchanged from column to column.

Scale Four

The fourth scale consists of questions concerning neighborhood mi-

lieu. The items sought to determine if the law was being broken in the

area where the respondant lived as a child. One item on the scale dealt

with fist fighting; however, this item did not factor well with the other

four items. The factor loadings on four items were found to be high. The

TABLE IX

HOME ENVIRONMENT SCALE BY UNROTATED
FACTOR 1 PATTERN VALUES

Items	Original	Final
1. As a child, my parents would try to reason and talk over problems.	-.16	* 0
2. My parents would listen to my explanation, when I got into trouble.	-.15	0
3. My parents helped me with school work.	-.20	0
4. My parents spent some time with me everyday.	-.33	0
5. I was an important part of my family.	-.24	0
6. My parents helped me with many hobbies, when I was a child.	-.27	0
7. My parents "went out" often in the evenings without me.	.53	.51
8. My father often beat up my mother.	.57	.61
9. My parents beat up my brothers and sisters, but not me.	.53	.57
10. My parents would scold me for doing something wrong.	.00	0
11. My father bruised my mother when he beat her.	.72	.77
12. My mother has gone to the hospital before, after my father beat her up.	.63	.63
13 I had fun when I was a child.	-.15	0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Item	Original	Final
14. My mother often hit my father.	.71	.73
15. The members of my family often hit each other.	.50	.51
16. When I saw my father hitting my mother, I felt bad.	.57	.62
17. I often saw my mother hitting my father.	.78	.81
18. I had fist fights with many of the other children.	.00	0
19. Playing by myself was more fun than in a group with my friends.	.29	0
20. As a child, I kept busy working around the house.	-.03	0
21. I was left with a babysitter much of the time.	.52	.53
22. I liked to help my mother with chores around the house.	-.10	0
23. My family went on "outings" together (camping, fishing, etc.).	-.43	0
24. I liked to help my father with chores around the house.	-.38	0
25. My mother punished me more than my father.	.46	.47

*Retained scale items for further analysis.

TABLE X

POSITIVE REWARD SCALE BY UNROTATED
FACTOR 1 PATTERN VALUES

	Item	Original	Final
1.	As a child my parents would give me candy or treats for doing what they asked.	.79	.79[*]
2.	My parents loved me	.65	.65
3.	When my parents were happy with me, they told me so.	.62	.62

[*]Retained scale items for further analysis.

range of the factor values was from a low of .63 to a high of .90. Table XI lists the original and final factor values for each scale item.

Scale Five

The fifth, and final scale consists of the respondent's attitude towards parental punition at the time of the testing period. Respondents were given instructions to think about their answers in terms of their present attitude. On this ten item scale factor analysis revealed that one item was particularly poor relative to the other items. The original and final factor values are listed in Table XII. The scores range from a low of .34 to a high of .75 on the final values retained for further analysis.

Summary

This section included factor analysis of the five scale inventory utilized in this research. The inventory initially contained 61 questions when the two check-questions were deleted. The final number of items retained was 38 to be used for further analysis. By using further analysis five scales were assessed by each individual item for their relative accuracy with other items in the same scale. Accuracy here does not imply that the scale is a total determinant of any one area of information, only that the items of the scale interrelate in arriving at scale consistancy, based on answering patterns. The five scales sought to assess physical punishment, home environment, positive rewards, neighborhood milieu, and prisoner attitudes towards punishment. Further analysis will be conducted with the retained scale items, to ascertain any differences which may have occurred between violent and non-violent groups.

TABLE XI

NEIGHBORHOOD MILIEU SCALE BY UNROTATED
FACTOR 1 PATTERN VALUES

Item	Original	Final
1. Many people I knew as a child, broke the law.	.63	.63*
2. Where I grew up many laws were broken.	.85	.85
3. Breaking the law, was common where I grew up.	.86	.86
4. I had many fist fights, as a child.	.25	0
5. In the town where I grew up, laws were often being broken.	.90	.90

*Retained scale items for further analysis.

TABLE XII

PRISONER ATTITUDE SCALE BY UNROTATED
FACTOR 1 PATTERN VALUES

Item	Original	Final
1. Physical punishment is the best way to correct a child.	-.34	.34*
2. When a parent spanks a child, they really don't need to give them any reason.	.52	.52
3. Trying to reason with a child is better than scolding them.	.59	.59
4. Spanking is harmful to children.	-.75	.75
5. Children should be rewarded for being good.	.46	.46
6. Children deserve the spanking they receive.	-.13	
7. Children should have a chance to explain before they are scolded.	.69	.69
8. To learn a lesson, a child should be physically punished.	.34	.34
9. Children will learn if they are always rewarded for doing what they are asked.	.66	.66
10. It doesn't hurt children to spank them as often as 2 or 3 times a day.	.46	.46

*Retained scale items for further analysis.

Difference in Means Analysis

The t-test is being utilized to determine whether two means between violent and non-violent groups are significant by differences on several demographic variables. The five scale inventory will be tested for significances in mean scores by overall t-scores, age, race, size of town where the offender lived, and if the offender lived with his parents at the time of the first offense. An overall t-score for differences between violent and non-violent groups is desirable, previous to any analysis on specific demographic variables.

Overall Difference in Means Test

A t-test was initially used for comparing the differences between the means of violent and non-violent groups. Of the 82 respondents 39 were non-violent, and 43 had been convicted of violent crimes. Table XIII consists of the overall difference in means scores for the two groups.

As apparent in Table XIII no significant difference ($p > .05$) is present between violent and non-violent groups on an overall basis. Because of the number of demographic data and their variability of information more specific investigation on several demographic items and scales are desirable.

Age

The five inventory scales were analyized more specifically by age. The ages were dichotomized at 30 years, and by violent and non-violent groups separately. Because the age range of respondents was from a low of 18 to a high of 66, the difference in recalling childhood experiences

TABLE XIII

FIVE SCALE OVERALL MEAN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS

Scales	N	Mean	t	df	P
1. Physical Punishment					
Non-Violent	39	2.29	-0.126	71.4	.900
Violent	43	2.31	-0.127	80.0	.898
			F = 1.06		
2. Home Environment					
Non-Violent	39	2.14	-0.899	78.7	.371
Violent	43	2.29	-0.900	80.0	.370
			F = 1.06		
3. Positive Rewards					
Non-Violent	39	3.59	.343	74.8	.732
Violent	43	3.54	.346	80.0	.730
			F = 1.40		
4. Neighborhood Milieu					
Non-Violent	38	3.22	1.131	77.9	.261
Violent	43	2.96	1.130	79.0	.261
			F = 1.02		
5. Prisoner Attitude					
Non-Violent	38	3.90	1.36	78.2	.177
Violent	43	3.72	1.35	79.0	.178
			F = 1.04		

probably would differ. Therefore, the author deemed it necessary to control for an older and younger group of offenders. Table XIV consists of the data on non-violent offenders, 30 years of age or less and 31 years of age or more, relative to the five scale inventory. No significant results (p > .05) are present for this group. Those respondents which were non-violent whether younger or older than thirty years of age did not perceive their childhoods differently according to the five inventory scales. Table XV consists of the violent offenders scores on difference in means by age.

The respondents who were violent did not significantly differ on the inventory scales, when controlled for younger and older age groups perceptions for both violent and non-violent groups of their childhoods did not differ according to age nor did the prisoner attitude scale of parental punition.

Race

Next the respondents were divided into two groups of white and non-white offenders. Originally, the demographic section of the inventory sought to obtain those persons who were white, black, Indian American, or Mexican American. However, the number of Indian and Mexican Americans was so low, that they were included in the non-white category. The over-all differences in means for the variable of race as it applies to the five scale inventory appears in Table XVI. Significant differences (p > .05) were not obtained based on race as to the perception of the of-fenders childhood for white and non-white groups. Subsequently, the difference in means test was applied to the violent and non-violent groups separately (Appendix B) for the purpose of assessing any differences

TABLE XIV

NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS DIFFERENCE
IN MEANS BY AGE

Scales	N	Mean	t	df	P
1. Physical Punishment					
30 years or less	19	2.39	.748	34.5	.459
31 years or more	20	2.20	.742	37.0	.462
			F = 1.95		
2. Home Environment					
30 years or less	19	2.20	.431	36.2	.669
31 years or more	20	2.09	.428	37.0	.670
			F = 1.51		
3. Positive Reward					
30 years or less	19	3.59	-0.013	32.6	.989
31 years or more	20	3.60	-0.013	37.0	.989
			F = 1.93		
4. Neighborhood Milieu					
30 years or less	18	3.45	1.32	34.9	.193
31 years or more	20	3.01	1.33	36.0	.191
			F = 1.15		
5. Prisoner Attitude					
30 years or less	18	3.95	.586	34.8	.561
31 years or more	20	3.84	.589	36.0	.559
			F = 1.17		

TABLE XV

VIOLENT OFFENDERS DIFFERENCE
IN MEANS BY AGE

Scales	N	Mean	t	df	P
1. Physical Punishment					
30 years or less	15	2.46	1.06	21.6	.299
31 years or more	28	2.23	1.18	41.0	.244
			F = 2.01		
2. Home Environment					
30 years or less	15	2.42	.739	21.6	.467
31 years or more	28	2.22	.822	41.0	.415
			F = 2.03		
3. Positive Reward					
30 years or less	15	3.77	1.90	37.2	.063
31 years or more	28	3.41	1.73	41.0	.090
			F = 1.92		
4. Neighborhood Milieu					
30 years or less	15	3.08	.560	31.7	.579
31 years or more	28	2.90	.540	41.0	.591
			F = 1.25		
5. Prisoner Attitude					
30 years or less	15	3.62	-0.802	26.6	.429
31 years or more	28	3.78	-0.825	41.0	.414

TABLE XVI

OVERALL OFFENDERS DIFFERENCE
IN MEANS BY RACE

	Scales	N	Means	t	df	P
1.	Physical Punishment					
	White	39	2.28	-0.264	77.5	.792
	Non-White	43	2.32	-0.260	80.0	.795
				F = 1.76		
2.	Home Environment					
	White	39	2.27	0.617	78.9	.538
	Non-White	43	2.17	0.618	80.0	.538
				F = 1.04		
3.	Positive Rewards					
	White	39	3.4	-1.40	79.4	.163
	Non-White	43	3.6	-1.39	80.0	.167
				F = 1.45		
4.	Neighborhood Milieu					
	White	38	2.9	-1.14	77.9	.255
	Non-White	43	3.2	-1.14	79.0	.256
				F = 1.01		
5.	Prisoner Attitudes					
	White	38	3.7	-0.791	79.0	.431
	Non-White	43	3.8	-0.783	79.0	.435
				F = 1.35		

variations are occurring within the violent and non-violent groups as
between white and non-white offenders within the two conviction groups.
The results showed insignificant statistical differences when tested in
this manner.

Size of Town

A difference in means test was next applied to the groups of vio-
lent and non-violent offenders to assess the propensity for parental
punition in small towns as compared to large towns. Two categories were
used for analysis. The first category was for small towns or rural areas
and the second category consists of small cities (less than 25,000), a
city (less than 100,000), and a large city (greater than 100,000). Table
XVII lists the difference in means scores for the violent and non-violent
groups based on size of town, as applied to the inventory scales.

None of the t-scores contained in Table XVII were significant at
the .05 level. Perceptions of the respondents concerning their childhood
and parental punitive practices did not differ based on the size of town
in which the individual was raised. Though difference may in fact have
occurred, the recollection of any differences is not present in the dif-
ference in mean scores.

Living With Parents

A difference in means test was applied to the variable of whether
or not the respondant was living with his parents at the time of his
first conviction. Table XVIII lists t-scores for violent and non-violent
groups according to responses given on the 5 scale inventory.

Significant differences for violent and non-violent groups were not
obtained for the inventory scales, using the variable of whether or not

TABLE XVII

VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS DIFFERENCE
IN MEANS BY SIZE OF TOWN

Scales	N	Mean	t	df	P
Violent					
1. Physical Punishment					
Rural-Small Town	16	2.33	.168	37.9	.867
City	27	2.30	.157	41.0	.875
			F = 1.66		
2. Home Environment					
Rural-Small Town	16	2.35	.3954	28.3	.695
City	27	2.25	.4097	41.0	.684
			F = 1.31		
3. Positive Rewards					
Rural-Small Town	16	3.3	-1.44	41.0	.155
City	27	3.6	-1.27	41.0	.208
			F = 2.78		
4. Neighborhood Milieu					
Rural-Small Town	16	2.73	-1.14	33.3	.261
City	27	3.10	-1.12	41.0	.267
			F = 1.14		
5. Prisoner Attitude					
Rural-Small Town	16	3.66	-0.679	39.0	.500
City	27	3.76	-0.571	41.0	.571
			F = 4.90		

TABLE XVII (Continued)

Scales	N	Mean	t	df	P
Non-Violent					
1. Physical Punishment					
Rural-Small Town	17	2.34	.532	27.7	.598
City	22	2.19	.556	37.0	.581
			F = 1.98		
2. Home Environment					
Rural-Small Town	17	2.31	1.77	24.6	.087
City	22	1.90	1.89	37.0	.066
			F = 2.81		
3. Positive Rewards					
Rural-Small Town	17	3.70	.538	35.2	.593
City	22	3.57	.536	37.0	.595
4. Neighborhood Milieu					
Rural-Small Town	17	3.01	-1.30	34.4	.202
City	22	3.44	-1.30	37.0	.201
			F - 1.01		
5. Prisoner Attitudes					
Rural-Small Town	17	3.83	-.585	32.5	.562
City	22	3.93	-.593	37.0	.556
			F = 1.24		

TABLE XVIII

VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT DIFFERENCE IN MEANS
BY LIVING WITH PARENTS

Scales	N	Mean	t	df	P
Violent					
1. Physical Punishment					
Living with parents	17	2.33	.190	32.9	.849
Not living with parents	26	2.30	.193	41.0	.847
			F = 1.12		
2. Home Environment					
Living with parents	17	2.26	-0.257	41.0	.797
Not living with parents	26	2.31	-0.236	41.0	.814
			F = 2.33		
3. Positive Rewards					
Living with parents	17	3.35	-1.42	26.4	.165
Not living with parents	26	3.66	-1.53	41.0	.133
			F = 1.99		
4. Neighborhood Milieu					
Living with parents	17	3.39	2.55	40.8	.014
Not living with parents	26	2.68	2.31	41.0	.025
			F = 2.79		
5. Prisoner Attitudes					
Living with parents	17	3.72	.000	26.5	.999
Not living with parents	26	3.72	.000	41.0	.999
			F = 1.97		

TABLE XVIII (Continued)

Scales	N	Mean	t	df	P
Non-Violent					
1. Physical Punishment					
Living with parents	22	2.36	1.00	36.3	.322
Not living with parents	17	2.12	.952	37.0	.347
			F = 2.27		
2. Home Environment					
Living with parents	22	2.11	.317	36.8	.752
Not living with parents	17	2.04	.304	37.0	.762
3. Positive Rewards					
Living with parents	22	3.74	1.05	34.8	.229
Not living with parents	17	3.49	1.05	37.0	.300
			F = 1.03		
4. Neighborhood Milieu					
Living with parents	22	3.26	.046	36.5	.962
Not living with parents	17	3.25	.044	37.0	.964
			F = 2.14		
5. Prisoner Attitudes					
Living with parents	22	3.94	.654	31.7	.517
Not living with parents	17	3.82	.667	37.0	.508

the respondent lived with his parents at the time of his first convicted offense.

Summary

Significant difference in mean scores for violent and non-violent offenders within group, respectively, were not found for overall t-scores, age, race, size of town where the offender lived, and if the offender lived with his parents at the time of the first offense. It behooved the researcher to make a further analysis for between group differences based on the demographic and inventory data used to analysis within group differences. Thus, analysis of variance was utilized to test for these differences.

Analysis of Variance

Whereas a difference in means test analyzes two groups by their mean scores, analysis of variance analyzes the mean scores of several groups. For the purposes of this research, the five factored scales, of physical punishment, home environment, positive rewards, neighborhood milieu, and prisoner attitudes were used as dependent variables, while age, race, size of town (GREUP), and whether or not the offender lived with his parents (LWP) were used as independent variables. On each test, identification of violent and non-violent offender was used as an independent and third variable.

Of the twenty variance analyses computed, the critical values of F were not significant at the .05 level or the .01 level. Analysis of variance is used to determine the probability that several variable means will differ based on only sampling error (McCall, 1975). Thus, other

variations are occurring within the violent and non-violent groups as well as between them. The sum of the squares was high for each variance analysis, meaning that the squared deviations around the mean were high. The researcher therefore has deleted the onerous listing of these scores in the body of this analysis. A listing does appear, however, in Appendix C of the variance analyses for violent and non-violent groups by demographic and five scale inventory items.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In the previous section of this research focus has been centered
around the basic ideas underlying the research, the methods, and proce-
dures for carrying out the research, and the quantitative findings from
the research. This section will be directed to the discussion of the
analysis limitations of the present research, and concluding remarks on
the suggestions for further research and this study as a whole.

Discussion

In the literature review section of this research, this researcher
noted social learning theories, the notion that aggressive behavior may
be learned through several means, and that learned aggression in chil-
dren oftentimes carries over into adult life. Parental punition and
circumstances in which violence may be observed act as learning centers
for aggression whether by imitation or vicarious means (Bandura &
Walters, 1963). If aggressive or violent behavior is experienced direct-
ly (physically) or observationally by a youngster, this researcher would
expect that differences in violence trends would generally result as
adults. This investigative research produced no significant differences
between known violent and non-violent offenders based on the recollec-
tions of their childhoods. Assuming that the instrument and data

analysis used in this research are valid, support for a social learning

approach to violence that is the carrying over of childhood learned

aggression to adulthood is nit substantiated. Furthermore, scales of

home environment and neighborhood milieu proved insignificant between

violent and non-violent groups, suggesting that the concept of modeling

and imitative learning while effective for novel behaviors may, in fact,

have no consequence for long-term patterns of violence continuing into

adulthood. This researcher acknowledges the point that in any experimen-

mental design seeking recall of many years past that perception and mem-

ory are important features. Of the total number of respondents, 91.4

percent either agreed or strongly agreed that their patents loved them,

69.4 said they were an important part of their family, and 81.7 percent

said their parents treated them fairly, even when they were punished.

Concurrently, 27.9 percent said they had bruises on them after being

punished, 28.7 percent said when their parents spanked them it was hard-

er than it needed to be, 29.0 percent said they were spanked more than

their brothers and sisters, 25.0 percent said that they did not always

know the reason they were being spanked, and 35.2 percent said each

spanking by their parents seemed to last a long time. Even though the

respondents felt their parents loved them and were treated fairly, other

inventory items suggest that violence and abuse may have been present.

So the idea that learned childhood aggression, whether from parents or

the neighborhood, carried over into adult life may depend on how an indi-

vidual perceives the motivation behind exhibited aggression. That is to

say, many individuals may not recall abuse and domestic violence if they

subscribe to the notion of parental love or concern as the reason. Thus,

significant differences between violent and non-violent adults may exist

only if, as a child, a person realized abuse. Typically, society de-
fines abuse as severe physical punishment or neglect, those characteris-
tics extrinsically defined. However, what is aggressive, abusive, or
negligent and leads to "violence begetting violence" are highly variable
based on subjective perception.

Another finding of interest to this research was on the prisoner
attitude scale, 78.7 percent of the respondents said it does not hurt
children to spank them as often as two or three times a day. It is this
researcher's view that such an attitude is prevalent in American society
as a whole. This again touches on the ambiguity surrounding correction,
child abuse, learned aggression, and a factor of perception.

Finally, a third finding of this research was in the demographic
portion concerning victimology. The non-violent group in 83.7 percent
of their crimes were total strangers with their victims, while 64.7 per-
cent of the violent offenders were at least acquainted with their vic-
tims. Of the violent group percentage, 20.8 percent of the victims were
close friends or spouses. This is supportive of current literature on
victimology. Leroy Schultz (1968) has said:

> The victims of many assaults and homicides have what may be
> called an aggressive-tyrannical personality and engage in acts
> with the offender which invite or excite assaultive response.
> The victim is usually emotionally involved with the offender--
> a spouse, parent, or lover (n.p.).

However, over one-third (34.8) of the violent group said that they were
strangers with their victims. These probably constituted those offend-
ers convicted of robbery rather than assault or murder.

In this section we have looked at several findings from this re-
search and the research has provided a possible interpretation that may
be drawn from these findings. While most of the data analysis showed

little or no significance between violent and non-violent offenders, this can be considered significant, questioning some of the existing modes of thought on childhood violence and its continuance into adulthood.

Limitations

As with any research containing groups of inmates in a maximum security prison, a control problem exists. The researcher was allowed only to conduct this study with trustees. Typically, in much of the research dealing with offenders the sample populations are usually low. Thus, the assurance of a representative sample may be quite limited.

The design of a questionnaire for prison inmates seems to be another difficulty. The problem is designing questions which obtain the desired information, but which also are brief and easily understood by the inmate population can be an excessive limitation for research of this kind. The researcher sought to take care in this task, but alterations, revisions, and further testing is still needed to insure validity.

Another limitation in an investigative study such as this is that the sample population was asked to recall experiences from their childhood. For many respondents this entailed remembering events from 30 or 40 years past. Some would argue that this automatically invalidates empirically sound research. However, some theorists of memory indicate that the memory of an event, whether correct or incorrect, has more bearing on present behavior than the actual event when it occurred.

Finally, the results of this research may not be applicable to differences between violent and non-violent groups outside the scope of this study. Because of the environment which exists in a maximum

security prison, inmates may never give accurate responses to a questionnaire. The depriving nature of a prison and the "machismo" which often must be maintained among the inmates can always be an inhibiting factor for true response patterns. Further research is desirable using larger sample populations within several geographical areas, and within maximum security institutions of varying size.

Conclusion

This research is concerned with learned childhood aggression. Aspects of physical parental punition, home environment, neighborhood, milieu, positive rewards, and prisoner attitudes were studied to assess differences between known violent and non-violent offenders.

This researcher concludes from data analyses that there are no significant differences concerning childhood background and aggression as predictive agents of criminal typologies contained in this study.

It is evident in this research that social learning approach theories of human behavior may need to be reassessed for they lack explanatory power when consideration is given to perceived aggression and motivational factors behind physical punition.

It was the goal of this research to be simply investigative using a commonly accepted theory of aggression as its basis, thereby helping to substantiate or refute its precepts.

Further research might examine more thoroughly definitions of abuse, perceptions of aggression in children, and seek to better monitor the long-term effects of children as they move into adulthood. Thus, the ability to predict future aggression could be utilized to dissuade its continuance.

It is obvious then that much research remains to be done in this area. Countless studies have been conducted in the areas of deviance, prisons, corrections, and criminology. However, the majority of the literature tends to base its foundations on long-term traditional theory. New theoretical models need to be derived for a quickly changing society, to continue the expansion of understanding as rapidly as the changing world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bandura, Albert
    1973 Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis. Garden City, N.J..

Bandura, A., and R. H. Walters
    1963 Social Learning and Personality Development. New York: Holt,
        Rinehart and Winston.

Bronfenbrenner, U.
    1958 Socialization and social class through time and space.
        3rd ed. New York: Holt.

Bryan, I. H., and T. Schwartz
    1971 "Effects of film material upon children's behavior." Psycho-
        logical Bulletin 75:50-59.

Caffey, John, Frederic N. Silverman, C. Henry Kempe, Homer Venters, and
    Marth Leonard
    1972 "Child battery: Seek and save." Medical World News 13(22):
        21-25, 28, 32-33.

Campbell, D. T.
    1961 Conformity and Deviation. New York: Harper and Row.

Curtis, George C.
    1963 "Violence breeds violence--perhaps?" American Journal of
        Psychiatry 120(4):386-387.

Federal Bureau of Investigation
    1977 Uniform Crime Reports for 1976. Preliminary Annual Release.
        Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Federal Bureau of Investigation
    1971 Crime in the Unites States. Uniform Crime Reports for 1970.
        Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Fontana, Vincent J.
    1971 "Which parents abuse children?" Medical Insight 3(10):16-21.

Frank, M. (ed)
    1970 Violence and the Struggle for Existence. Boston: Little,
        Brown, and Company.

Glueck, S., and E. Glueck
    1950 Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard
        University Press.

Goode, William
    1969 "Violence among intimates." In U.S. National Commission on
          the Causes and Prevention of Violence: Task force on Indivi-
          dual Acts of Violence (ed.), Crimes of Violence 13:941-977.

Haskell, M. R., and L. Yablonsky
    1978 Criminology: Crime and criminality. New York: Rand McNally
          College Publishing Company.

Helfer, Ray E., and Henry C. Kempe
    1968 The Battered Child. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kempe, C. Henry, and Frederic Silverman
    1962 "The Battered Child Syndrome." The Journal of the American
          Medical Association 181(1):17-24.

Kerlinger, Fred N.
    1973 Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart
          and Winston Inc.

Krasner, L., and L. P. Ullmann
    1965 Research in Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart
          and Winston Inc.

McCall, Robert B.
    1975 Fundamental Statistics for Psychology. New York: Harcourt
          Brace Jovanovich Inc.

McCord W., I. McCord, and I. K. Zola
    1959 Origins in Crime: A New Evaluation of the Cambridge-
          Sommerville Youth Study. New York: Columbia University Press.

McNeil, E. B.
    1959 "Psychology and aggression." Journal of Conflict Resolution
          3:195-293.

Miller, N. E., and J. Dollard
    1941 Social Learning and Imitation. New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univer-
          sity Press.

Owens, David J., and Murray A. Straus
    1974 The social structure of violence in childhood and approval
          as an adult.   DHEW Pub. No. (ADM) 75-136. U.S. Department
          of Health, Education, and Welfare.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice
    1967 The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society. Washington, D.C.:
          U.S. Government Printing Office.

Schultz, Leroy G.
    1968 The Victim-Offender Relationship. Oakland: Alameda Co. Pro-
          bation Department, Training Office.

Sears, Robert R.
    1959 Personality theory. Monographs of the Society for Research
          in Child Development 22, Ser. No. 74:37-50.

Sears, Robert R.
    1973 Socialization and Personality Development. Reading, Mass.:
          Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Silver, L. B., C. C. Dublin, and R. S. Lourie
    1969 "Does violence breed violence?" American Journal of Psychia-
          try 126:404.

Spencer, C.
    1966 A typology of violent offenders. Research Report No. 23,
          Sacramento Research Division, Department of Corrections.

Steinmetz, S. K., and M. A. Straus
    1973 "The family as cradle of violence." Society 10(6):50-56.

Steinmetz, S. K., and M. A. Straus
    1974 Violence in the Family. New York: Dodd, Mead.

Straus, Murray
    1971 "Some social antecedents of physical punishment: A linkage
          theory interpretation." Journal of Marriage and the Family
          33(4):658-663.

Thompson, R. E.
    1957 "Further Validation of the Glueck Social Prediction Table for
          Identifying Potential Delinquents." Journal of Criminal Law,
          Criminology and Police Science 48(July-August):175.

Watson, Goodwin, and David Johnson
    1972 Social Psychology. Phildelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Zalba, Serapio R.
    1971 "Battered Children." Trans-Action 8(9/10):58-61.

APPENDIX A

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer each of the following questions as accurately as possible. The information that you give will be used exclusively for research purposes and will not be connected with your name in any way. Your response to all items in this questionnaire will be kept anonymous. Please do not put your name on this questionnaire.

The first set of questions are designed for recording your personal background.

1. Age at last birthday ___

2. What is your race?

    a. ___ Black American
    b. ___ Indian American
    c. ___ Mexican American
    d. ___ White American
    e. ___ Other

3. What is your religious preference?

    a. ___ Catholic
    b. ___ Jewish
    c. ___ Muslim
    d. ___ Protestant
    e. ___ Other
    f. ___ None

4. Which of the following best describes the place where you grew up?

    a. ___ Rural area
    b. ___ Small town
    c. ___ Small city (2,500 to 25,000 people)
    d. ___ City (25,000 to 100,000 people)
    e. ___ Large city (over 100,000 people)

5. What crime were you convicted of that resulted in your present prison term?

    a. _____

6. Who was the victim?

    a. ___ Spouse
    b. ___ Close friend
    c. ___ Casual acquaintance
    d. ___ Stranger

7. At what age were you convicted of your first crime?

    a. ___

8. Were you living with your parents at the time you were convicted of your first offense?

    a. ___ Yes
    b. ___ No

9. What crime or crimes have you been convicted of before?

a. _____
b. _____
c. _____

10. What was your occupation before imprisonment?

a. _____

11. What is/was your father's occupation?

a. _____

12. Which of the following levels of school did your father complete? (Please check the highest level completed.)

a. __ Elementary school (grades 1-6)
b. __ Middle school (grades 7-9)
c. __ High school (grades 10-12)
d. __ College (4 years)
e. __ Other   What kind? _____

13. What is your present marital situation?

a. __ Single
b. __ Married
c. __ Separated
d. __ Divorced
e. __ Widowed

14. What was your parents' marital situation when you lived at home?

a. __ Single: Father __ or Mother __ at home
b. __ Divorced: Father __ or Mother __ at home.
c. __ Separated: Father __ or Mother __ at home
d. __ Widowed: Father __ or Mother __ at home
e. __ Married: Both parents living at home

15. Did you have a step-parent?

a. __ Yes: Stepfather __, Stepmother __
b. __ No. I did not have any step-parents.

16. As a child, were there any other adult relatives besides your mother and father living in your home?

1. __ Yes. Please list them: _____
_____
_____
_____

2. __ No. No other adult relatives.

17. How many brothers and sisters did you have in your family? (Please give the number.)

a. __ Brothers
b. __ Sisters
c. __ Step-brothers
d. __ Step-sisters
e. __ Others. Who were they? _____

On the following set of questions, please mark (SD) for "strongly disagree," (D) for "disagree," (DK) for "don't know," (A) for "agree," and (SA) for "strongly agree."

While answering the questions, try and remember back to the time of your life before you were, say, 12 years old or in middle school.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18.	My parents spanked me whether I deserved it or not.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
19.	As a child, my parents would try to reason and talk over problems with me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
20.	I was spanked more by my parents than were my other friends by their parents.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
21.	My parents would listen to my explanation when I got into trouble.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
22.	When I broke something my parents would spank me without question.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
23.	My parents helped me with school work.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
24.	My parents spent some time with me every day.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
25.	I was spanked 5 or 10 times every week.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
26.	I was an important part of my family.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
27.	As a child, I had bruises after being punished.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
28.	My parents helped me with many hobbies when I was a child.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
29.	Each spanking by me parents seemed to last a long time.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
30.	My parents "went out" often in the evenings without me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
31.	My father often beat up my mother.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
32.	As a child, my parents would give me candy or treats for doing what they asked.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
33.	My parents beat up my brothers and sisters, but not me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
34.	My parents would scold me for doing something wrong.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
35.	My father bruised my mother when he beat her.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
36.	My parents loved me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
37.	My mother has gone to the hospital before, after my father beat her up.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
38.	I had fun when I was a child.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
39.	My mother often hit my father.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
40.	My parents beat all of the children in my family.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
41.	Many people I knew, as a child, broke the law.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
42.	The members of my family often hit each other.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
43.	When my parents were happy with me, they told me so.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
44.	When I saw my father hitting my mother, I felt bad.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
45.	Other adult relatives, besides my parents, lived in my home.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
46.	In my home, as a child, my parents didn't hit me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
47.	I often saw my mother hitting my father.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
48.	Where I grew up, many laws were broken.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
49.	My mother hit me more than my father.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
50.	My father would come home and hit me for no reason.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
51.	I was the only boy in my family. (I had no brothers.)	SA	A	DK	D	SD
52.	I had fist fights with many of the other children.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
53.	Playing by myself was more fun than in a group with my friends.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
54.	As a child, I kept busy working around the house.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
55.	When my parents argued, they would become angry with me and hit me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
56.	Breaking the law was common where I grew up.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
57.	I had many fist fights, as a child.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
58.	I had an older brother who often hit me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
59.	I had an older sister who often hit me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
60.	In the town where I grew up, laws were often broken.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
61.	When my parents spanked me, it was harder than it needed to be.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
62.	I was left with a baby-sitter much of the time.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
63.	My parents spanked me when I asked too many questions.	SA	A	DK	D	SD

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
64.	I liked to help my mother with chores around the house.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
65.	When my parents spanked me, I always knew the reason.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
66.	My family went on "outtings" together (camping, fishing, etc.).	SA	A	DK	D	SD
67.	I liked to help my father with chores around the house.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
68.	Besides spanking me, my parents often beat me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
69.	My parents treated me fairly, even when they punished me.	SA	A	DK	D	SD

On the next set of questions, please indicate the answer which best describes YOUR opinion.

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
70.	Physical punishment is the best way to correct a child.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
71.	When a parent spanks a child, they really don't need to give him any reason.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
72.	Trying to reason with a child is better than scolding him.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
73.	Spanking is harmful to children.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
74.	Children should be rewarded for being good.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
75.	Children deserve the spanking they receive.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
76.	Children should have a chance to explain before they are scolded.	SA	A	DK	D	SD

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
77.	To learn a lesson, a child should be physically punished.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
78.	Children will learn if they are always rewarded for doing what they are asked.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
79.	It doesn't hurt children to spank them as often as 2 or 3 times a day.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
80.	I was spanked more than my other brothers and sisters.	SA	A	DK	D	SD
81.	My mother punished me more than my father.	SA	A	DK	D	SD

APPENDIX B

VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT DIFFERENCE IN

MEAN SCORES BY RACE

Violent

		N	Mean	t	df	P
1.	Physical Punishment					
	White	23	2.39	0.909	35.1	0.369
	Nonwhite	20	2.22	0.926	41.0	0.359
				F = 1.75		
2.	Home Environment					
	White	23	2.36	0.674	40.9	0.503
	Nonwhite	20	2.21	0.665	41.0	0.509
				F = 1.45		
3.	Positive Reward					
	White	23	3.40	-1.430	35.2	0.160
	Nonwhite	20	3.70	-1.460	41.0	0.151
				F = 1.74		
4.	Neighborhood Milieu					
	White	23	2.90	-0.274	39.7	0.785
	Nonwhite	20	3.00	-0.275	41.0	0.784
				F = 1.08		
5.	Prisoner Attitudes					
	White	23	3.60	-1.110	32.3	0.272
	Nonwhite	20	3.80	-1.140	41.0	0.257
				F = 2.27		

Non-Violent

		N	Mean	t	df	P
1.	Physical Punishment					
	White	16	2.10	-1.180	36.6	0.243
	Nonwhite	23	2.40	-1.120	37.0	0.265
				F = 1.71		
2.	Home Environment					
	White	16	2.15	0.044	35.5	0.964
	Nonwhite	23	2.14	0.042	37.0	0.966
				F =		
3.	Positive Rewards					
	White	16	3.52	-0.514	33.9	0.610
	Nonwhite	23	3.65	-0.507	37.0	0.615
				F =		
4.	Neighborhood Milieu					
	White	15	2.98	-1.160	28.6	0.255
	Nonwhite	23	3.38	-1.170	36.0	0.247
				F =		
5.	Prisoner Attitudes					
	White	15	3.94	0.356	28.8	0.724
	Nonwhite	23	3.87	0.360	36.0	0.720
				F =		

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN VIOLENT AND

NON-VIOLENT GROUPS BY DEMOGRAPHICS AND

FIVE SCALE INVENTORY ITEMS

1. ID and Age by:

Physical Punishment	df	SS[1]
Explained	3	0.90
Unexplained	78	39.00
Total	81	39.90
F = 0.60		PR > F = 0.6205

Home Environment	df	SS
Explained	3	1.27
Unexplained	78	41.09
Total	81	42.37
F = 0.81		PR > F = 0.4963

Positive Rewards	df	SS
Explained	3	1.53
Unexplained	78	38.37
Total	81	39.90
F = 1.04		PR > F = 0.3815

Neighborhood Milieu	df	SS
Explained	3	3.41
Unexplained	78	84.73
Total	81	88.15
F = 1.05		PR > F = 0.3768

Prisoner Attitude	df	SS
Explained	3	0.91
Unexplained	78	25.26
Total	81	26.17
F = 0.94		PR > F = 0.3768

2. ID and Race by:

Physical Punishment	df	SS
Explained	3	1.33
Unexplained	78	38.57
Total	81	39.90
F = 0.90		PR > F = 0.4485

Home Environment	df	SS
Explained	3	1.21
Unexplained	78	41.15
Total	81	42.37
F = 0.77		PR > F = 0.5171

Positive Rewards	df	SS
Explained	3	1.09
Unexplained	78	38.80
Total	81	39.90
F = 0.07		PR > F = 0.5389

Neighborhood Milieu	df	SS
Explained	3	3.69
Unexplained	78	84.45
Total	81	88.15
F = 1.14		PR > F = 0.3400

Prisoner Attitudes	df	SS
Explained	3	1.03
Unexplained	78	25.14
Total	81	26.17
F = 1.07		PR > F = 0.3667

3. ID and Greup[2] by:

Physical Punishment	df	SS
Explained	3	0.26
Unexplained	78	39.63
Total	81	39.90
F = 0.17		PR > F = 0.9107

Home Environment	df	SS
Explained	3	2.60
Unexplained	78	39.73
Total	81	42.37
F = 1.73		PR > F = 0.1669

Positive Rewards	df	SS
Explained	3	1.04
Unexplained	78	38.85
Total	81	39.90
F = 0.70		PR > F = 0.5594

Neighborhood Milieu	df	SS
Explained	3	4.90
Unexplained	78	83.24
Total	81	88.15
F = 1.53		PR > F = 0.2111

Prisoner Attitudes	df	SS
Explained	3	0.76
Unexplained	78	25.41
Total	81	26.17
F = 0.78		PR > F = 0.5106

4. ID and LWP[3] by:

Physical Punishment	df	SS
Explained	3	0.64
Unexplained	78	39.25
Total	81	39.90
F = 0.43		PR > F = 0.7372

Home Environment	df	SS
Explained	3	0.97
Unexplained	78	41.39
Total	81	42.37
F = 0.61		PR > F = 0.6125

Positive Rewards	df	SS
Explained	3	1.79
Unexplained	78	38.11
Total	81	39.90
F = 1.22		PR > F = 0.3083

Neighborhood Milieu	df	SS
Explained	3	7.01
Unexplained	78	81.14
Total	81	88.15
F = 2.25		PR > F = 0.0882

Prisoner Attitudes	df	SS
Explained	3	0.68
Unexplained	78	25.49
Total	81	26.17
F = 0.70		PR > F = 0.5599

---

[1] Sum of squares.

[2] Size of town where offender grew up.

[3] Living with parents at first conviction.

Barry W. Hancock

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: VIOLENT AND NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS AND DIFFERENCES ON RECALLED
PARENTAL CONTROL PRACTICES

Major Field: Corrections (Sociology)

Biographical:

    Personal Data: Born in Guymon, Oklahoma, July 10, 1954, the son of
John and Vera Hancock.

    Education: Graduated from Washington-Lee High School, Arlington,
Virginia, in June, 1972; received the Bachelor of Science de-
gree in Psychology from Oklahoma State University in July,
1977; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree
from Oklahoma State University in July, 1980.

    Professional Experience: Attended and instructed seminars, Univer-
sity of Stockholm, 1974-1975; graduate assistant, Department
of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, 1980.