SOCIALIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITY SCORES OF FIRST-TERM VS. MULTI-TERM OFFENDERS

By

DAVID ERNEST MOORE II

Bachelor of Arts

Central State University

Edmond, Oklahoma

1973

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
May, 1987

SOCIALIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITY SCORES OF

FIRST-TERM VS. MULTI-TERM OFFENDERS

Thesis Approved:

Harjit S. Sandhu
Thesis Adviser

Richard Dodder

Gene Acuff

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

Harrison Gough's Socialization (SO) and Responsibility (RE) Scales were administered to 200 medium security inmates from a midwestern state correctional facility, housing approximately 600 offenders. These scales, which are extracted from the California Psychological Inventory, have been used to measure the depth and extent of delinquency and criminality. The two scales were administered in an attempt to show a relationship between the incarcerated offenders' SO and RE scores and rate of recidivism. More specifically, the information was gathered in order to determine whether or not a distinction existed between the scores of the first-term offender (first-time incarcerated) and the multi-term offender (more than one incarceration). In addition, comparisons of first-term and multi-term offenders, in relation to various sociodemographic variables are presented.

One of the problems encountered during the course of the study was that a first-term offender is, of course, not necessarily a single-term offender. An assessment tool to accurately predict, in every case, whether or not a first-term offender will be a recidivist, currently does not exist. It is probable, based on numerous studies on recidivism in recent years, that a large percentage (70% plus, nationally) of the first-term offenders in the sample will return to prison subsequent to their release. It is my contention, however, that the data gathered and the findings revealed will offer a positive contribution to the existing

body of literature concerning recidivism and the depth and extent of delinquency and criminality.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all the people who assisted me in this work and during my studies at Oklahoma State University. In particular, I am especially indebted to my major adviser, Dr. Harjit S. Sandhu, for his intelligent guidance, genuine concern, invaluable help, and eternal patience.

I am also thankful to the other committee members--Dr. Richard Dodder and Dr. Gene Acuff--for their advisement in the course of this work. Special thanks are due to Mr. Joseph Boggs, senior case manager at the facility at which the data was gathered, for programming his personal computer to randomly select the numbers of the offenders who participated in the study and for his assistance in administering the instrument.

The help of inmate Kirk Mertz, in coordinating movement of respondents to and from the area in which the instrument was administered, is also deeply appreciated. I am thankful for the unforgettable friendship, encouragement, and company of Warden Tim West, who authorized the use of the area for the research.

Special thanks are due to Bud Clark of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections Planning and Research Department. Mr. Clark provided feedback and moral support at critical times when others were not available.

My mother, with whom I stayed temporarily during the writing stage of the research; my wife Ella; and my two sons, Ashton and Ashley; deserve my deepest appreciation for their constant support, moral encouragement, and understanding. I am most grateful to my wife Ella, whose sacrifices made it possible for me to complete this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Socialization and Responsibility Scores of First-Term Vs. Multi-Term Offenders

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, a "first-term offender" is one who has been incarcerated one time only, regardless of the number of felonies for which he/she has been convicted. A "multi-term offender" is one who has been incarcerated on more than one occasion; the number of felony convictions again notwithstanding. A "socialization (SO) score" is a score derived from a scale used to measure the degree to which individuals are social or asocial with respect to interpersonal behavior. A "responsibility (RE) score" is a score derived from a scale used to measure the degree to which individuals govern their lives by reason, rule, and order (Gough, 1948).

Purpose of the Research

Studies of the factors that account for delinquent and/or criminal behavior encompass a wide range of general theoretical issues. Many plausible accounts have been offered concerning the sociological and social psychological processes involved in the production of delinquency. Numerous attempts have been made to research and evaluate the current theoretical ideas in order to determine their relevance in explaining

delinquency causation. However, comparatively little research has been conducted to show the degree to which an individual is delinquent. Moreover, there have been fewer efforts, to date, to show a relationship between the incarcerated offenders' SO and RE scores and recidivism.

Two scales which have been used to measure the depth and extent of delinquency and criminality are Gough's (1948) Socialization and Responsibility Scales. These scales were extracted from the California Psychological Inventory. Using the theory of role taking, Gough has constructed a Socialization Scale which has proved to be very successful in distinguishing individuals and groups, in terms of their socialization and delinquency. The items in this scale appear to group themselves into several rather distinctive clusters: (1) role-taking deficiency and insensitivity to interactional cues, (2) resentment against the family, (3) feelings of despondency and alienation, (4) lack of confidence in self and others, and (5) poor scholastic adjustment and rebelliousness. Gough's (1948) Responsibility Scale was developed empirically by selecting items revealing significant correlations with ratings of responsibility in several different groups of males and females. The present version of the scale includes items touching on such issues as: (1) civic responsibility, (2) self-discipline, and (3) fiscal integrity. The purpose of each scale is to predict what an individual will do in a specified context and/or identify individuals who will be described as high or low in socialization and responsibility. These aims are important, both theoretically and practically, and should be distinguished from the more common goal in inventory measurement of trait specification.

Gough (1948) found that offenders generally score lower on the Socialization and Responsibility Scales than do nonoffenders. An awareness of a consistent discrepancy which exists between the socialization and

responsibility scores of the offender and the nonoffender is significant. With this knowledge, prediction analysis could be utilized and preventive therapeutic programs directed at the delinquent candidate could be developed. Moreover, it is suggested that knowledge of a constant "gap" between the socialization and responsibility scores of the first-term offender and the multi-term offender would also provide an important contribution to the treatment of the offender. This information could be utilized into a classification risk assessment. Specifically, an individual offender's scores on the two scales could be incorporated along with other criteria into a risk assessment, in order to determine: (1) the level of supervision necessary for an incarcerated offender, (2) whether or not one should be paroled, and (3) the extent of supervision required while on parole status. In addition, appropriate programmatic needs could be identified in accordance with scores on the two scales. Finally, it was the writer's intent and purpose, in conducting this research, to attempt to provide evidence that would support the hypotheses submitted in Chapter III of this thesis.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Self in Relation to Socialization and Responsibility

Many theories of crime causation are not able to answer the valid question: Why does one individual react according to societal norms in a given situation while another reacts in a delinquent fashion? In his book Modern Corrections, Sandhu (1974) submitted that the answer to this differential reaction lies in the individual's self. Reckless (1967) identified different factors of self which cause an individual to veer away from, or toward delinquency: self-concept, images and perceptions, awareness of limited opportunity, acceptance or rejection of middle-class values, norm retention or norm erosion, techniques of neutralization of offenses, types of alienation, and acceptance or rejection of blame.

Reckless and Dinitz (cited in Reckless, 1967) attempted to find a self factor that might provide some insight into the reasons why most boys in areas with high delinquency rates do not get involved in "official" delinquency. They found that in those areas where 12-year-old boys had been nominated as "good" boys by their school teachers, a favorable perception of self had already been developed. The boys designated as "bad" boys had a poor self-concept. Four years later, the boys and their records were checked. The "good" boys stayed out of trouble, while the "bad" boys had been in juvenile court an average of three times. Reckless concluded that:

> . . . a good self-concept, undoubtedly a product of favorable socialization veers slum boys away from delinquency, while a poor self-concept, a product of unfavorable socialization, gives the slum boy no resistance to deviancy, delinquent companions, or delinquent subculture (p. 467).

The "good" boys in the study scored high on both the socialization and the responsibility scales.

According to Aichhorn (1951), a colleague of Freud, every child is at first an asocial being, in that he demands direct instinctual satisfaction without regard for the world around him. The task of rearing a child is to bring him from this asocial state to a social state. He must learn how to grow out of infantilism, restrict the immediate gratification of instinctual drives, adapt to the "reality principle" in life (that is, responsibility), and share in the general culture of his age. Redl and Wineman (1957), disciples of Aichhorn, contended that the aggressive child develops a delinquent ego and a "spotty" superego. The child very early develops hostility toward adults, fails to take over the required models of behavior, and strikes back aggressively at authority and adults in expressions of hostility. Friedlander (1947) suggested that this faculty development in the first few years of life adds up to an antisocial character structure, incapable of handling reality properly. Thus, faulty development as a child can lead to irresponsible behavior in later years.

In a study of 1,000 males to age 31, Glueck and Glueck (1968) found that only 28.0% of the delinquents could definitely be characterized as mature adults, as compared with the very considerable proportion of 67.7% of the members of the control group. Immature males were defined as infantile or childish, unrealistic, undependable, and irresponsible in all aspects of life: marriage, family relations, work, use of leisure, and so on. Half of the delinquents who were studied were still

committing crimes at age 31. Thus, lack of maturity (responsibility) and recidivism apparently go together in a large number of cases (Glueck and Glueck, 1968).

Gough (1948) made a very practical contribution to the measurement of socilization. Using Mead's (1934) concept of self and the sociological theory of role playing, Gough described psychopathic behavior as essentially "asocial." The psychopath is deficient in his role-playing ability. He is inacapable of identifying with another's point of view. Gough stated:

> The psychopath is unable to foresee the consequences of his own acts, especially their social implications, because he does not know how to judge his own behavior from another standpoint. What might be called social emotions, such as embarrassment, discomfiture, loyalty, contrition and gregariousness (group identification), are not experienced by psychopaths (p. 364).

To sociologists, the self is social (Sandhu, 1974). The self, to Cooley (1956), is not something present at the birth of an individual; it is social development after birth. The way we imagine ourselves to appear to another person is an essential element in our conceptions of ourselves. Cooley stated that "We are ashamed to seem evasive in the presence of a straightforward man, cowardly in the presence of a brave one, gross in the eyes of a refined one, and so on" (p. 174). The fact that we exhibit a different self in different social groups gives us a clue to the understanding of a delinquent's behavior (Cooley, 1956). Cooley asserted that "A gang boy must act differently when he is in his gang than when he is in the presence of his counselor" (p. 174). He also introduced the term "primary groups" and credited these primary groups with molding the individual into a social being. He called the primary groups the "nurseries of human nature." According to Mead (1934), we consolidate all of the significant persons with whom we interact into a

"generalized other"; this generalized other, in turn, is identical with the social group to which we belong.

Most sociologists consider delinquency and crime a product of the social structure and social processes (Sandhu, 1974). According to Sandhu, delinquency and crime are a property of the society.

Environmental Conditions in Relation to Socialization and Responsibility

Ever since Ferri (1896), sociologists have been calling attention to bad environmental conditions. This was echoed by Bonger (1916), who placed the blame for disproportional crime and delinquency among the proletariat on the pressures of the capitalistic system. However, the American sociologists in the 1920s pointed to conditions of social or community disorganization, rather than factors related to poverty. They became engrossed in identifying the location and characteristics of high delinquency areas of the city, specifying family disruption and conflict instead of the broken home. They called attention to the vital importance of companionship in delinquency (Aultman, 1979).

Different studies have shown a relationship between marital unhappiness, family discord, and juvenile delinquency (U.S. President's Commission on Crime, 1967). It was in the early 1930's that Shaw and McKay (1942) found that it was not so much the formal break in the home which was related to delinquency as it was the internal conflict and discord in the family. McCord, McCord, and Zolan (1959) found the quality of family life to have an important bearing on delinquency. The quality of life naturally has an important bearing on the socialization of youth. McCord and McCord (1964) also found a strong association between school failure and delinquency. They found that:

> Available evidence strongly suggests that delinquent commitments result in part from adverse or negative school experiences of some youth, and, further that there are fundamental defects within the educational system, especially as it touches lower income youth, that actively contribute to these negative experiences (p. 176).

School failure can be a devastating experience in the socialization process for youth from any class. It may also reflect one's response to their socialization--a denial of academic responsibility.

Durkheim (1933) defined the term "anomie" as a situation of normlessness where social restraints were unable to deal with the "overwhelming" ambitions of man. Anomie arises when disruption of the collective order allows man's natural aspirations to rise beyond all possibility of their fulfillment.

According to Merton (1957), when a society holds up an attractive goal for all but does not open equally the legitimate means for all to achieve that goal, it obliges certain persons or groups to resort to illegitimate means. The persons thus blocked from the legitimate channels to success goals and pressured into deviant routes "are responding normally to the social structure in which they find themselves" (Merton, 1957, p. 132). Societal norms and social restraints certainly play a significant role in the socialization process.

Another term for the breakdown in traditional norms is "social disorganization." An example is provided by Shaw and McKay (1942) in a study of community characteristics of high delinquency areas. The high delinquency areas are in the process of transition from residence to business and industry, decreasing population and the disintegration of the conventional culture and organization. When industry and business invade a community, the community thus invaded ceases to function effectively as a means of social control. Traditional norms and standards of

the conventional community weaken and disappear. There then sets in a tradition of crime and delinquency in a community, and this tradition is carried over from one generation to another. According to Shaw and McKay (1942), in the areas adjacent to heavy industry in the city of Chicago, the rates of delinquency remained relatively constant over several years, despite the successive changes in the ethnic composition of the population of the areas. Some youth are socialized by the delinquent norms of the high crime community.

Cohen (cited in Aultman, 1979), picking up the lead from Whyte's "Street Corner Society," (Aultman, 1979), contended that working class boys who turned their backs on middle-class virtues and values found the solution for their status problems in the delinquency subculture of the gang. Cloward and Ohlin (1960) proposed the theory that suburban slum boys gravitate to delinquency subcultures when they discover they do not have access to legitimate avenues of success.

Learned Behavior in Relation to Socialization and Responsibility

Around 1940, Sutherland and Cressey (1966) hypothesized that persons acquire patterns of personal behavior in the same way that they acquire patterns of lawful behavior. That is, criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in the process of communication. Sutherland and Cressey (1966) stated:

> . . . the person's associations are determined in a general context of social organization. . . . Crime is rooted in the social organization and is an expression of that social organization. A group may be organized for criminal behavior or against criminal behavior. Most communities are organized both for criminal and anti-criminal behavior and in that sense the crime rate is an expression of the differential group organization (p. 75).

According to Sutherland and Cressey (1966), when persons become criminal, they do so because of contacts with criminal behavior patterns, and also because of isolation from noncriminal patterns in that group of their membership. In other words, persons become criminals principally because they have been relatively isolated from the culture of law-abiding groups, by reason of their residence, employment, codes, and native capacities, or else have been in relatively frequent contact with a rival criminal culture. Consequently, they are lacking in the experiences, feelings, ideas, and attitudes out of which to construct a life organization that the law-abiding public will regard as desirable.

Sutherland's theory (cited in Reckless, Dinitz, and Murray, 1956) is not basically different from the one announced by Tarde (1903) 50 years earlier, which regarded criminal behavior as a product of imitation of circulating patterns. Glasser (1956) proposed differential identification as a substitute for differential association. One takes over the models of behavior from those reference groups with which one identifies. But this does not have to be face-to-face or person-to-person identification.

Several studies have tested the "fit" between operant psychology and human behavior (e.g., Bandura, 1971; Burgess and Bushnell, 1969; McGinnes and Ferster, 1971). In his work, Bandura emphasized the effect of a model's behavior on an individual who is capable of emitting imitative responses.

An important difference between traditional sociological theories of delinquency and a social learning theory of delinquency is that the generalizations of the latter are derived inductively, primarily through experimentation, while sociological theories tend to develop deductively (Conger, 1976). Essentially, operant psychology, according to Conger, is

based on the dictum that behavior is maintained by the effects it has on the environment. As situations change, behavior will change to fit new circumstances. Thus, student X may behave in an academically appropriate fashion while a teacher is present but change that behavior to chalk-throwing with classmates when the teacher leaves the room. In the first instance, the student may know that studious behavior avoids a trip to the principal's office, while in the latter case, chalk-throwing will be rewarded with laughter and approval by peers. In either instance, behavior is explained by the contingencies which maintain it rather than by "internal" personality variables.

Drawing on the work of Miller and Dollard (1941), Bandura (1971) studied the ways people use models for information about what actions are appropriate to particular situations. An observer perceives which responses produce valued ends or avoid unpleasant consequences for a model. Using those perceptions, the observer acquires the appropriate behavior for similar circumstances without actual trial and error learning. Bandura (1971) called this process "vicarious reinforcement" and concluded that it is capable of explaining the rapid acquisition of behavior. However, once behavior is acquired, its maintenance and eventual cessation follow the usual principles of operant psychology (Bandura, 1971). Further, modeling processes have their effect, not only by direct observation of the model, but symbolically as well (e.g., through visual or printed media).

Jeffrey (1965), Burgess and Akers (1966), and Adams (cited in Jeffrey, 1965) have all attempted to apply operant principles to deviant behavior. Burgess and Akers stated that criminal behavior is learned and maintained in both social and nonsocial situations which are discriminative for its reinforcement. In addition, the reinforcing stimuli which

maintain delinquent behavior may be social in nature (approval), or may be nonsocial (the acquisition of goods). The learning of specific techniques such as safe-cracking may require social interaction, but the consequences which maintain the performance of the technique may be nonsocial, as noted above. Finally, Conger (1976) stated that certain activities by deviants (engaging in specific types of verbalization) may act as avoidance procedures to escape punishment or as discriminative stimuli for criminal behavior. In the latter instance, statements which approve of law violating by particular peers may "cue" the individual that a delinquent act will meet with social approval.

Burgess and Akers (1966) also discussed the role of modeling in the acquisition of deviant actions which can be acquired from various media or by observation of another person at a distance, without close social interaction. The combination of this modeling approach, plus the basic tenets of operant psychology form the groundwork for a social learning theory.

Each of the learning theories above emphasize the social processes of differential association, imitation and identification, which socialize the youth as a delinquent or nondelinquent. Most of the learning theories postulate that behavior is learned through close interaction with significant others. Certainly, close association and strong identification with significant others during the socialization process impacts the pattern of behavior the individual establishes, whether it be responsible or irresponsible.

Personal and Social Controls in Relation to Socialization and Responsibility

In a study of Chicago delinquents who failed or succeeded on

probation, Reiss (1951) found that the relative weakness of personal and societal controls accounts for most cases of delinquency. Reiss found, however, that the personal controls had more predictive efficiency than the social controls as far as recidivism was concerned.

Nye (1958) presented evidence to show that trends toward delinquent behavior are related to four control factors: (1) direct control, which comes from discipline, restrictions, and punishments; (2) internalized control, which is the inner control of conscience; (3) indirect control, which is exerted by not wanting to hurt or go against the wishes of parents or other individuals with whom the person identifies; and (4) the availability of alternative means to goals. Direct control and the availability of alternative means to goals are part of the socialization process, whereas internalized and indirect controls reflect a propensity toward responsibility. The extent to which one is influenced by each of the control factors significantly impacts the direction an individual will take regarding delinquency or nondelinquency.

Hogan and Mookherjee (1981) conducted research on delinquency and personal versus social controls. The study was based on the responses of 486 male and female high school and introductory level university students to an exploratory test of the association between self-reported delinquency and the control concept. They found that four personal control and six social control variables accounted for 36% of the variance (with 30% of the variance being specified by the variable of deviance proneness alone).

The question that Reckless (1967) was addressing in the development of a containment theory is: Are there elements within the self and within the person's immediate world that enable him to hold the line against deviancy or to hue to the line of social expectations? The

assumption is that strong inner and reinforcing outer containment (control) constitutes an insulation against normative deviancy; that is, violation of the norm.

Reckless (1967) explained that inner containment consists mainly of self control, good self concept, ego strength, well developed superego, frustration tolerance, high resistance to diversions, high sense of responsibility, goal orientation, ability to find substitute satisfactions, tension-reducing rationalizations, and so on. Reckless termed these as inner regulations.

Outer containment, according to Reckless (1967), represents the structural buffer in the person's immediate social world which is able to hold him "within bounds." It consists of such items as a presentation of a consistent moral front to the person, institutional reinforcement of his norms, goals, and expectations, the existence of a reasonable set of social expectations, effective supervision and discipline (social controls), provision for reasonable scope of activity (including limits and responsibilities) as well as for alternatives and safety valves, opportunity for acceptance, identification, and belongingness. Such structural ingredients help the family and other supportive groups such as church, school, peers, and formal authority, contain the individual.

Reckless (1967) wrote that: "It appears as if inner and outer containment occupy a central core position in between the pressures and pulls of the external environment and the inner drives or pushes of the individual" (p. 467). Crime is seen by the containment theorist as a failure of inner and outer containment.

Strong inner containment indicates a commitment to and responsibility toward law-abiding behavior. It is the researcher's contention that the degree to which one is committed and feels a responsibility

toward law-abiding behavior, is directly related to the socialization process.

Social Bonding in Relation to Socialization and Responsibility

From an urban California county, Hirschi (1969) presented his findings, which support his social bonding theory that delinquents fail to form or maintain a bond to society consisting of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. He had theorized that delinquency would be the result of the loosening of various elements of the social bond, including attachment to a meaningful person, commitment to conventional goals, involvement in nondelinquent activities, and belief in the validity of social rules. Hindelang (1973), using a rural New York state school for his sample, replicated most of the findings from Hirschi's urban California respondents. Jensen (1972) also found that as the number of delinquent friends increases, so does the likelihood of delinquent behavior, regardles of whether one's beliefs are for or against violating the law.

Brian and Piliavin (1965) referred to Hirschi's commitment component as "stakes in conformity" (p. 35). Their findings regarding commitment are consistent with both the research by Hirschi (1969) and Hindelang (1973). For example, commitment to scholarly pursuits as measured by academic achievement is negatively related to delinquent behavior in both studies. Phillips et al. (1973) have also shown, through recent applied research, that increasing academic commitment decreases the likelihood of future delinquent activities.

Krohn and Massey (1980) examined the overall and relative effects of the elements of Hirschi's (1969) Social Bonding Theory on four separate

measures of deviance, using data drawn from a sample of 3,065 adolescents. Their findings support the theory for all four deviant behavior scales. Lyerly and Skipper (1981) administered questionnaires to a rural and an urban juvenile detention center population. The objective was to investigate both extent of delinquency involvement and degree of commitment to five institutional orders: family, church, school, peers, and formal authority. A strong inverse relationship was found between commitment and delinquency.

Finally, using data from a Youth in Transition study, Wiatrowski, Griswold, and Roberts (1981) tested multivariate models of social control which simultaneously consider how the four bond elements operate in relation to delinquency. In the context of statistical controls for ability, social class, and grades in school, the bond elements which emerge as important explanatory variables are: attachment, school, belief, and involvement. Parental attachment and school attachment were found to have a strong negative relationship with delinquency, whereas for grades the coefficient was moderately negative.

The degree of attachment/commitment to, or involvement/belief in, various elements of the "social bond" is related to an individual's response to their socialization. The loosening of these various elements is correlated, in the researcher's judgment, to the extent to which one feels a responsibility toward these elements.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Hypotheses

It is the contention of the researcher that the greater the extent of criminality that exists in an individual's experience, the lower the socialization and responsibility scores will be. Thus, it was suggested that the results of this inquiry would reveal an inverse relationship between the socialization and responsibility scores of an incarcerated offender and the number of times he had been incarcerated. An inverse relationship between the extent and degree of self-reported drug and alcohol use and the scores of the offender on the socialization and responsibility scales was also expected.

Null Hypotheses

The following are the null hypotheses for this study:

1. There will be no direct relationship between the socialization and responsibility scores of the offender and the number of times they have been incarcerated.

2. There will be no direct relationship between the extent and degree of the offenders' self-reported drug or alcohol use and their scores on the socialization and responsibility scales.

Sample

Two hundred medium security inmates from a midwestern state correctional facility, housing approximately 600 offenders, were randomly selected as the sample population. Two questionnaires had to be discarded, as they were not properly filled in, leaving a balance of 198. The institution's population consisted of first-term as well as multi-term offenders and violent as well as nonviolent offenders. The inmate population ranged in age from 18 to 64, with a mean age of 26.8. During the period in which the study was conducted, the facility was in compliance with a federal court order mandating a racial distribution of 60% Caucasion, 30% Black, and 10% other categories.

Sampling Procedure

The facility's computer system was utilized to print a numerical roster of the inmate population. From this print-out, those inmates who were listed as "trusty" status and those listed as "escape" status were deleted. The trusty status inmates were deleted since they had been assigned to service agencies outside the institution and were unavailable to participate in the research, under the same conditions, in the same environment. The obvious reason for deleting the escape status inmates is that they were inaccessible for the purpose of this inquiry.

In an attempt to achieve a purely random sample, a private computer system was employed. Each inmate in the population who had not already been excluded as a "trusty" or "escapee" was assigned a number beginning with one and continuing through whatever number the total population was on the date the numerical roster print-out was obtained. A private computer system was required for this task, in that the programming of the

state facility Department of Correction's computer could be done at department headquarters only. It could not be accomplished from the facility terminal.

Although inmates assigned to this particular institution did possess Department of Corrections registration numbers, these numbers were not necessarily consecutive. This was due to the fact that this particular facility was only one of many in the state to which inmates were sent after receiving their initial orientation and registration number. The purpose of this assignment of numbers was to make the process of programming the computer to supply random numbers an easier task. Rather than having to put 600 or so registration numbers into the computer, the computer was programmed to supply random numbers from a range of 1 to approximately 600.

Realizing that it would have been unrealistic to expect all 200 randomly selected inmates to respond positively to the research instrument, the computer was programmed to list 400 purely random numbers from 1 to approximately 600. From the 400 numbers, it was the goal of the researcher to obtain a minimum of 200 responses.

The number 400 was chosen to allow for: (1) inmates who chose not to respond, (2) inmates who transferred from the target facility prior to being requested to respond, (3) inmates who discharged or paroled from the target facility prior to an opportunity to participate in the study, and (4) duplication of numbers (since the numbers provided by the computer were to be a purely random selection). Each of the four conditions were uncontrollable, to a reasonable degree.

In order to retain the "pureness" of the sampling technique, the 200 responses desired were randomly selected from the group of 400 numbers in the following manner: First, the numbers were recorded in the order they

appeared on the computer screen. Second, the first 200 nonduplicated numbers were identified. The inmates who corresponded to these first 200 numbers were the first to be approached. If, for any of the reasons identified in the selection process, a "No Response" was recorded beside the inmates name whose corresponding number appeared on the initial list of 200, the next number listed was utilized and the corresponding inmate was approached.

Instrument of Measurement

The Socialization (SO) and Responsibility (RE) Scales from Gough's (1948) California Psychological Inventory (CPI) was used to measure the depth and extent of delinquency and criminality (Gough, 1961; Gough and Sandhu, 1964). The CPI is intended for diagnosis and evaluation of individuals, with emphasis upon interpersonal behavior and dispositions relevant to social interaction. Because the instrument is intended for the diagnosis and comprehension of interpersonal behavior, the concepts selected are those that occur in everyday social living and which arise from social interaction. The purpose of each scale is to reflect to a maximum degree some theme or aspect of interpersonal behavior, one that has clear visibility and is conceptually recognized by all people, everywhere. It is to predict what an individual will do in a specified context, and/or to identify individuals who will be described in a certain way.

The objective of the RE Scale is to identify people who are articulate about rule and order, and who believe that life is best if governed by reason. The low-scorer is seen as lazy, careless, and likely to behave in an impulsive and improvident way.

The SO Scale was originally developed to identify individuals of asocial, delinquent disposition. It has been shown to be highly valid in this function, both in the United States and in extensive cross-cultural application.

The SO Scale seeks to classify people along a continuum of socialization, proceeding from highly asocial and criminal dispositions at one end to highly socialized and rule-respecting inclinations at the other. Persons with low scores tend to be unperceptive concerning the inner needs and feelings of others, little guided by interpersonal nuances, and given to rash and precipitous behavior. High scorers are responsive to what others feel and think, are prudent, circumspect, and habitually in accord with the obligations of interpersonal life.

The combined SO and RE Scales contain 90 true and false items which can be administered either individually or in a group. The items are printed on a three and one-half page questionnaire and the letters "T" and "F" are marked immediately adjacent to the items. The subject read each item, decided whether he agreed or disagreed with what was said, and then circled the T or F for true or false. If a subject preferred not to answer certain items, he could leave them blank. Respondents were not timed.

Validation of the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) socialization scale was successfully conducted in 1948 by Gough and Sandhu (1964). In addition, numerous studies have utilized the CPI, RE, and SO scales, since its introduction by Gough in 1948. Each of the studies produced similar findings. Thus, the reliability of the instrument has been demonstrated with substantial reinforcement, since its origin.

Procedure Used to Administer the Instrument

The researcher administered the questionnaire to approximately 10 inmates per setting, two or three evenings per week, until the goal of 200 responses was achieved. Coffee and soft music were provided at each session, to enhance the cooperation of the subjects selected to participate. Participation was strictly voluntary. Classroom desks simulating the traditional classroom setting were situated in the programs area of the facility, after administrative staff had retired for the day. Brief instruction was provided prior to each session, but there was no time limit for respondents to complete the questionnaire. The researcher attempted to provide a semi-structured atmosphere, one that the inmate would feel relatively comfortable in, yet one conducive to an appropriate level of concentration. Every effort was made to hold the environmental variables reasonably constant throughout the inquiry.

Statistical Tests

The chi-square, t-test, and Product-Moment Correlation statistical methods were used to assess the relationship between the SO and RE scores of the first-term and the multi-term offender. The primary objective of the study was to determine whether or not the multi-term offender would score lower on the SO and RE Scales than would the first-term offender. Utilizing the above statistical tests, this thesis also related certain sociodemographic variables with the SO and RE scores of the first-term and multi-term offender, in an attempt to assess whether or not a relationship existed between the two scales and demographic characteristics of inmate respondents.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter contains tables which illustrate the results of the survey. Socialization and Responsibility scores are presented in relation to various sociodemographic variables. Correlations between certain sociodemographic variables of the sample population are shown. Each table is followed by a brief discussion of the significant findings.

The General Linear Models Procedure was utilized to show a relationship between the SO and RE scores of the offenders in the sample and certain attributes of prison inmates. The results are shown in Table I. The summary which follows briefly highlights the significant findings.

The Native American Indians scored lower on socialization than any other racial group represented in the sample. This may have been due to cultural differences regarding this particular group. Furthermore, it should be noted that the number of American Indians in the sample was only six. Of the four groups, the married offenders scored the highest in socialization. The singles group scored lowest in responsibility. Moreover, the respondents who claimed strong family ties scored somewhat higher on socialization than any of the other measures of family relationships represented (although surprisingly, only slightly higher than the weak ties group).

The nondrug user made a higher score, both on socialization and responsibility. As with the nondrug user, those inmates in the sample who

TABLE I

SOCIALIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITY SCORES IN RELATION TO VARIOUS SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION (N=168)

Demographic Variable	N	SO ($\bar{X}$)*	RE ($\bar{X}$)*
Race			
White	99	24.70	21.91
Black	49	24.53	22.08
Mexican American	3	25.33	22.67
Native American Indian	6	19.67	20.33
Other	2	27.50	28.50
Marital Status			
Single	76	24.05	20.30
Married (Conventional)	27	25.41	23.48
Married (Common Law)	21	23.95	24.52
Separated/Divorced	36	25.03	22.86
Family Ties			
Strong	109	24.91	22.36
So-So	31	22.48	20.06
Weak	18	24.89	23.89
Drug Use			
None	35	25.31	24.63
Marijuana	46	24.85	21.52
Hard Drugs	23	24.48	22.45
Combination	56	23.63	20.45
Drug Frequency			
Does not apply	34	25.94	24.65
Every day	69	24.67	21.43
Once a day	8	23.75	19.88
Occasionally	51	23.80	20.88
Rarely	6	24.00	21.00
Alcohol Frequency			
Never	9	26.00	25.44
Rarely	41	25.54	21.49

TABLE I (Continued)

Demographic Variable	N	SO ($\bar{X}$)*	RE ($\bar{X}$)*
Alcohol Frequency			
Occasionally	88	24.51	22.44
Chronically	30	23.13	19.40
Friends in Trouble Frequency:			
Often	38	22.80	21.26
Sometimes	98	24.80	22.26
Never	32	26.00	21.50
Incarceration as a Catalyst for Personal Change			
No Change	24	24.17	21.00
Negative Change	24	23.50	19.17
Positive Change	106	25.13	22.92
Both Negative and Positive Change	5	23.40	19.60

*Significant at the .05 level.

claimed to be nondrinkers scored higher on socialization and responsibility than did those who claimed to fall into the other three categories of the frequency of alcohol use. The chronic drinkers scored lowest on responsibility.

Again as expected, the findings of the survey revealed that those inmates who claimed to have had friends who were in trouble often, "on the street," scored lower on socialization than did those who claimed "friends-in-trouble," with less frequency. The results of the study

showed an inverse relationship between socialization scores and the frequency of reported friends-in-trouble prior to incarceration. As the number of reported friends-in-trouble increased, the socialization scores decreased.

The respondents who indicated that prison had served as a negative change agent scored the lowest, both on socialization and on responsibility. Conversely, the highest scores on responsibility and socialization were found among the group who claimed that incarceration had changed them in a positive way.

Those who are outside the mainstream of society did not score high on socialization and responsibility scales. Again, the drug abusers scored low on socialization and responsibility. Similarly, the alcohol-using offenders showed low scores on both indices, and as their abuse of alcohol increased, their socialization and responsibility indices were lowered. These findings support the reference group theory, in that those who have criminal friends generally do not subscribe to the larger society's norms. Again, those who are not well socially and are not responsible to the societal norms, do not seem to respond positively to the prison experience. Conversely, those with relatively "better" socialization and a higher sense of responsibility appear to react constructively to this experience (perhaps they "learn a lesson" from imprisonment). This implication will be discussed in Chapter V.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to show a relationship between various characteristics of the sample population. Table II shows the results. The following significant findings are based on the .05 level of probability:

The survey results revealed that as the present age reported by the respondent increased, the responsibility score increased. Moreover, as

TABLE II

CORRELATION BETWEEN VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION

SAS

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS / PROB > |R| UNDER HO:RHO=0 / NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS

	PRESAGE	EDU	PAOFFEN	AGEAR	RESPONS	SOCIAL	JUVCON	NPROB	NINCAR	TINCAR	NPAROLE	TPROB	EDUYRS
PRESAGE	1.00000	0.04420	0.23920	0.23764	0.22432	0.09164	-0.04977	-0.13909	-0.00527	0.50946	0.19418	0.08674	0.05379
	0.0000	0.5364	0.0010	0.0009	0.0017	0.2038	0.4999	0.0525	0.9417	0.0001	0.0063	0.2279	0.4540
	198	198	186	192	194	194	186	195	195	194	197	195	196
EDU	0.04420	1.00000	-0.01940	0.04014	0.05909	-0.04138	-0.03919	-0.07835	-0.04612	0.11776	0.05361	0.09890	0.10934
	0.5364	0.0000	0.7927	0.5804	0.4131	0.5667	0.5954	0.2763	0.5220	0.1020	0.4544	0.1690	0.1271
	198	198	186	192	194	194	186	195	195	194	197	195	196
PAOFFEN	0.23920	-0.01940	1.00000	-0.20218	-0.08717	0.00208	0.22445	0.19976	0.11313	0.28647	0.25375	0.15004	0.11662
	0.0010	0.7927	0.0000	0.0059	0.2420	0.9778	0.0028	0.0066	0.1262	0.0001	0.0005	0.0421	0.1149
	186	186	186	184	182	182	175	184	184	184	186	184	184
AGEAR	0.23764	0.04014	-0.20218	1.00000	0.17156	0.13118	-0.33267	-0.32525	-0.34178	-0.15077	-0.06362	-0.04188	-0.10590
	0.0009	0.5804	0.0059	0.0000	0.0186	0.0728	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0384	0.3807	0.5662	0.1459
	192	192	184	192	188	188	181	190	190	189	192	190	190
RESPONS	0.22432	0.05909	-0.08717	0.17156	1.00000	0.41309	-0.05211	-0.08658	-0.01945	0.07021	-0.03605	-0.07728	0.08485
	0.0017	0.4131	0.2420	0.0186	0.0000	0.0001	0.4848	0.2337	0.7894	0.3358	0.6187	0.2880	0.2419
	194	194	182	188	194	194	182	191	191	190	193	191	192
SOCIAL	0.09164	-0.04138	0.00208	0.13118	0.41309	1.00000	-0.13362	-0.27284	-0.20665	-0.02774	-0.03510	-0.07680	-0.02282
	0.2038	0.5667	0.9778	0.0728	0.0001	0.0000	0.0721	0.0001	0.0041	0.7040	0.6280	0.2910	0.7534
	194	194	182	188	194	194	182	191	191	190	193	191	192
JUVCON	-0.04977	-0.03919	0.22445	-0.33267	-0.05211	-0.13362	1.00000	0.48209	0.58767	0.23992	0.14091	-0.03407	0.14549
	0.4999	0.5954	0.0028	0.0001	0.4848	0.0721	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	0.0011	0.0557	0.6471	0.0488
	186	186	175	181	182	182	186	185	184	182	185	183	184
NPROB	-0.13909	-0.07835	0.19976	-0.32525	-0.08658	-0.27284	0.48209	1.00000	0.50476	0.06705	-0.04082	0.02569	0.10804
	0.0525	0.2763	0.0066	0.0001	0.2337	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000	0.0001	0.3567	0.5720	0.7236	0.1338
	195	195	184	190	191	191	185	195	193	191	194	192	194
NINCAR	-0.00527	-0.04612	0.11313	-0.34178	-0.01945	-0.20665	0.58767	0.50476	1.00000	0.26696	-0.00496	-0.07105	0.20025
	0.9417	0.5220	0.1262	0.0001	0.7894	0.0041	0.0001	0.0001	0.0000	0.0002	0.9451	0.3274	0.0052
	195	195	184	190	191	191	184	193	195	191	195	192	193
TINCAR	0.50946	0.11776	0.28647	-0.15077	0.07021	-0.02774	0.23992	0.06705	0.26696	1.00000	0.37481	0.07272	0.36771
	0.0001	0.1020	0.0001	0.0384	0.3358	0.7040	0.0011	0.3567	0.0002	0.0000	0.0001	0.3149	0.0001
	194	194	184	189	190	190	182	191	191	194	193	193	192
NPAROLE	0.19418	0.05361	0.25375	-0.06362	-0.03605	-0.03510	0.14091	-0.04082	-0.00496	0.37481	1.00000	0.40261	0.20229
	0.0063	0.4544	0.0005	0.3807	0.6187	0.6280	0.0557	0.5720	0.9451	0.0001	0.0000	0.0001	0.0046
	197	197	186	192	193	193	185	194	195	193	197	194	195
TPROB	0.08674	0.09890	0.15004	-0.04188	-0.07728	-0.07680	-0.03407	0.02569	-0.07105	0.07272	0.40261	1.00000	-0.01449
	0.2279	0.1690	0.0421	0.5662	0.2880	0.2910	0.6471	0.7236	0.3274	0.3149	0.0001	0.0000	0.8415
	195	195	184	190	191	191	183	192	193	194	195	195	193
EDUYRS	0.05379	0.10934	0.11662	-0.10590	0.08485	-0.02282	0.14549	0.10804	0.20025	0.36771	0.20229	-0.01449	1.00000
	0.4540	0.1271	0.1149	0.1459	0.2419	0.7534	0.0488	0.1338	0.0052	0.0001	0.0046	0.8415	0.0000
	196	196	184	190	192	192	184	194	193	192	195	193	196

TABLE II (Continued)

SAS

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS / PROB > |R| UNDER HO:RHO=0 / NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS

	PRESAGE	EDU	PAOFFEN	AGEAR	RESPONS	SOCIAL	JUVCON	NPROB	NINCAR	TINCAR	NPAROLE	TPROB	EDUYRS
VOCYRS	0.06293	0.05265	0.20568	-0.08330	0.05345	-0.00084	0.13989	0.13654	0.15623	0.32045	0.16539	-0.05751	0.53846
	0.3834	0.4659	0.0052	0.2545	0.4627	0.9908	0.0596	0.0719	0.0284	0.0001	0.0212	0.4294	0.0001
	194	194	183	189	191	191	182	191	192	190	194	191	193
COUYRS	0.04488	0.18649	0.21848	0.06891	0.06734	0.07135	0.01896	0.01634	0.09849	0.13148	0.15379	0.05257	0.52719
	0.5354	0.0094	0.0030	0.3474	0.3559	0.3280	0.7995	0.8229	0.1753	0.0713	0.0327	0.4713	0.0001
	193	193	182	188	190	190	182	190	191	189	193	190	192
JTINC	0.02733	0.00924	0.09769	-0.32677	0.00785	-0.13489	0.50468	0.49041	0.78883	0.25820	0.07813	-0.06117	0.22757
	0.7081	0.8994	0.1933	0.0001	0.9153	0.0664	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0004	0.2840	0.4056	0.0017
	190	190	179	185	186	186	179	188	190	187	190	187	188
RECID	-0.14763	-0.04088	-0.38948	0.21325	0.00800	0.16025	-0.33754	-0.26480	-0.28984	-0.38715	-0.48255	-0.32628	-0.22636
	0.0379	0.5675	0.0001	0.0030	0.9118	0.0256	0.0001	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0014
	198	198	186	192	194	194	186	195	195	194	197	195	196
REVOK	0.03675	0.03623	0.24430	-0.06920	-0.08469	-0.10954	0.10855	0.03542	-0.00868	0.15541	0.47670	0.29973	0.00621
	0.6100	0.6151	0.0008	0.3427	0.2441	0.1314	0.1436	0.6257	0.9047	0.0318	0.0001	0.0001	0.9317
	195	195	184	190	191	191	183	192	193	191	195	192	193
STAY	0.19501	0.11520	-0.02473	-0.12873	0.09051	-0.01814	0.12001	0.06711	0.19102	0.25647	0.20071	0.27181	0.15030
	0.0070	0.1135	0.7410	0.0808	0.2192	0.8059	0.1106	0.3615	0.0086	0.0004	0.0055	0.0002	0.0395
	190	190	181	185	186	186	178	187	188	187	190	187	188
MV	0.29927	0.15562	0.18383	-0.06762	-0.02078	-0.04939	0.14991	-0.00604	0.08382	0.25926	0.21758	0.06439	0.00664
	0.0001	0.0290	0.0123	0.3527	0.7742	0.4952	0.0417	0.9334	0.2452	0.0003	0.0022	0.3724	0.9266
	197	197	185	191	193	193	185	194	194	193	196	194	195

	VOCYRS	COUYRS	JTINC	RECID	REVOK	STAY	MV
PRESAGE	0.06293	0.04488	0.02733	-0.14763	0.03675	0.19501	0.29927
	0.3834	0.5354	0.7081	0.0379	0.6100	0.0070	0.0001
	194	193	190	198	195	190	197
EDU	0.05265	0.18649	0.00924	-0.04088	0.03623	0.11520	0.15562
	0.4659	0.0094	0.8994	0.5675	0.6151	0.1135	0.0290
	194	193	190	198	195	190	197
PAOFFEN	0.20568	0.21848	0.09769	-0.38948	0.24430	-0.02473	0.18383
	0.0052	0.0030	0.1933	0.0001	0.0008	0.7410	0.0123
	183	182	179	186	184	181	185
AGEAR	-0.08330	0.06891	-0.32677	0.21325	-0.06920	-0.12873	-0.06762
	0.2545	0.3474	0.0001	0.0030	0.3427	0.0808	0.3527
	189	188	185	192	190	185	191
RESPONS	0.05345	0.06734	0.00785	0.00800	-0.08469	0.09051	-0.02078
	0.4627	0.3559	0.9153	0.9118	0.2441	0.2192	0.7742
	191	190	186	194	191	186	193
SOCIAL	-0.00084	0.07135	-0.13489	0.16025	-0.10954	-0.01814	-0.04939
	0.9908	0.3280	0.0664	0.0256	0.1314	0.8059	0.4952
	191	190	186	194	191	186	193

TABLE II (Continued)

SAS

CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS / PROB > |R| UNDER HO:RHO=0 / NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS

	VOCYRS	COUYRS	JTINC	RECID	REVOK	STAY	MV
JUVCON	0.13989	0.01896	0.50468	-0.33754	0.10855	0.12001	0.14991
	0.0596	0.7995	0.0001	0.0001	0.1436	0.1106	0.0417
	182	182	179	186	183	178	185
NPROB	0.13054	0.01634	0.49041	-0.26480	0.03542	0.06711	-0.00604
	0.0719	0.8229	0.0001	0.0002	0.6257	0.3615	0.9334
	191	190	188	195	192	187	194
NINCAR	0.15823	0.09849	0.78883	-0.28984	-0.00868	0.19102	0.08382
	0.0284	0.1753	0.0001	0.0001	0.9047	0.0086	0.2452
	192	191	190	195	193	188	194
TINCAR	0.32045	0.13148	0.25820	-0.38715	0.15541	0.25647	0.25926
	0.0001	0.0713	0.0004	0.0001	0.0318	0.0004	0.0003
	190	189	187	194	191	187	193
NPAROLE	0.16539	0.15379	0.07813	-0.48255	0.47670	0.20071	0.21758
	0.0212	0.0327	0.2840	0.0001	0.0001	0.0055	0.0022
	194	193	190	197	195	190	196
TPROB	-0.05751	0.05257	-0.06117	-0.32628	0.29973	0.27181	0.06439
	0.4294	0.4713	0.4056	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.3724
	191	190	187	195	192	187	194
EDUYRS	0.53846	0.52719	0.22757	-0.22636	0.00621	0.15030	0.00664
	0.0001	0.0001	0.0017	0.0014	0.9317	0.0395	0.9266
	193	192	188	196	193	188	195
VOCYRS	1.00000	0.46175	0.05305	-0.21975	-0.02728	0.10540	0.03764
	0.0000	0.0001	0.4708	0.0021	0.7072	0.1511	0.6033
	194	192	187	194	192	187	193
COUYRS	0.46175	1.00000	0.03422	-0.16851	0.02527	0.02747	0.05357
	0.0001	0.0000	0.6429	0.0192	0.7286	0.7098	0.4605
	192	193	186	193	191	186	192
JTINC	0.05305	0.03422	1.00000	-0.29250	0.05642	0.20913	0.05895
	0.4708	0.6429	0.0000	0.0001	0.4419	0.0045	0.4204
	187	186	190	190	188	183	189
RECID	-0.21975	-0.16851	-0.29250	1.00000	-0.35981	-0.34745	-0.24824
	0.0021	0.0192	0.0001	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	0.0004
	194	193	190	198	195	190	197
REVOK	-0.02728	0.02527	0.05642	-0.35981	1.00000	0.04184	0.13013
	0.7072	0.7286	0.4419	0.0001	0.0000	0.5686	0.0705
	192	191	188	195	195	188	194
STAY	0.10540	0.02747	0.20913	-0.34745	0.04184	1.00000	0.19223
	0.1511	0.7098	0.0045	0.0001	0.5686	0.0000	0.0080
	187	186	183	190	188	190	189

the reported age at first arrest increased, so did the responsibility score. Thus, the older the respondent was at first arrest, the higher he scored on the responsibility scale.

The survey showed that as the number of probations or the number of incarcerations increased, the socialization scores decreased. Furthermore, as the present age reported increased, the number of affirmative responses to the question asking if the inmate was a recidivist decreased. This finding revealed an inverse relationship between age and recidivism in this sample. In addition it is interesting to note that as the number of juvenile convictions increased, or the number of times on probation increased, or the number of incarcerations, or the amount of time spent incarcerated increased, or the amount of time spent in educational programs while incarcerated increased, the number of times incarcerated decreased.

As socialization scores increased, responsibility scores also increased. Therefore, the inmates who scored high on socialization also scored high on responsibility. The number of probations was found to be directly related to the number of incarcerations. As the number of probations increased, the number of incarcerations also increased. As the amount of time spent on probation increased, the number of paroles increased, and as the amount of time spent in educational or vocational programs or counseling while incarcerated increased, the number of paroles increased. It appears that the longer one has spent on probation status, the more likely one is to be granted a parole on a subsequent incarceration. In addition, most paroling authorities require some educational or vocational training and/or counseling as a prerequisite for granting parole. Thus, achievements in these areas are not necessarily motivated by self-interest other than the desire to be paroled.

The number of past offenses were found to be directly related to the number of parole revocations. As the number of past offenses increased, the number of revocations of parole increased.

The correlation tables also yielded the means and standard deviation values of the first-termers versus the multi-termers, and are displayed for the information of the readers (Table III). While many of the correlation values of the two groups were significant at various probabilities ranging from .05 to .0001, the actual differences in the means of the two groups are not significant in actual terms. However, the first-time offenders do differ in the extent of their criminal history--their experiences of convictions, probations, and incarcerations during their juvenile years and later on during the adult period.

The Parametric Statistical Method was used to compare the scores of first-term and multi-term offenders regarding various demographic variables. The findings are presented in Table IV.

The results of the survey revealed only a slight age difference between the first-term and the multi-term offender. However, it also disclosed that the multi-term offender was more than two years younger at the time of his first arrest. Fewer juvenile convictions, juvenile probations, and juvenile incarcerations were reported among the first-term group.

There was, however, no significant difference in the educational achievement of the two groups and very little difference in the time spent in educational or vocational programs while incarcerated. Moreover, the difference in the number of reported years spent in counseling while incarcerated was negligible.

Unexpectedly, no significant difference was found in the mean scores of the two groups on socialization and responsibility, although the

TABLE III

A COMPARISON OF SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF FIRST-TERM VS. MULTI-TERM OFFENDERS USING THE PARAMETRIC STATISTICAL METHOD

Demographic Variable	First-Term Offender			Multi-Term Offender		
	N	$\bar{X}$	Std. Dev.	N	$\bar{X}$	Std. Dev.
Present Age	74	27.14	7.77	123	28.70	7.47
Education (Years) Offense	74	11.23	1.77	123	11.27	2.10
Age at First Arrest	70	17.76	8.46	122	15.46	4.02
Responsibility	72	22.53	5.35	121	21.66	4.82
Socialization	72	25.57	4.03	121	24.38	4.10
No.of Juvenile Convictions	70	1.84	1.77	115	2.85	2.01
No. of Juvenile Probations	72	0.65	1.25	122	1.03	1.53
No. of Juvenile Incarcerations	73	0.81	1.66	122	1.25	1.86
Time Incarcerated as an Adult (Years)	71	2.82	2.54	122	4.57	2.69
No. Times Paroled	74	0.09	0.29	123	0.66	0.72
No. Times on Adult Probation	72	0.71	1.54	122	1.89	1.96
No. Years in Educational Program(s)	73	0.95	1.39	122	1.30	1.09
No. Years in Vocational Program(s)	74	0.50	0.88	120	0.82	0.99
No. Years in Counseling	73	0.63	0.99	120	0.78	1.01
Juvenile Incarcerations	74	1.85	0.36	123	1.24	0.43
No. Times Parole Revoked	72	0.06	0.23	123	0.51	0.69
Average Period Between Adult Incarcerations (Years)	70	1.03	2.05	120	1.98	1.81

TABLE IV

A COMPARISON OF SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES OF FIRST-TERM VS. MULTI-TERM OFFENDERS USING THE CHI-SQUARE STATISTICAL METHOD

Demographic Variable	First-Term Offenders No.	%	Multi-Term Offenders No.	%	Total No.	%
Degree of Drug Involvement						
None	24	12.18	23	11.68	47	23.86
Marijuana	23	11.68	36	18.27	59	29.95
Hard Drugs	3	1.52	21	10.66	24	12.18
Combination	24	12.18	43	21.83	67	34.01
Total	74	37.56	123	62.4	197	100.00
X^2=0.22 df=3 P=.02						
Drug Use Frequency						
Does not Apply	21	10.90	20	10.47	41	21.37
Everyday	24	12.57	51	26.70	75	39.27
Weekly	2	1.05	7	3.66	9	4.71
Occasionally	17	8.90	41	21.47	58	30.37
Rarely	6	3.14	2	1.05	8	4.19
Total	70	36.65	121	63.65	191	100.00
X^2=11.67 df=3 P=.02						
Committed Offense Under the Influence of Drugs						
Yes	43	21.83	90	45.69	133	67.51
No	31	15.74	33	16.75	64	32.49
Total	74	37.56	123	62.44	197	100.00
X^2=4.78 df=1 P=.03						
Educational Achievement While Incarcerated						
Does not Apply	46	24.08	57	29.84	103	53.93
Took Some Training	9	4.71	16	8.3	25	13.09
Earned a Certificate	14	7.33	49	25.6	63	32.98
Total	69	36.13	122	63.87	191	100.00
X^2=8.53 df=2 P=.01						

TABLE IV (Continued)

Demographic Variable	First-Term Offenders No.	%	Multi-Term Offenders No.	%	Total No.	%
Incarceration as Preparation for Returning to the Community						
No	7	3.55	29	14.72	36	18.27
Yes, New Job Skills	9	4.57	6	3.05	25	7.61
Yes, New Social Skills	6	3.05	9	4.57	15	7.61
Yes, Understand Self Better	37	18.78	45	22.84	82	41.62
Other	6	3.05	11	5.58	17	8.63
Total	74	37.56	123	62.44	197	100.00
X^2=.55 df=5 P=.04						
Type of Community Returned to (or will be released) to						
High Crime Rate	5	2.78	25	13.89	30	16.67
Low Crime Rate	35	19.44	27	15.00	62	34.44
Medium Crime Rate	23	12.78	65	36.11	88	48.89
Total	63	35.00	117	65.00	180	100.00
X^2=21.77, df=4 P=.0002						
Vocational Training as Helpful in Returning to the Community						
No Training	22	11.58	30	15.79	52	27.37
No	5	2.63	6	3.16	11	5.79
Yes	30	15.79	37	19.47	67	35.26
Some Help	12	6.32	48	25.26	60	31.58
Total	69	36.32	121	63.68	190	100.00
X^2=10.18 df=3 P=.02						
Living Arrangement Prior to Conviction or Reconviction						
Living With Parents, Relatives	12	6.12	18	9.18	30	15.31
Living With Wife and Children	26	13.27	27	13.78	53	27.04

TABLE IV (Continued)

Demographic Variable	First-Term Offender No.	%	Multi-Term Offender N	%	Total No.	%
Living Independently	8	4.08	35	17.86	43	21.94
Living With a Girl Friend	12	6.12	22	11.22	34	17.35
Living With Other Friends	7	3.57	11	5.61	18	9.18
Other Arrangements	5	2.55	2	1.02	7	3.57
Multiple Answers	4	2.04	7	3.57	11	5.61
Total	74	37.76	122	62.24	196	100.00
X^2=13.14 df=6 P=.04						
Assisted Most Upon Release/Will be Assisted Most Upon Release by:						
Wife or Girl Friend	11	8.70	21	13.04	35	21.74
Parents or Other Relatives	11	6.83	39	24.22	50	31.06
Friends	1	0.62	7	4.35	8	4.97
Did Not Need Help	1	0.62	3	1.86	4	2.48
Received No Help	4	2.48	15	9.32	19	11.80
Parole Officer	0	0	3	1.86	3	1.86
Other	12	7.45	7	4.35	19	11.80
Multiple Answer	5	3.11	18	11.18	23	14.29
Total	48	29.81	113	70.19	161	100.00
X^2=17.17 df=7 P=.02						
Extent of Contact/ Influence of Criminal Friends Prior to Incarceration						
No Contact, No Influence	31	16.94	25	13.66	56	30.60
Contact, but No Influence	17	9.29	51	27.87	68	37.16
Contact, Influence	14	7.65	42	22.95	56	30.60
Does not Apply	3	1.64	0	0	3	1.64
Total	65	35.52	118	64.48	183	100.00
X^2=21.06 df=3 P=.0001						

first-term group did score slightly higher on each scale. A possible explanation as to why the study revealed no significant difference in the scores of the two groups when comparing the mean values, is that a first-term offender is not necessarily a single-term offender. An assessment tool to accurately predict, in every case, whether or not a first-term offender will be a recidivist, currently does not exist. It is probable, based on numerous studies on recidivism, that a large percentage (more than 70% nationally in recent years) of the offenders represented in the sample will return to prison subsequent to their release.

Again as expected, the multi-term offender group reported that they had served more incarceration time as an adult. However, the somewhat surprising finding was that the difference in the mean of the two groups was less than two years. One possible explanation for such a small difference can be found in the disparity of sentences. Some in the first-term offender group were serving long sentences for violent offenses, while some of the multi-term offenders were serving their second or third short sentences for property offenses.

As was shown in Table IV, the Chi-Square Statistical Method was utilized to compare first-term and multi-term offenders regarding various other demographic variables. The following narrative discusses the significant results revealed:

Significantly more of the multi-term offenders reported that they used hard drugs than did the first-term group. Less frequency of drug use was reported among the first-termers. More of the multi-term offenders reported that they had committed the crime for which they were incarcerated under the influence of drugs.

Significantly more multi-term offenders earned certificates of vocational training than did the first-term offenders. This finding was

anticipated, since the multi-termer had more opportunity to do so, in most cases.

The multi-term group reported that prison did not prepare them for life outside of prison. However, more of the first-termers thought that prison gave them a better understanding of themselves.

More first-term offenders returned to a low-crime community upon release to parole and more of the multi-term offenders returned to a medium-or high-crime community. More multi-termers thought that prison training programs were helpful preparation for the community. This group also earned more certificates of training while incarcerated.

Most of the multi-term offenders lived alone upon release from incarceration, while more first-term offenders lived with their wives and children. More of the multi-term group reported that they met their criminal friends in the community, and in some cases were influenced by them. The first-term group, on the other hand, reported less contact with and were less influenced by their criminal friends. Finally, the wives or girl friends provided, or were expected to provide upon release, the most assistance to the first-term offender, whereas the multi-term offender reported receiving the most assistance from parents or other relatives.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Summary

Gough's (1948) Socialization (SO) and Responsibility (RE) Scales were administered to 200 medium security inmates from a midwestern state correctional facility housing approximately 600 offenders. These scales, which are extracted from the California Psychological Inventory, have been used to measure the depth and extent of delinquency and criminality. The two scales were administered in an attempt to show a relationship between the incarcerated offenders' SO and RE scores and rate of recidivism. More specifically, the information was gathered in order to determine whether or not a distinction existed between the scores of the first-term offender (first-time incarcerated) and the multi-term offender (more than one incarceration).

A review of the literature concerning the various theories in crime causation was presented. The review included theories of: self, environmental conditions, learned behavior, personal and social controls, social bonding, and the relationship between each of these theories to socialization and responsibility. In addition, comparisons of first-term and multi-term offenders, in relation to various sociodemographic variables, were presented.

The findings of the survey, which relate to the hypotheses, included the following:

Null Hypothesis #1. There will be no direct relationship between the SO and RE scores of the offender and the number of times they have been incarcerated.

As the number of incarcerations increased, the socialization and responsibility scores decreased.

Null Hypothesis #2. There will be no direct relationship between the extent and degree of the offenders' self-reported drug or alcohol use and their scores on the socialization and responsibility scales.

The nondrug user scored significantly higher on the responsibility scale than did those who claimed other measures of the degree of involvement with drugs (marijuana, hard drugs, a combination) and other measures of the frequency of drug use (every day, once a day, occasionally, rarely). They also scored slightly higher on the socialization scale.

Those who claimed to be nondrinkers scored significantly higher on responsibility than did those who claimed to fall into the other three categories of the frequency of alcohol use (rarely, occasionally, chronically). They too scored slightly higher on the socialization scale. Thus, both of the hypotheses were supported.

Conclusions

The study supported the contention that the multi-term offender is relatively less responsible when compared to the first-term offender. It also suggested that the socialization process of the multi-term offender is generally a less positive experience than that of the first-term offender (i.e., role-taking deficiency and insensitivity to interactional cues, resentment against family, feelings of despondency and alienation, lack of confidence in self and others, rebelliousness and poor scholastic adjustment).

The results of the study revealed a direct relationship between socialization (SO) and responsibility (RE); that is, the more positive the socialization experience, the higher the sense of responsibility. The SO scale appears to be a better differentiator than does the RE scale, according to the findings of this research. The study revealed significant correlations between socialization and the number of probations, the number of incarcerations, and age at first arrest. It also revealed a significant correlation between responsibility and age at first arrest. Numerous studies have shown age at first arrest to be a strong predictor of a continuing criminal career.

The findings indicated that those who engage in delinquency at an early age, accumulating juvenile convictions and probations, tend to spend longer periods of time incarcerated and are incarcerated usually on more than one occasion. In other words, there appears to be a direct relationship between an early juvenile delinquent record and a criminal career with multiple incarcerations.

The SO and RE scores collected cast an interesting light on the incarcerated offender. Those who scored low on both the SO and RE scales were generally minority members of the society, somewhat alienated, given to excessive use of alcohol, associated with criminal friends, and not inclined to "learn a lesson" from the experience of imprisonment (i.e., prison does not serve as a deterrent against further criminal activity). Finally, the multi-term offender, as depicted in the results of this study, is also characterized by more frequent and heavier abuse of hard drugs, returning to a high crime community where they are more likely to live alone, with little or no help.

This study reinforced the previous finding of Gough (1948) and Reckless (1967). Gough contended that a delinquent or a criminal is weak in

role playing and cannot put himself in the place of his victim. Role taking is seen as a product of the socialization process. Reckless identified the importance of the factor of self in the explanation of delinquency and crime, demonstrating empirically that a favorable self-concept (also a product of socialization) insulates the individual against delinquency. Resocialization efforts, including responsible behavior, can be incorporated into educational, vocational, and interpersonal skills training programs.

Gough (1948) also found that as the age at first arrest increased, the RE score of the offender increased as well. He further found an inverse relationship between the SO score of the offender and the number of probation sentences received, the number of incarcerations served, and the age at first arrest. In other words, as the scores of the nonoffender on the SO scale increased, the above stated demographic variable decreased.

The Corrections Yearbook (1984) revealed the following demographic statistics for 1983:

1. The average age of inmates admitted to state correctional facilities throughout the United States ranged from 31 in Alaska and Nevada, to 21 in New Hampshire and 24.1 in Tennessee.

2. The average age for the 43 reporting states and the District of Columbia was 28.3, up from 26.9 in 1982.

3. The state average for male inmates was 28.1. (In 1984, the state average for males was 28.0, and in 1985 it was 28.6.)

Finally, a comparison of the racial composition of state correctional facilities (as depicted by the Corrections Yearbook, 1984) and the racial composition of the sample population in this study is displayed in Table V.

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF THE RACIAL COMPOSITION
OF STATE CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Racial Composition	State Correctional Facilities 1983	1984	1985	Sample Population 1983
White	53.2%	54.8%	54.7%	62.5%
Black	36.5%	35.8%	33.2%	31.7%
Hispanic	5.7%	6.9%	7.3%	1.9%
Native American	3.0%	1.7%	3.6%	3.8%
Other	1.6%	0.8%	1.2%	0.1%

Limitations

As with most research endeavors, this study was not without its shortcomings. It has served as a learning experience for the researcher, in that the knowledge gained from having conducted it will help to avoid succumbing to the same pitfalls in future research projects.

One limitation of the study is the fact that, while administering the questionnaires to the inmate sample population, the researcher was employed as an administrative officer at the correctional facility wherein the research was conducted. It was therefore possible to be considered a member of the administration, and as such, the researcher was viewed as someone whose authority might enhance the participating inmate's incarcerated status in some way. Moreover, the responses of the inmate participants might in some instances have been influenced by an expectation

of reciprocity. In other words, some participants may have responded to the questions according to what they perceived the researcher's desires to be in an attempt to gain favor.

A second limitation was based on the same principle as the first, self-reported information. The information obtained via the questionnaires and thus the findings of this research effort were based entirely on that which was reported by the respondents. Because approximately 25% of the participants were transferred to other facilities, discharged, or paroled within a relatively short period subsequent to completing the questionnaire, and because of the time and expense of checking records of each participant to validate their responses, and because most of the information requested was not contained in their record, a validation of responses was not conducted.

A third limitation is one involving the clarity of terminology. A first-term offender is not necessarily a single-term offender. An assessment tool to accurately predict in every case whether or not a first-term offender will be a recidivist, does not currently exist. It is probable, based on numerous recidivism studies, that a large percentage (more than 70%, nationally) of the first-term offenders represented in the sample will return to prison sometime subsequent to their release.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aultman, M. G. Delinquency causation: A typological comparison of path models. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 70, Summer, 1979, 152-163.

Bandura, A. A Social Learning Theory. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1971.

Bonger, W. A. Criminality and Economic Conditions. Boston: Little, Crown, 1916.

Brian, S. and Piliavin, I. "Delinquency, situational inducements, and commitments to conformity." Social Problems, 13, 1965, 35-45.

Burgess, R. and Akers, R. "A differential association-reinforcement theory of criminal behavior." Social Problems, 14, 1966, 128-147.

Burgess, R. and Bushnell, D. Behavioral Sociology: The Experimental Analysis of Social Process. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.

Cloward, R. A. and Ohlin, L. E. Delinquency and Opportunity. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Cohen, A. C. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang. New York: Free Press, 1955.

Conger, R. D. "Social control and social learning models of delinquent behavior, a synthesis." Criminology, 14(1), May, 1976, 26-39.

Cooley, C. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Free Press, 1956.

Corrections Yearbook. South Salem, New Jersey: Criminal Justice Institute, 1984.

deTarde, G. The Laws of Imitation (translated from the French). Gloucester, Massachusetts: Paul Smith, 1903.

Durkheim, E. The Division of Labor (translated by George Simpson). New York: Free Press, 1933.

Ferri, E. Criminal Sociology. New York: D. Appleton, 1896.

Friedlander, K. The Psychoanalytical Approach to Juvenile Delinquency: Theory, Case Studies and Treatment. New York: International Universities Press, 1947.

Glasser, D. "Criminality theories and behavioral images." American Journal of Sociology, 61, 1956, 440.

Glueck, S. and Glueck, E. Delinquents and Non-delinquents in Perspective. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Gough, H. G. "A sociological theory of psychopathy." American Journal of Sociology, 53, 1948, 364.

Gough, H. G. "An Interpreter's Syllabus for the California Psychological Inventory." (Unpublished Syllabus, University of Berkeley), 1961.

Gough, H. G. and Sandhu, H. S. "Validation of the CPI socialization scale in India." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 53, 1964, 364.

Hindelang, M. J. "Causes of delinquency: A partial replication and extension. Social Problems, 20(193), 1973, 471-487.

Hirschi, T. Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Hogan, H. W. and Mookherjee, H. N. "Delinquency and personal vs. social controls." Journal of Social Psychology, 114, 1981, 52-55.

Jeffrey, C. R. "Criminal behavior and learning theory." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 56, September, 1965, 294-300.

Jensen, G. F. "Parents, peers and delinquent action: A test of the differential association perspective." American Journal of Sociology, 78, 1972, 63-72.

Krohn, M. D. and Massey, J. L. "Social control and delinquent behavior: An examination of the elements of social bond." Sociological Quarterly, 21, Autumn, 1980, 529-544.

Lyerly, R. R. and Skipper, J. K., Jr. "Differential rates of rural-urban delinquency: A social control approach." Criminology, 19(3), November, 1981, 385-399.

McCord, J. and McCord, W. "The effects of parental role on criminality." In: Readings in Juvenile Delinquency, R. Cavan, Ed. New York: Lippincott, 1964, 176-186.

McCord, J.; McCord, and Zolan, I. K. Origins of Crime. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

McGinnes, E. and Ferster, C. B. The Reinforcement of Social Behavior. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971.

Mead, G. H. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press, 1957.

Miller, N. E. and Dollard, J. Social Learning and Imitation. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1941.

Nye, F. I. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley, 1958.

Phillips, E. L.; Phillips, E. A.; Fixsen, D. L.; and Wolf, M. M. "Behavior shaping for delinquents." Psychology Today, 7, June, 1973, 74-79.

Reckless, W. C. The Crime Problem, 4th ed. New York: Appleton, 1967.

Reckless, W. C.; Dinitz, S.; and Murray, E. "Self concept as an insulator against delinquency." American Sociological Review, 21, 1956, 745.

Redl, F. and Wineman, D. The Aggressive Child. New York: Free Press, 1957.

Reiss, A. J., Jr. "Delinquency as the failure of personal and social controls." American Sociological Review, 16, 1951, 196-206.

Sandhu, H. S. Modern Corrections. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Shaw, C. R. and McKay, H. D. Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931a.

Shaw, C. R. and McKay, H. D. Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency. (Report on the Causes of Crime.) Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, 13(II), 1931b.

Sutherland, E. M. and Cressey, D. R. Criminology, 9th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1974.

Sutherland, E. M. and Cressey, D. R. Principles of Criminology, 7th ed. New York: Lippincott, 1966.

U.S. President's Commission on Crime. Task Force Report. Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Wiatrowski, M. D.; Griswold, D. B.; and Roberts, M. K. "Social control theory and delinquency." American Sociological Review, 46, October, 1981, 525-541.

VITA

David Ernest Moore

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: SOCIALIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITY OF SCORES OF FIRST-TERM AND MULTI-TERM OFFENDERS

Major Field: Corrections

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Kansas City, Missouri, March 18, 1947, the son of Ernest W. and Muriel Moore. Married to Ella O. McAlister on August 19, 1972.

Education: Graduated from McCollum High School, San Antonio, Texas, in May, 1965; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology from Central State University in December, 1973; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1987.

Professional Experience: Employed by the Oklahoma Department of Corrections for nine and one-half years. Positions held include: Correcitonal Officer; Case Manager; Parole Board Staff Interviewer; Central Office Sentence Administration Auditor; Administrative Officer (Sentence Administration and Classification); Correctional Technology Analyst; Warden's Assistant. Employed by the U.S. Secret Service as a Special Agent during the Ford and Carter Administrations.

Publications: "The Perimeter Security Sensor Dilemma," Corrections Today, April, 1986; "Innovations in Technology Which Might Impact the Field of Corrections," (a two-volume, 153 page report which was distributed to Criminal Justice Agencies and private organizations throughout the United States and Canada).