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CHAPTER I

PURPOSE AND SETTING OF THE STUDY

Purpose

There have been practically no detailed studies of classification and screening procedures in correctional institutions. One of the very few is that by J. J. Panakal, who studied the recommendations of the classification committee at the United States Federal Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio.1 However, beside studying the recommendations of a whole staff unit or committee which screens or classifies, it is necessary to analyze the screening and recommendations of individual professional persons entrusted with this work.

Consequently, the writer felt that the reports of one of the psychiatrists in the Counselling Clinic at the Ohio Penitentiary could be profitably subjected to study. First of all, how effective were his reports in screening inmate prisoners? Secondly, what background case factors influenced his prognoses and his recommendations, in regard to custody and parole adjustment? The present study is going to shed some light on the value of this psychiatrist's reports and is going to analyze some of the factors which influenced the recommendations in those reports.

The Role of Psychiatrists in Prison

Of course, diagnostic or prognostic reporting is one of several functions which some prison psychiatrists are performing today. As

---

1 J. J. Panakal, "A Study of Classification At Admission," mimeographed by The School of Social Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1950.
early as 1923, Dr. Winifred Overholser, then connected with the Department of Mental Diseases in the state of Massachusetts and later superintendent of St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, D.C., conducted a survey to find how many psychiatric services were offered in penal institutions and in connection with courts. We present his findings on their use in penal institutions:

Questionnaires giving information concerning their use of psychiatry were returned by 259 public penal and correctional institutions of the United States.

Of these 259 public institutions, 95, or 35.9 per cent, employ psychiatrists on either a full-time or a part-time basis.

Eighty-five, or 32.8 per cent, so employ psychologists.

The practice, in 1930, or 50 per cent, of the institutions is to refer cases suspected of mental abnormality to private physicians for examination.

A favorable opinion as to the value of ascertaining the mental, nervous, and physical condition of prisoners as an aid to their classification and disposition was expressed by 129, or 50 per cent, of the institutions.

In general, psychiatry and psychology appear to be used less in penal and correctional institutions in the South and Far West than elsewhere in the country.

Of the various groups of public institutions, the reformatories report the largest proportion of psychiatrists and psychologists.

The smallest proportion of psychiatrists is reported by the juvenile institutions. This group ranks second to reformatories in proportion of psychologists.

The state prisons and county jails differ but little in the proportion of psychiatrists and psychologists reported. More of the state prisons than of the jails have full-time psychiatrists.1

Reckless points out that, "if a prison or reformatory is able to get psychiatric service, such service is mainly devoted to examination, diagnosis, and classification of inmates at admission and practically no time is available for psycho-therapy, assuming that the psychiatrist

is qualified to give it."¹ He goes on to state that some psychiatrists feel that, "an institution such as a prison or reformatory will never be able to staff enough trained workers to make any therapeutic impression on the load of inmates needing such attention and that therefore the best role for the psychiatrist is one of mental hygienist, suggesting ways and means of improving the atmosphere, the program, and the function of the staff."¹

George G. Kilinger, Chairman of the United States Board of Parole, states that one of the factors which should be carefully weighed in making selections for parole is the report of the psychiatrist. "Since studies have shown that a great percentage of persistent violators are in varying degrees mentally and emotionally unstable, it is fundamentally important that penal institutions be staffed with psychiatrists and psychologists who are able to make proper diagnosis, offer therapy; and give prognosis regarding future behavior and adjustments. At the present time a majority of the institutions (federal) are without trained psychiatrists and the work of the parole board is made much more difficult and much less effective when there is not available the results of psychiatric investigations and evaluations in each case."²


The New Penology

The experience of a century and a third with prisons and prisoners has developed a science of prisons which we now call penology, and the work of men such as E.C. Wins, Franklin B. Sanborn, Zebulon Brockway, and Gaylord Hubbell became the foundation for the progressive growth of the science during the last fifty years. Especially during the last twenty years, there has been a significant change in the attitude and ideas of our prison administrators in regard to the function, the operation, and desired results of present day penal institutions. A statement exemplifying the present day philosophy has been made by one of the country's more well known prison wardens, Dr. Walter W. Wallack.

Today there is much discussion of what is commonly called the "new penology." The basic underlying concept in the new penology is that men are sent to prison as punishment rather than for punishment. Security is still of first importance; the prison is a place wherein convicted criminals are incarcerated in order that society may be protected from their continued depredations, as well as a place wherein criminals may be protected from themselves. But such incarceration is only a means to an end. That end is the final protection of society through a change in the attitudes and behavior of prisoners. Thus, incarceration becomes classification and segregation for treatment. Treatment takes the form of case work. Penologists are confronted with the problem of what to do for individual prisoners in contrast with the old problem of what to do with them. This introduces a new approach in caring for the inmates of penal institutions which is characterized by an attempt to use "Scientific techniques." In application, these techniques involve the services of such specialists as psychiatrist, psychologist, sociologist, physician, and educator as well as administrative officers.

\[\text{1}^\text{1}\text{Harry E. Barnes and Negley K. Teeters, New Horizons in Criminology, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1943, p. 15,651.}\]
parole officers, guards, and others. There is diagnosis of
"treatment needs" after thorough study of the life history and
personality of each prisoner. A treatment prescription results.
What happens to the convict is to be in terms of some kind of
therapy which aims to reconstruct him in order that he may live
a properly adjusted life, at least free from further criminal
activity, after his release into the free community.¹

A similar statement was made more recently by Dr. Walter C.

As the modern correctional institution for adult offenders
now exists, it performs a dual function, namely, that of
protective custody and of rehabilitation of the individual.
Since most offenders sentenced to a prison or reformatory
today are going to be released within a comparatively short
period of time, the rehabilitative function of the institution
is the principal function, whereas protective detention, that
is, holding persons out of circulation for long periods of
time, is the lesser function. If the overwhelming majority
of offenders sentenced to prisons and reformatories stayed
for long periods of time and were detained for maximum periods
of for life under an indeterminate-sentence law, then the
principal function of the institution would be protective
custody rather than treatment or rehabilitation.

Because of the rather short periods of time American
offenders stay in a prison or reformatory under present laws,
with or without good-time deduction and minimum sentences,
the burden of reconditioning the human material sent to them
is squarely placed on the correctional institution. If a
prisoner is released after a short period of incarceration,
the need to improve him and prepare him to reorder his life
on the outside is much more urgent than under conditions in
which prisoners are kept for long periods. Consequently, the
modern prison and reformatory are gravitating toward becoming
rehabilitation or treatment centers rather than custodial or
isolation centers.²

¹Walter M. Wallack, Glenn M. Kendall, and Howard L. Briggs,
Education Within Prison Walls, Bureau of Publications, Teachers

²Reckless, op. cit., p. 434.
The Classification Process

"If the present day treatment of offenders is to be effective for society and at the same time build a structure which will enable future penologists to deal successfully with the problems which will be theirs, pace must be kept with the changes. In order to do this, it is necessary to develop a methodology or technique which will be flexible enough to make all the adaptations. There is little doubt but that in the past twenty years there has been developed a methodology which can meet these changes, namely, classification or screening."¹

The Committee on Classification and Case Work of the American Prison Association prepared a handbook on classification in which it states that, "if classification is to be accepted, it must among other values be shown to be a means toward more effective prison management. For nearly twenty years classification has proved to be an effective tool in the administration of penal and correctional institutions."² More and more of the enlightened administrators are constantly experimenting with various forms of classification, and it is becoming generally accepted that the process is basic to the proper use of facilities and personnel, fundamental to a rehab-


ilitative program, and necessary for a really protective penology.

"Classification represents an important trend in penology but it is not a new idea. On the other hand, it is one of the oldest elements in the concept of individualized treatment in correctional institutions."\(^1\)

"Classification of prisoners may be said to have begun with the development of imprisonment after conviction. The very process of separation of guilty from the non-guilty was in itself a process of classification of those accused of criminal behavior; the separation of debtors from criminals was a species of classification by legal status. With separation by sex and by age came separation by crime. The whole reformatory movement was an attempt not merely to separate the young from the old but to separate the serious offender from the less serious one. Different institutions were developed to care for types of individuals, who, either because of age, character or legal responsibility, were assumed to be better grouped together."\(^2\)

"Theoretically, classification means the entire process of systematically studying the individual inmate, formulating an individualized program covering custodial care, medical, psychiatric and social work treatment, education, vocational training, work, etc., that are best suited to his special needs and abilities."\(^3\)

---

1 Panakal, op. cit., p. 6.

2 The Committee on Classification and Case Work, op. cit., p. 1 ff.

3 Panakal, op. cit., p. 6, 7.
The Procedure at the Ohio Penitentiary

The classification procedure in the Ohio Penitentiary began in November, 1939, when a seven man committee of department heads and other staff members was formed in order to better decide the custody each newly admitted inmate should be afforded, and the work assignment he should have in the institution. However, routine psychiatric examinations were not conducted until eight years later when a full-time psychiatrist was assigned to the institution by the Department of Welfare.

In 1949, the state Division of Corrections, which administers all the penal facilities in the system, found it necessary to conduct a survey of the population at the penitentiary in order to be able to estimate the size of new institutions and penal installations which were being planned.1 The information needed included the approximate number of inmates in the different psychiatric categories, the kind of custody they should be given, and a prognosis of their adjustment on parole. It was felt that psychologists and psychiatrists were better fitted from the standpoint of training and background to do the job and; therefore, later that same year, a second psychiatrist and clinical psychologist (the writer) joined the original psychiatrist to complete the staff of the first psychiatric depart-

1 John H. Lammeck and Arthur L. Glattke, Ohio's Correctional Program, State of Ohio, Department of Public Welfare, Division of Corrections, Columbus, Ohio, 1950, p. 25 ff.
ment or diagnostic unit in the history of Ohio Penal Institutions.¹

The first task of the newly formed screening unit at the Ohio Penitentiary, which later became known as the Counselling Clinic, was to undertake the examination of as many of the recently admitted inmates as possible in order to determine the number of the various psychiatric types represented in the institution; to decide the degree of institutional custody each should be afforded and the prognosis of adjustment on parole of each. The screening program was carried on through the use of the individual psychiatric examination, which consisted of a private interview lasting an average of from fifteen to thirty minutes as necessity demanded, and under favorable conditions each of the three examiners was able to conduct from eight to ten interviews a day. A complete social history of each man, as gathered by the sociologist, was read carefully before each individual interview. At the close of the day, a typewritten report was made of each interview from pencil notes taken during the interview or immediately afterwards. The report was originally entitled "Admittance Psychiatric Report," but early in the program, it was changed to "Personality Evaluation," which was a more meaningful term. Five copies of the report were made, four of which were periodically distributed to the institution record office; to the paroling authority, The Ohio Pardon and Parole Commission; to the parole supervising authority, The Bureau of Probation and Parole;

¹The Counselling Clinic, Ohio Penitentiary, "First Annual Report," mimeographed at the Ohio Penitentiary, Columbus, Ohio, 1950, p. 2.
and to the office of the Commissioner of Corrections. The fifth copy remained in the files of the Counseling Clinic. All of the Personality Evaluations, were written in the same form by all three examiners and contained the same general material, including the following items:

1. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

   A. The inmate's name and institution serial number.
   B. His offense, sentence, and date of admittance.

2. SOCIAL INFORMATION

   A. Age, color, marital status, and number of dependents.
   B. Brief description of his previous criminal record.
   C. Statement of the present offense.

3. CLINICAL OBSERVATIONS

   A. His reaction to the interview situation.
   B. Apparent level of mental ability.
   C. Description of his personality in psycho-dynamic terms.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

   A. Type of custody he should be afforded in the institution.
   B. Prognosis for adjustment on parole and for permanent social adjustment.
   C. Type of sponsorship needed, his vocational preparedness, and other factors influencing the formation of a proposed parole plan.

5. PSYCHIATRIC DIAGNOSIS

   It can be noted above, that two of the items included in each personality evaluation written by the staff are a recommendation of the type of custody the inmate should be afforded in the institution, and also a prognosis of his adjustment on parole, following his

   See Appendix A for a sample Personality Evaluation.
release from the institution. In constructing the basic design
of the study, these two items were selected for evaluation,
since it was in writing these points that the examiner was directly
involved in the screening and prediction processes. A check of the
files in the office of the Counselling Clinic revealed that the
reports of the second psychiatrist contained a clear cut recommenda-
tion of institutional custody and a definite concise prognosis of
adjustment on parole more constantly, than did those of the other
two examiners, and his reports were selected for use in the study
for that reason.

Unfortunately, both psychiatrists of the original staff
eventually left state work and at the present time no full-time
psychiatric service is available in the institution. The Counselling
Clinic is now staffed entirely by psychologists, and the admin-
istration of a battery of psychological tests and measurements
has replaced the screening interview as far as newly admitted inmates
are concerned. However, the screening interview is still being
carried on with those inmates being considered for transfer to the
London Prison Farm, in order to discover if they are likely to adjust
satisfactorily in a medium to minimum security institution of that
kind. The clinical psychologist of the original clinic staff also
conducts examinations of a few men selected for special study by
the parole board each month.
CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

In order to assure that a random sample of cases would be used, it was decided that a block of three hundred consecutively done Personality Evaluations, by one of the psychiatrists attached to the Counselling Clinic at the Ohio Penitentiary, could be used for the present study. The evaluations finally selected were written between June 1, 1949 and December 1, 1949 on consecutive work days by this psychiatric examiner. (See a sample of one of the three hundred cases in the Appendix.)

Unless a large enough number of the three hundred cases selected had been paroled since the reports were written, an evaluation of the parole adjustment prognoses could not be made; therefore, it was necessary to conduct a preliminary survey in order to determine the present custody or parole status of each of the cases. A list of the institutional serial numbers of the three hundred cases was made and the status of each case was looked up in the institution Registration Ledger, which is kept in the Record Office. Upon adding the tabulations, it was found that ninety-eight men, or approximately one-third of the three hundred cases, had been paroled since being examined, and this figure was considered large enough upon which to base the study. Although, inclusion of earlier reports would no doubt have produced a larger number of men paroled, such was

---

1 See Appendix B
not possible, since the Counselling Clinic did not come into existence as a unit until late in May of that year and copies of previous reports were no longer available.

As suggested above, part of the experimental design was to record; first, the recommendations as to institutional custody and; secondly, the prognosis of the inmates adjustment on parole after his release. These two points were to be followed up by recording the actual institutional adjustment and the parole adjustment attained by each of the three hundred men. A thorough examination of the various records in the institution was made in an attempt to discover how the actual institutional adjustment could best be measured qualitatively. The number of times an inmate was cited for disciplinary action, because of both minor and major infractions of the rules, was finally selected as the measure of actual institution adjustment. A copy of the official book of rules and regulations given each new inmate was obtained, and the Deputy Warden, as the staff member directly in charge of disciplinary matters in the institution, was asked to mark which of the violations listed in the book he considered major and which ones he considered as minor ones. His selections are listed in the appendix.¹

When an inmate is released from the institution on parole, he is assigned to a particular parole officer, whose duty it is to supervise the man as long as he is on parole, or until either the officer or the

¹ See Appendix B
parolee is transferred to another parole district. Periodically, the parole officer sends a written report to the main office of the Bureau of Probation and Parole, describing his supervision of the parole and the parolee's adjustment to date. In past years, a copy of this report by the parole officer was sent to the institution from which the parolee had been released, and incorporated in the man's official records. Copies of the parole officers reports pertaining to the ninety-eight parolees involved in this study were not available, and even if they had been, it was felt that the lack of uniformity in reporting would have precluded their use. It was decided that the simplest and best way of measuring actual parole adjustment would be to determine whether each parolee was still active on parole, had been officially declared a parole violator, or had been granted a final release from supervision.

In addition to recording the number and type of disciplinary court calls and the present parole status of each man, it was decided that the other items covered by the personality evaluations should be analyzed, in order to determine what sociological factors influenced the examiner in making his recommendation as to the type of institutional custody each man should be afforded, and in making his prognosis of each man's parole adjustment. If such a determination could be made, then, certainly an opportunity for further research would be created and the process of screening, classification, and prediction might eventually be placed on a more scientific objective basis; therefore, the effectiveness greatly
improved. The items covered in each of the 500 Personality
Evaluations which were selected for analysis are as follows: age,
color, marital status, present offense, present sentence, number of
previous adult institution commitments, psychiatric diagnosis, and
the initial institution work assignment. When these items are added
to the ones already mentioned, we found we had a list of fifteen
facts of information, including the case number, to be recorded for
each case; or a grand total of forty-five hundred items.

To record forty-five hundred items by hand, on large tabulation
sheets, not only seemed impractical, but also layed the study open
to various types of human errors and mistakes. A mechanical record-
ing method of some sort seemed to be indicated; hence, arrangements
were made with the State Welfare Department's Bureau of Research and
Statistics to record the data and make the necessary tabulations,
through the use of their International Business Machine card punch-
ing equipment.

"The use of card-punching equipment for statistical research
work and for record keeping is becoming increasingly wide-spread.
Several states are now introducing punched card systems to record
uniform information on offenders, so that up-to-date statistical data
may be readily secured. It would undoubtedly be possible in many
jurisdictions for correctional personnel to secure access to punched
card machines in another state department on a part-time basis if the
volume of correctional cases does not warrant full-time use. Machine
methods make it possible to secure much more information with greater
speed and accuracy than is attainable by hand-tabulating methods. These advantages are particularly significant in prediction work, which requires a great deal of sorting and tabulating in order to secure the necessary information after the data have been gathered.  

The Bureau's Supervisor of Machine Operations was consulted at some length and the details for assembling the desired information for the machine operator was worked out. Before a punched card could be prepared, it was necessary to devise a simple but accurate method of coding the material to be recorded.  

A key punch data sheet, or "pick-off sheet", listing the fifteen items was drawn up and three hundred copies, one for each case, were mimeographed. The first of the fifteen items listed on the sheet was the case number, and each of the sheets was marked with its appropriate number from one to three hundred. Each man's institutional serial number was then stamped in the upper right hand corner of his particular sheet for ready reference and as a check against possible errors. The Counselling Clinic copy of the three hundred personality evaluation reports was pulled from the file and the information for ten of the remaining fourteen items was coded directly on the key punch data sheets. Information for the other four items, which

---


2 See Appendix C.

3 See Appendix D.
included the initial institution work assignment, custody status, parole status, and number of disciplinary court calls had to be taken from the man's individual official record folder which is kept in a vault in the institution's Record Office. This represented a problem because, of the three hundred cases being considered in the study, one hundred and seventeen had been transferred from the Ohio Penitentiary to the London Prison Farm since the personality evaluations had been written. When a man is transferred to the London Prison Farm, his official record folder is sent with him, and it first looked as though all of the one hundred and seventeen cases that had been transferred might have to be eliminated from further consideration. The writer was able to make a trip to the London Prison Farm, and in a few days time the missing information was coded and the completed key punch data sheets were delivered to the Bureau of Research and Statistics for processing.

Each International Business Machine card contains eighty columns, and for the fifteen items recorded for this study only twenty-two columns were used, leaving ample space for adding data in the future as additional research demands. The desired information was punched on the cards and the next step was the drafting of tables to be used in presenting the information in this paper. Ruled tables were constructed so that the recommended institutional custody could be compared with all of the other fourteen items (exclusive of the case number and the intellectual level.) A second set of tables was constructed so that the parole adjustment prognosis
could be compared with the same items. The three hundred punched cards were then run through the mechanical sorter and tabulator as indicated in the drafts of the tables and the appropriate totals were checked and entered in the proper space.
CHAPTER III
THE FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Custodial Recommendations and Institutional Adjustment

It may be remembered from the previous discussion concerning
the basic design of this study that it was decided to evaluate the
effectiveness of the screening procedure by first comparing the
recommended type of custody and the number of disciplinary reports.
It is admitted that in many ways these reports are not an entirely
satisfactory means of measuring actual institutional adjustment.
The "Prison-wise" inmate is often adroit at not getting himself in-
to a situation where a disciplinary report would result. Other
inmates are successful in persuading the reporting officer to tear
up the report before it is sent to the Deputy Warden for disposition.
Then too, different officers have pet rule violations for which they
will consistently report an inmate while other officers might only
rarely report an inmate for the identical violation. In spite of
these deficiencies, the use of the number and type of disciplinary
reports had to be accepted for use since it is the best, or only a
few, means to determine institutional adjustment.

When writing the Personality Evaluations used in the study, the
psychiatrist almost without exception used the words minimum, medium,
and maximum to describe the type of institutional custody he recomm-
ended. Occasionally the word "light" was used in place of minimum,
or the word "close" was used instead of maximum, but otherwise no
significant deviation from this pattern was noticed. Those several
cases in which other terminology was used were combined with those in which no recommendation appeared, and were tabulated as not given. Therefore, the terms selected to describe the custody recommendations in the table were minimum, medium, maximum and not given. The terms selected for use in describing the parole adjustment prognosis were those seen most often in the psychiatrist's reports, namely; good, fair, and poor. Here too, there were some cases in which the prognoses were stated in somewhat ambiguous language, and these likewise were combined with those cases in which no prognoses appeared, and tabulated as not given.

With this in mind, we turn now to Table I where the custodial recommendations are compared with the inmates actual institutional adjustment, as measured by the number and type of disciplinary court calls he had. It can be seen, that of the men for whom minimum custody was recommended, 81 per cent or four fifths, made a good institutional adjustment, while only 43 per cent, or slightly more than two-fifths of those for whom maximum custody was recommended, made a good institutional adjustment. This amounts to a difference of 38 per cent between the two extremes. It is noted also that only 5 per cent of the men recommended for minimum custody made a poor institutional adjustment, whereas 28 per cent of the men recommended for maximum custody made a poor adjustment. This amounts to a difference of 23 per cent between the extremes. As a group for whom medium custody was recommended, only 27 per cent actually made a fair adjustment in the institution. This percentage is somewhat lower than might be expected; for, theoretically, if the screening pro-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Adjustment</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Not Given</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good(^a)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair(^b)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor(^c)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) No major and no minor court calls
\(^b\) No major and two minor court calls
\(^c\) One major and one or more minor court calls
procedure was absolutely and perfectly efficient, 100 per cent of those men would have made a fair institution adjustment. However, that 27 per cent is larger than the percentage of men in the minimum group and smaller than that in the maximum. This same smaller and larger percentage relationship exists in all three custody classifications, in regard to all three types of institutional adjustment. The accuracy of the predictions, as suggested by the custodial recommendations of the psychiatrist, seemed to be poorest in differentiating, one from another, the men who would make fair and poor. The accuracy seemed to be fairly good in differentiating the men who would make good and poor adjustments, and was best when it came to singling out the men who made a good institutional adjustment. An analysis of all the findings in Table I indicates that, as a whole, the screening procedure at the Ohio Penitentiary is not as efficient as it might be, but that it is fairly effective at the extremes of minimum and maximum custody, and especially effective in picking out inmates who will make a good adjustment in the institution, as it is measured in this study.

**Parole Adjustment Prognoses and Actual Parole Status**

It will be recalled from earlier in the discussion, that the periodic reports of the parole officers in charge of supervising the men released on parole from the institutions were not available so that they could be used as a measure of actual parole adjustment, and therefore, the actual parole status would have to serve as such a measure. It was relatively easy to see that if a man was declared a parole violator, and ordered returned to the institution, he was
making, or rather had made, a poor or an unsuccessful parole adjustment. Also it was obvious that if a parolee had been granted a final release from all supervision without being declared a violator, he had made a successful parole adjustment. It was decided that men still active on parole should be classed as making a successful adjustment in a negative sense, in that they had not been declared parole violators or returned to any of the institutions. So it should be kept in mind that men declared parole violators are classed as having made an unsuccessful parole adjustment while men granted a final release or who are still active on paroles are classed as having made a successful parole adjustment up until the time this study was done.

Now by referring to Table II, where the parole adjustment prognoses are compared with the actual parole adjustment the men made, or are making at the present time, another view of the effectiveness of screening techniques and methods may be seen. The first noticeable fact is that of the men given a good prognosis, 42 per cent have not been paroled, but rather are still in custody. At first, this figure might seem high and thus suggest that the paroling authority is not greatly influenced by prognoses as they appear in the Personality Evaluations. However, if the table is investigated further, it will be seen that 59 per cent of the men given a fair prognosis and 71 per cent of the men given a poor prognosis have not been paroled either, but rather are still in confinement. Of those men having been given a parole adjustment prognosis of good, 46 per cent have been paroled and have made or are making a successful adjustment. Of the men in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Parole Adjustment</th>
<th>Parole Adjustment Prognosis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Fair Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Poor Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Not Given Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still in custody</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. - Includes men active on parole or granted a final release.

b. - Declared parole violators.

c. - Includes men released by expiration of sentence, returned to court and released, turned over to other authorities, transferred to Lima State Hospital or who died.
fair prognosis group, 34 per cent have been paroled and have made a successful parole, whereas only 19 per cent of the poor prognosis group have been paroled and are making a successful adjustment. There is no significant percentage difference in the number of men who have made an unsuccessful parole adjustment in the good, fair, and poor prognosis groups. It can be noted that the percentages are 6, 7, and 6 for the three prognosis groups respectively. It would have been helpful if the cases still in confinement could have been eliminated, and a new table constructed using only the cases that had been paroled. Percentages of successful and unsuccessful parole adjustment would then be more meaningful. However, this was not possible because such a small number of cases from each of the three prognosis groups had been released on parole up until the time this study was done. It must be remembered that the study cannot, in its limited scope, attempt to explain why the poor prognosis group made so few successful adjustments, or why the good prognosis group made such a higher percentage of successful adjustments. It is not as important here that fewer of the poor group were released on parole by the paroling authority, as it is that for whatever reasons there were, the group as a whole, had a smaller percentage of successful parole adjustments.

The best information that can be derived from the tables at hand, is that either the paroling authority is releasing a considerably larger number of good prognosis cases than poor prognosis cases, or else the poor prognosis group, as a whole, were committed to the institution on longer sentences than the other two groups, and therefore, not as
many of those cases have been considered by the paroling authority. Probably both factors are involved to some extent. Unfortunately, no clear statement can be made regarding the incidence of unsuccessful parole adjustments in each of the three prognosis groups, however, it does seem that a trend or tendency is indicated, showing that the good prognosis group has a better chance of being paroled, and therefore, of making a successful adjustment, than does the poor prognosis group.

Here again it appears that the psychiatrist was more efficient in prognosticating the inmates who would make a successful "go" of their parole, than he was in picking the inmates who would fail on parole.

Factors Influencing the Recommendations and Prognoses.

In turning to an analysis of the factors which influenced the examining psychiatrist in making his recommendations and prognosis, it should be pointed out again that it was standard procedure for the examiner to carefully read the institutional classification folder of each man being screened before the interview began. In this folder is a social history summary compiled by the Sociologist, which contains all the items or factors to be analyzed. It probably was inevitable that the examiner's personal prejudices, educational background, and his professional experience would cause him to have formed some preconceived notions about the man being screened before the interview began.
In looking first at the factors which had some influence on the custodial recommendations, it is noticed in Table III that the examining psychiatrist recommended minimum custody more often for the men in the 40 years and above group than in any other age category. The 34 years and under group contained a higher percentage of maximum custody recommendations than any other. This indicates that the psychiatrist felt that, generally speaking, the older an inmate was, the better he would adjust in the institution.

Table IV shows that a higher percentage of white men were placed in both the minimum and maximum custody groups, while more of the colored men were recommended for medium custody. The difference in percentages, however, was not too great and the figures probably indicate only that the psychiatrist was more sure of himself, or perhaps more discriminating in making the custodial recommendations for whites than for negroes.
**TABLE III**

**RECOMMENDED CUSTODY CLASSIFICATION AND AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Custody Recommended</th>
<th>24 and under</th>
<th>25 through 39</th>
<th>40 and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Type of Custody</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table comparing the custodial recommendations and the marital status (Table V) shows that a much higher percent of married than single men were given minimum custody; whereas, a higher percent of the single than married men were given maximum custody. It seemed that as a whole the married men were thought to have a better chance of making a good institutional adjustment.

A slightly higher percentage of men who had committed crimes against the person were classified by the examining psychiatrist for both minimum and maximum custody than were men who had committed crimes against property. (Table VI) The latter group were recommended for medium custody more often than were the first. It seems the examiner was somewhat more discriminating in his recommendations regarding persons convicted of crimes against the person, and no doubt, this was due to his personal attitudes regarding the individual offenses which included everything from non support of minor children to aggravated assault and forcible rape.
### Table V

**Recommended Custody Classification and Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Custody Recommended</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Other a</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married Number</td>
<td>Single Number</td>
<td>Other Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>31 28</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>27 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>63 58</td>
<td>60 65</td>
<td>47 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>11 10</td>
<td>22 24</td>
<td>20 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109 100.</td>
<td>92 100.</td>
<td>99 100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. - Includes divorced, separated, widowed, and men with common law marriages.
### TABLE VI

**RECOMMENDED CUSTODY CLASSIFICATION AND PRESENT OFFENSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Custody Recommended</th>
<th>Crimes against the person</th>
<th>Crimes against Property</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. - See Appendix E.*
From Table VII, it appears as if the examining psychiatrist was influenced somewhat by the length of an inmate's sentence in his recommendations for custody. The short sentence prisoners received a much higher per cent of minimum custody recommendations than the long sentence prisoners, while the reverse is true in reference to maximum custody.

Table VIII shows that prisoners serving short sentences were classified by the examining psychiatrist for minimum custody much more frequently than were those serving medium length or long sentences. A much higher per cent of men with no previous commitments than with previous commitments were recommended for minimum custody, while a much higher per cent of the inmates with previous commitments than with no previous commitments were recommended for maximum custody.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Custody Recommended</th>
<th>Length of Sentence&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> - See Appendix F.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Type of Custody</th>
<th>Number of Previous Adult Commitments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Two and Over</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IX indicates that the examining psychiatrist seemed to recommend the prisoners diagnosed by him as inadequate personalities for minimum custody much more than those diagnosed as psychopathic personalities. Of the psychopathic personality group, only 5 per cent were recommended for minimum custody; whereas, 32 per cent of the inadequate personality groups were recommended for that type of custody. Even those diagnosed as mentally deficient received a smaller percentage of the minimum custody recommendations. The inmates diagnosed as having psychopathic personalities were recommended for maximum custody as compared to 6 per cent of both the other two groups measured. It seems that from these figures, the psychiatric classification in which the examiner felt the man should be placed, markedly influenced the type of institutional custody he recommended.

Table X shows that the initial work assignment, which had been made previous to the psychiatrists examination, had very little bearing on the institutional custody that was recommended. This is true for the men assigned to Ohio Penal Industries and institutional maintenance. The men assigned to the educational program were much more lumped in medium custody recommendations than were the other two groups. This is due, perhaps, to the fact that a large proportion of the assignments in the educational program at the Ohio Penitentiary were filled by negroes who have not gone beyond the fourth grade and who are "made" to take educational assignments. We also noted that the examining psychiatrist classified negroes primarily in the medium custody group. (See Table IV).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of custody recommended</th>
<th>Psychopathic Personality</th>
<th>Inadequate Personality</th>
<th>Mentally Deficient</th>
<th>Other a</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Includes psychotic, psychoneurotic, emotionally immature, alcoholic and sexually deviated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of custody recommended</th>
<th>Institution work assignment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Penal Industries</td>
<td>Institutional Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. See Appendix G for the specific assignments included in each of the types.
In Table XI, the present custody status of the 300 cases is compared with the institutional custodial recommendations that were made by the psychiatrist at the time of the screening examination. It will be noticed first of all, that a larger percentage of men recommended for minimum custody have been paroled than those recommended for medium and maximum custody. Also a much smaller percentage of the minimum group are still confined at the Ohio Penitentiary than are those of the other two custody classifications. The percentage of men of each of the three custody groups who have been transferred to the state's medium security institution at London, Ohio is 20 per cent, 25 per cent and 17 per cent respectively. This seems to indicate that institutional custody that was recommended by the psychiatrist in his reports was not a significant factor in the transferring of men to the London Prison Farm. The table shows, however, that the recommended custody apparently was a factor in the paroling of the men involved in this study.
**TABLE XI**  
**CUSTODY STATUS**  
and  
**RECOMMENDED CUSTODY CLASSIFICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custody status</th>
<th>Recommended Custody Classification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Ohio Penitentiary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In London Prison Farm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paroled</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other¹</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. Includes men released by expiration of sentence, returned to court and released, turned over to other authorities, transferred to Lima State Hospital or who died.
The type of custody that was recommended is compared with present parole status and the actual parole adjustment of the 300 men in Tables XII and XIII. It will be remembered from the previous discussion that those men who had been granted a final release from supervision, or who were still on parole but who had not been declared parole violators, would be considered as having made a successful parole adjustment; and that those of the 300 who had been declared a parole violator would be considered as having made an unsuccessful adjustment.

In Table XIII, it is seen that the minimum custody cases had a higher percentage of successful parole adjustments than did either the medium or maximum cases. It is also noted that the minimum group included a much smaller percentage of men still in custody who had not been paroled, than did either of the other two groups. All three groups, minimum, medium and maximum included approximately the same percentage of unsuccessful adjustments. It seems that the custodial recommendations were related to release from custody and therefore indirectly to successful parole adjustment; however, there seems to be little relationship between recommended custody and unsuccessful adjustment on parole.
### TABLE XII

**Parole Status**

and

**Recommended Custody Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole Status</th>
<th>Recommended Custody Classification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still in custody</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active on parole</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted final release</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declared a violator</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a.* Includes those released by expiration of sentence, returned to court and released, turned over to other authorities, transferred to Lima State Hospital or who died.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of parole adjustment</th>
<th>Recommended Custody Classification</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still in custody</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. - Includes those released by expiration of sentence, returned to court and released, turned over to other authorities, transferred to Lima State Hospital or who died.
In considering the factors influencing the parole adjustment pro-
gnooses of the psychiatrist it will be remembered that the terms good,  
fair and poor were most often used in the reports to describe the pro-
gnooses. These are the words, then, that were selected for use in the  
tables concerned with parole prognoses.

However, before turning our attention to the individual tables, it  
is significant to note that of the total group of three hundred men  
twenty-one per cent were recommended for minimum custody, fifty-seven  
per cent for medium and eighteen per cent for maximum. Of the total  
group of three hundred only ten per cent were given a good prognosis,  
twenty-nine per cent were given a fair prognosis and fifty-three per  
cent a poor prognosis. This indicates that as a whole the psychiatrist  
felt that the group studied in the paper would adjust more satisfac-
torily in the institution than they would on parole. The examining  
psychiatrist's recommendations for custody were concentrated in the  
middle, namely, medium custody. However, his parole prognoses were  
concentrated in the poor classification. He seems to take a much dimmer  
view of a prisoner's parole adjustment than he does of the prisoner's  
institutional custody.

After looking at Table XIV it can be said that the older men were  
thought to have a better chance of making a successful parole adjust-
ment since a higher percentage of men forty years and over were given a  
good prognosis than were the men of the other two age groups. The  
younger men were given a somewhat higher percentage of poor prognoses  
than were the other two groups. It seems that the psychiatrist was in-
fluenced by the inmate's age in making his parole adjustment prognosis,
especially in making a good prognosis.

Table XV shows that approximately the same percentage of both white and colored men were given a good prognosis, and about the same percentage of both were also given a poor prognosis. Apparently race or color was not a factor which significantly influenced the psychiatrist in making parole adjustment prognoses.
TABLE XIV

PAROLE ADJUSTMENT PROGNOSIS AND AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole adjustment prognosis</th>
<th>24 and under</th>
<th>25 through 39</th>
<th>40 and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Custody</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Colored</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning marital status, the figures in Table XVI indicate that a greater percentage of married men were given a good parole prognosis than were the single men. Conversely, a much higher percentage of the single men were given a poor prognosis, indicating that the parole adjustment prognoses were influenced significantly by the marital status of the men being screened.

It is noted in Table XVII that a slightly higher percentage of men committed to prison for crimes against the person were given a good prognosis than were either the men committed for crimes against property or for miscellaneous crimes. A slightly lower percentage of the first group were given a poor prognosis. It seems that the type of crime the inmate had committed had only a slight effect on the parole adjustment prognoses the psychiatrist made.
## TABLE XVI

**Parole Adjustment Prognosis and Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole adjustment prognosis</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th></th>
<th>Other a</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Includes divorced, separated, widowed, and men with common law marriages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole adjustment prognosis</th>
<th>Present Offense a</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crimes against the person</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Crimes against Property</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. - See Appendix E.
Table XVIII shows that sixty per cent of the men serving both medium and long sentences were given a prognosis of poor while, only forty per cent of the men serving short sentences were classed in that fashion. It is also noted that a higher percentage of short sentence men were given both a fair and a good prognosis than were the men with medium or long sentences. This indicates that the length of time an inmate would probably be confined in prison, as determined by the length of his sentence, significantly influenced the psychiatrist in making his parole adjustment prognoses.

Table XIX shows that a much higher percentage of the prisoners with no previous adult institutional commitments were given a good parole prognosis than were either men who had served one previous or those who had served two or more previous commitments. The men having the most number of previous commitments were given a much higher percentage of poor prognoses than were either the men having none or one previous commitment. It appears that the psychiatrist was significantly influenced in making his parole adjustment prognoses by the length of the inmates previous criminal record as it was indicated by the number of previous adult institutional commitments.
TABLE XVIII

PAROLE ADJUSTMENT PROGNOSIS AND LENGTH OF SENTENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole adjustment prognosis</th>
<th>Length of Sentence&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> - See Appendix F.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole adjustment prognosis</th>
<th>Number of Previous Adult Commitments</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Two and Over</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen in Table XX that thirteen per cent of the prisoners diagnosed as inadequate personalities were given a good parole prognosis, while only one per cent of the psychopathic personalities and eight per cent of the mentally deficient were given a like prognosis. The first group rated a fair prognosis in forty-eight per cent of the instances, while the psychopathic personalities and mentally deficient rated a fair prognosis in nineteen and twenty-seven per cent of the instances, proportionately. A much higher percentage of the psychopathic personalities were given a poor prognosis than were either the inadequate personalities or the mentally deficient. This would seem to suggest that the personality structure of the individual, as the psychiatrist saw it, influenced the prognosis he made regarding parole adjustment, and that he expected the least of the psychopathic personalities in the way of parole adjustment.

It can be seen from Table XXI that about the same percentage of men from each of the three important work assignments classifications were given a good prognosis. Also about the same percentage of the three classifications were given a fair prognosis and a poor prognosis. Apparently the initial work assignment of the prisoners at the time they were screened had little or no effect on the parole adjustment prognosis made by the psychiatrist.
# TABLE XX

**Parole Adjustment Prognosis**
and
**Psychiatric Diagnosis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole Adjustment Prognosis</th>
<th>Psychopathic Personality</th>
<th>Inadequate Personality</th>
<th>Mentally Deficient</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes the psychotic, psychoneurotic, emotionally immature, alcoholic and sexually deviated.*
TABLE XXI

PAROLE ADJUSTMENT PROGNOSIS and INITIAL INSTITUTION WORK ASSIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole adjustment prognosis</th>
<th>Ohio Penal Industries</th>
<th>Institutional Maintenance</th>
<th>Educational</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. - See Appendix G for the specific assignments included in each of the types.
In Table XXII the present custody status of the three hundred cases is related to the parole adjustment prognoses that were made by the psychiatrist at the time of the screening examination. It will be noticed that the prisoners screened for good parole prognosis show the smallest percentage still in custody at the Ohio Penitentiary, and the largest per cent released on parole, when compared with the prisoners given fair and poor prognoses. The fair prognosis prisoners, however, make a better custodial showing than do the poor prognosis prisoners, as indicated by the smaller percentage still in custody at the Ohio Penitentiary and a higher percentage released on parole.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custody status</th>
<th>Parole Adjustment Prognosis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Ohio Penitentiary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In London Prison Farm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paroled</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. - Includes men released by expiration of sentence, returned to court and released, turned over to other authorities, transferred to Lima State Hospital or who died.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

By way of summary, it can be said that the concept of classification or screening, which is actually an attempt to objectively predict future human behavior, is fundamental to the present day science of penology. Since the process of classification is rapidly becoming a basic part of modern penological practice, there is a need to describe and evaluate the effectiveness of the techniques and methods being used in order that they may be improved. The purpose of this study is to shed some light on the screening program as it operates at the Ohio Penitentiary and to discover some of the factors which influenced that screening procedure. The screening in that institution is carried on by psychiatrists and psychologists and three hundred chronologically recorded cases of one psychiatrist were selected for use in the study. The type of institutional custody recommended and the prognosis of parole adjustment were singled out as the items to be used in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the program, and a tentative list of fifteen other items was compiled for use in determining what factors influenced the screening. The material for the study was gathered from the institutions official records, coded and recorded mechanically by machine, and tables were drafted and completed from the machine tabulations.

The examining psychiatrist, whose reports were analyzed in this study, showed a bias toward medium institutional custody and poor parole prognoses. The findings of the study, as pictured in the completed tables, would seem to be that the examining psychiatrist was able to
predict with fair accuracy the institutional adjustment, especially the
good adjustment, of prison inmates in a maximum security institution.
He was also able to do about as well in predicting later adjustment on
parole, especially the successful adjustment, although the results on
this point are not quite as conclusive. In making recommendations as to
the type of institutional custody and parole prognosis, the examining
psychiatrist was apparently influenced most by the age, marital status,
length of sentence, number of previous adult institutional commitments
and type of personality of the man he was screening. The color or race
of the individual, the type of present offense and the initial work
assignment within the institution seemed to have little effect on the
decisions that were made.

As a whole the study has shown that the screening process as de-
scribed in this paper has potentialities as a useful tool to the prison
administrators in classifying and segregating the population of correc-
tional institutions for treatment and eventual rehabilitation of the
social offender. It is possible, however, that other trained examiners,
representing other disciplines such as psychology and sociology, would
have been more or less efficient at the same level of examination and
that they would or would not have been influenced by the same case
factors in valuing custodial recommendations and parole prognoses. The
same can be said for other psychiatrists, particularly those who differ
by virtue of their school of thought and practice. Further research on
the screening performance of clinicians and professionally trained staff
in prisons needs to be made. The present study is merely a trail blazer.
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APPENDIX A

PERSONALITY EVALUATION

30598 - DOE, John

Burglary

COMMENT:

This 25 year old colored man is separated from his wife and has one dependent child. A statement of his offense indicates that he broke into a wine store. He has served two previous major commitments, one for Housebreaking & Larceny, and the other for Receiving & Concealing Stolen Property. He also was committed to a Tennessee BIS as a juvenile delinquent.

Psychometric tests indicate that this man is mentally deficient. He is low average for both mechanical comprehension and hand-eye coordination. The Minnesota Personality was given to him orally, and indicates a severe personality disorganization. Seven of the factors in the Profile exceed the top limits of normal and he goes quite high for schizophrenia and for the neurotic features.

Clinically, this man is mentally deficient and severely disorganized in respect to his personality. There is evidence of a psychosis at this time, but this is the type of mentally deficient person who may develop psychotic episodes. At the present time he is apathetic, somewhat withdrawn, and is reluctant to discuss his future plans as well as his past behavior. His parents separated during his childhood, and he was reared in an environment of low moral and social standards as evidenced by his mother, with whom he lived, taking several successive common-law husbands, while his father served a commitment for murder. He has demonstrated a defective delinquent type of behavior since early adolescence, and this has proceeded in an unabated fashion except for his periods of confinement. He seems to be sufficiently disassociated so that he is able to produce behavior with utter disregard for its acceptability, or for punishment. His judgment is defective, he cannot learn from experience, and he has little regard for the rights of others. Adjustment in custody has been satisfactory and no serious behavior problems are anticipated since institutional living may provide the necessary security for him to go for an extended period of time without experiencing any serious conflicts. The only difficulty which may be anticipated is that he may become more disorganized, and become frankly psychotic, and then exhibit any of the bizarre behavior so typical of the mentally deficient with a psychosis. His prognosis for an extra-mural adjustment is extremely poor and one may say with certainty that he will probably
re-offend regardless of the type of supervision he may have, unless he gains some insight into his mental retardation and personality deviation. Such achievement is rare in a personality of this type.

DIAGNOSIS: without psychosis.
Mental deficiency.

CUSTODY: Medium.

John R. Smith, M.D.
Psychiatrist
APPENDIX B

A. MAJOR VIOLATIONS

1. Unauthorized or contraband articles in cell or possession.
2. Allowing wrong inmate in cell.
3. Destroying or damaging State property.
4. In wrong cell.
5. Possession of lewd articles.
6. Intoxication.
7. Refusal to give name and number.
8. Manufacturing intoxicating beverages.
9. Possession or dealing in narcotics or hypnotics.
10. Lookout for gamblers, etc.
11. Escape or attempt to escape.
12. Crookedness.
13. Fighting.
15. Immoral acts.
16. Impertinence to visitors.
17. Insolence to officer.
18. Possession of knife or weapon.
19. Profanity or vile language.
20. Refusing to work.
21. Smoking out of place.
22. Stealing.
23. Carrying keys without permission from the Deputy Warden.

B. MINOR VIOLATIONS

1. Creating disturbance anywhere in institution.
2. Wrong number on clothing.
3. Agitating trouble or quarreling.
4. Possession of stolen property.
5. Carrying food from Dining Room.
6. Improperly clothed.
7. Altering State clothing.
8. Washing State clothing.
9. Giving, loaning, trading or selling any articles with value of more than 15¢ without permission of Deputy Warden.
10. Painting cell.
11. Breaking seal on radio.
12. Working on radio in quarters.
13. Connecting radio to light circuit.
14. Having radio hook-up from more than one cell away.
15. More than two adult canary birds.
16. When coat is not worn, top button of shirt will be unbuttoned.
17. Blaring radio.
18. Clothing not in proper order.
19. Communications by note or sign.
20. Dirty cell or furnishings.
22. Inattentive in line, work or school.
23. Lying.
24. Malicious mischief.
25. Music hour violation.
26. Not at the foot of bed and dressed for dormitory count.
27. Not at door and dressed for cell count.
28. Not promptly out of cell on signal.
29. Out of place in shop, line or block.
30. Spitting on floor.
31. Talking in line, School, Chapel, or Block.
32. Wasting food.
33. Writing rules violated.
34. Smoking in bed.
35. Violation of rules of department where assigned.
APPENDIX C

THE CODING TABLE INDEX

In order to record the data gathered for use in this study, it was necessary to code the factors on a "pick-off sheet" in each of the three hundred cases (see Appendix D.). The three hundred "pick-off sheets" or "key punch data sheets" were taken to the Bureau of Research and Statistics, Ohio State Department of Public Welfare, where the information was punched on International Business Machine tabulation cards. Each card has on it eighty columns, each column having under it ten positions. Usually the factors to be tabulated have no more than ten or less sub-divisions or categories, thus allowing for the recording of eighty different factors. Occasionally, however, as in this study, some of the factors have more than ten sub-divisions, in which two or more columns must be utilized in recording that particular factor. In this study, twenty-two columns were used to record fifteen items or factors. The fifteen factors and their sub-divisions are listed below. The number of the columns used in recording each factor appears in parenthesis after the title of that particular factor. Figures appearing at the extreme left, designate the sub-divisions of the various factors and the words in the center indicate the name of the sub-divisions.
Case Number. (1-5)

Actual case number from 001 to 300

Age. (4-5)

Actual age from 00 to 99

Color (6)

0. White
1. Colored
2. Other
3. Not given

Marital Status (7)

0. Married
1. Single
2. Divorced
3. Separated
4. Widowed
5. Common law
6. Not given

Present Offense (8-9)

0. Homicide
1. Aggravated assault
2. Other assault
3. Rape
4. Other sex offenses
5. Crimes against the family and/or children
6. Robbery
7. Burglary - breaking and entering
8. Larceny
9. Auto theft
10. Forgery
11. Fraud and embezzlement
12. Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc.
13. Stolen property; buying, receiving, concealing, etc.
14. Other
15. Not given

Present Sentence (10-15)

Actual sentence from a minimum of 0 years to a maximum of 99 years and from a minimum of 99 years to a maximum of 99 years. A life sentence was indicated by a code of 9999.
Number of Previous Adult Institutional Commitments (14)

Actual number of commitments from 0 to 9

Intellectual level (15)

0. Mentally deficient
1. Borderline mentally deficient
2. Dull normal
3. Normal
4. Bright normal
5. Superior
6. Not given

Psychiatric Diagnosis (16)

0. Psychotic
1. Psychoneurotic
2. Psychopathic
3. Emotionally immature
4. Inadequate
5. Alcoholic
6. Sexually deviated
7. Mentally deficient
8. Other
9. Not given

Initial Institution Work Assignment (17)

0. Ohio Penal Industries
1. Institutional maintenance
2. Clerical, hospital
3. Educational
4. Idle
5. Other
6. Not given

Custody Status (19)

0. In Ohio Penitentiary
1. In London Prison Farm
2. In Lima State Hospital
3. Paroled
4. Other
5. Not given

---

The data was recorded for this factor but was not used in the study.
Parole Status (19)

0. Still in custody
1. Active on parole
2. Declared parole violator
3. Granted final release
4. Other
5. Not given

Institutional Adjustment Prognosis (20)

0. Good
1. Fair
2. Poor
3. Not given

Parole Adjustment Prognosis (21)

0. Good
1. Fair
2. Poor
3. Not given

Disciplinary Court Calls (22)

0. No major and no minor
1. No major and one minor
2. No major and two minors
3. One major and no minors
4. One major and one or more minors
5. Two majors and one or more minors
## APPENDIX D

### KEY PUNCH DATA SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSRIAL NUMBER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COLUMN</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASE NUMBER</td>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLOR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARITAL STATUS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT OFFENSE</td>
<td>8 - 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT SENTENCE</td>
<td>10 - 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF PREVIOUS ADULT COMMITMENTS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLECTUAL LEVEL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHIATRIC DIAGNOSIS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL INSTITUTION WORK ASSIGNMENT</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTODY STATUS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAROLE STATUS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT PROGNOSIS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAROLE ADJUSTMENT PROGNOSIS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCIPLINARY COURT CALLS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAROLE ADJUSTMENT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATORS CHECK</td>
<td>24 - 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E
CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENSES

The State Department of Public Welfare, through its Bureau of Research and Statistics, carries on a program of uniform reporting of crimes committed in Ohio. The classification of offenses listed below is a modification of the one used by the Bureau in that program.

A. CRIMES AGAINST THE PERSON

1. Criminal Homicide. - Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter includes all wilful felonious homicides as distinguished from deaths caused by negligence.

2. Aggravated Assault. - Includes assaults with intent to kill; assault by shooting, cutting, stabbing, maiming, poisoning, scalding, or by the use of acids.

3. Other Assaults. - Includes all assaults and attempted assaults which are not of an aggravated nature.

4. Rape. - Includes forcible rape, statutory rape (no force used -- victim under age of consent), assault to rape, and attempted rape.

5. Sex Offenses. - Includes offenses against chastity, common decency, morlas, and the like. Includes attempts.

6. Offenses Against the Family and Children. - Includes offenses of nonsupport, neglect, desertion, or abuse of family and children.

7. Robbery. - Includes stealing or taking anything of value from the person by force or violence or by putting in fear, such as strong-arm robbery, stick-ups, robbery armed. Includes assault to rob and attempt to rob.
B. CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY

1. **Burglary - Breaking or Entering.** - Includes burglary, housebreaking, safecracking, or any unlawful entry to commit a felony or a theft, even though no force was used to gain entrance. Includes attempts. Burglary followed by larceny is included in this classification and not counted again as larceny.

2. **Larceny - Theft (Except Auto Theft).** - Fifty dollars and over in value; under $50 in value. Includes in one of the above subclassifications, depending upon the value of the property stolen, thefts of bicycles, automobile accessories, shoplifting, pocket-picking, or any stealing of property or article of value which is not taken by force and violence or by fraud.

3. **Auto Theft.** - Includes all cases where a motor vehicle is stolen or driven away and abandoned, including the so-called joy-riding thefts.

4. **Forgery.** - Includes offenses dealing with the making, altering, uttering, or possessing, with intent to defraud, anything false which is made to appear true. Includes attempts.

5. **Embezzlement and Fraud.** - Includes all offenses of fraudulent conversion, embezzlement, and obtaining money or property by false pretenses.

6. **Stolen Property.** - Includes buying, receiving, and possessing stolen property as well as attempts to commit any of those offenses.

7. **Weapons.** - Includes all violations of regulations or statutes controlling the carrying, using, possessing, furnishing, and manufacturing of deadly weapons or silencers and all attempts to violate such statutes or regulations.

C. OTHER CRIMES

1. All crimes which do not come under one of the above classifications.
APPENDIX F

LENGTH OF SENTENCE CLASSIFICATION

A. SHORT

1. Minimum sentences from zero to one year, with a maximum of ten years or less.

B. MEDIUM

1. Minimum sentences from one to four years, with a maximum of from eleven to twenty years.

C. LONG

1. Minimum sentences of five or more years with a maximum of from twenty one years to life.
APPENDIX G

INSTITUTIONAL WORK ASSIGNMENT CLASSIFICATION

The Ohio Penitentiary operates under the so called "state use" system, in which products manufactured within the institution can be sold only to other departments in the institution, other institutions or other divisions and sub-divisions of the state government. The Administrative unit within the Department of Public Welfare, which procures raw materials and supervises the manufacture and sale of the products in penal institutions throughout the state, is entitled the Ohio Penal Industries Division.

A. OHIO PENAL INDUSTRIES

1. Cotton mill
2. Knitting mill
3. Woolen mill
4. Planing mill
5. Foundry and tin shop
6. Machine shop
7. Print shop
8. Auto tag shop
9. Power plant

B. INSTITUTIONAL MAINTENANCE

1. Dining room, kitchen and bakery
2. Laundry
3. Barber shop
4. Bath house
5. Shoe shop
6. Tailor shop
7. Construction
8. Dry cleaning shop
9. Coal company

C. EDUCATIONAL

1. Grade school (grades one to eight inclusive)
2. High school (commercial courses only)
3. School teachers
D. OTHER

1. All inmate clerical positions in department offices
2. Hospital nurses and other personnel
3. Dental clinic
4. Commissary and radio shop
5. Storeroom
6. Recreation company
7. Runners or messengers
8. Bank and orchestra
9. All idle men including the:
   a. Medically idle
   b. Psychiatrically idle
   c. Disciplinary idle
   d. Sexually deviated