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CHAPTER I
POST-PRISON ADJUSTMENT OF THE FEMALE OFFENDER
A Structural-Interactional Perspective

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to study the adjustment patterns of female parolees to independent living during the most critical period of parole, the first eight months after release from prison. Difficult as is the achievement of a successful parole outcome for males, female parolees must undergo an even more radical readjustment in their life patterns. The unique nature of female criminality, the greater selectivity of the female felons as they progress through the criminal justice system as seen in their criminal case mortality rate, the unique nature of the female inmate culture, the special characteristics of female inmates, and the often unrealistic expectations placed upon women in society combine to make their post-prison adaptation a most difficult process.

Review of the Literature

The Nature of Female Criminality

Criminologists have been especially intrigued with the female offender. Since Lombroso's pioneering work on female criminality,

1 This research was supported by the Division of Psychiatric Criminology, The Ohio Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction, 1968-1971.
Poliak, Giallombardo, Ward, Kassabam, Kay, Clark, Reckless, the Cluecks and Petraglia, among others, have contributed significantly to this literature. Lombroso noted that most female offenders are not "born" (atavistic) criminals but rather are occasional offenders or situational offenders; however, the "born" female offenders are more difficult and more hardened than male offenders. In his words:

The criminal woman is consequently a monster. Her normal sister is kept in the path of virtue by many causes, such as maternity, piety, weakness, and when these counterinfluences fail, and a woman commits a crime, we may conclude that her wickedness must have been enormous before it could triumph over so many obstacles.

Pollak, on the other hand, and much more recently at that, sensitized criminologists to the "masked" quality of female crime. This masked criminality perspective is generally accepted as the most basic and reliable generalization concerning women in crime. According to Pollak, there are three major reasons for the masking of female offenses: women more than men tend to be involved in crimes which, by their nature, are greatly underreported, such as shoplifting or prostitution; the criminal justice system tends to treat women much more

---

2 See the Bibliography for additional references on the female offender.


leniently than men; and it is much harder to detect crimes committed by women than by men. To quote Poliak:

(1) Are those crimes in which women seem to participate exclusively, or to a considerable extent, offenses which are known to be greatly underreported? (2) Are women offenders generally less often detected than are men offenders? (3) Do women, if apprehended, meet with more leniency than do men? It seems that each of these three questions will have to be answered in the affirmative and that the long discussion which has centered around the apparent numerical sex differential in crime may have been based on a statistical deception.

Poliak argues that it is harder to detect crimes by females because (1) there are differential behavioral expectations for men and women which means that men must ordinarily step out of their customary roles in committing a crime while women can remain within their prescribed role sets, (2) men tend to protect and shield women from the criminal justice system, and (3) women are instigators rather than perpetrators.

The involvement of women in underreported crime has been delineated further by Reckless and Kay in their discussion of the maleness and femaleness of offenses. According to their method and the Uniform

---


7 Ibid., p. 1.

8 Pollak, The Criminality of Women, p. 2-3; See the shielding and Lady Macbeth factors in Reckless and Kay, "The Female Offender," pp. 15-16.
Crime Report data for 1967,\(^9\) prostitution, larceny, embezzlement, forgery and counterfeiting, murder, nonnegligent manslaughter, disorderly conduct, aggravated assault, and violation of the narcotic laws are more female than male in nature in the sense that the male to female ratio is lower in these offenses than in the average of all known crimes (Table 46, Appendix B).

Many of these offenses, particularly prostitution and larceny (shoplifting) tend to go unreported.\(^10\) In addition, despite the fact that women and men are arrested most frequently for exactly the same three offenses -- larceny, disorderly conduct, and drunkenness\(^11\) -- the other seven offenses of the top ten for which women most frequently are arrested -- prostitution and vice, other assaults, liquor violations, driving under the influence, aggravated assault, violation of the narcotic laws, and embezzlement (Table 47, Appendix B) -- tend to be more grossly underreported than the offenses committed mainly by men. These ten offenses account for 69 percent of the female arrests.

**Female Criminal Case Mortality Rate**

Furthermore, the same factors involved in the "masked" quality of female criminality also influence every stage in the criminal justice system. Women are proportionately less often reported, arrested,

---


\(^10\)Cameron, *The Booster & The Snitch*, pp. 61-69; Robin, "Employees as Offenders," n. 2, pp. 17-18.

charged, indicted, convicted, and incarcerated. The method for determining the sex-ratio arrest rate developed by Reckless and Kay indicates that even though the differential between the number of men and women arrested has decidedly decreased over the past decade from 8.3:1 in 1960 to 7.2:1 in 1967, the disparity was still great in 1967. In other words, males are arrested about seven times more often than women. Utilizing the method Van Vechten used to determine the criminal case mortality rate for men and the available raw data on women, the female criminal case mortality rate is 0.12 percent whereas the male rate is 2.4 percent (Table 48, Appendix B). Consequently, given this sifting process, women who end up in prison are likely to be much more

12 Federal Bureau of Investigation, The Uniform Crime Reports—1967, p. 119. Statistics for 1967 have been used in this analysis since the majority of the study respondents were admitted to the Ohio Reformatory for Women during 1967.

"hardened" in their criminality and attitudes than male inmates.  

**Female Correctional Institutions**

There is a great disparity in the number, type, and size of male and female institutions in the United States. The total number of prisons in 1967 for adult men was 296 and for male juveniles was 168; whereas, there were 40 prisons for adult women and 54 for female juvenile delinquents (Table 49, Appendix B). In addition there were 40 adult and 43 juvenile institutions with one section for men and a much smaller one for women. Not only are there approximately 7.4 times as many institutions for adult men as for women, but the female institutions are much smaller (Table 50, Appendix B). In fact, Frontera in California is the only all-female institution which has 400 or more inmates whereas there are 130 all-male institutions that have at least that large a population.  

It is much more difficult to state the exact relationship

---


between the male and female institutions according to type, since the 1968 directory of institutions does not state which of the institutions are maximum, medium, or minimum security. However, in a recent survey Vermont's Women's Reformatory at Rutland with an average population of only 13 inmates, was the only female institution described as predominantly maximum security. 16 Since all except one of the predominantly maximum security prisons is for men, it can be assumed that the amount of security tends to be much greater for men than for women (cf. Table 51, Appendix B). In summary, there are: (1) more male than female institutions, (2) the men's institutions are much larger than the women's, and (3) the amount of security is much greater for men than for women.

Female Inmate Culture

Even though the differences in size, number, and type of institutions for men and women have undoubtedly had some influence on the informal social structures of the respective institutions, probably the most important factor affecting the female inmate culture is the difference in the sets of female and male cultural expectations found in the external world from which the inmates have come. 17 Despite similarities in the psychological needs, deprivations, and pain of


imprisonment for men and women, there are dissimilarities in their adjustment patterns to cope with imprisonment: (1) in the degree of inmate loyalty, (2) in the staff-inmate relationships, and (3) in the homosexual structure.

Giallombardo noted that the problems of adjustment to imprisonment for the women at Alderson were about the same as those that many criminologists have noted for men. Imprisonment for both sexes has its, "... basis in the disorientation resulting from the abrupt termination of the individual's freedom: the lack of opportunity for heterosexual relationship; the fracturing of every influence favorable to the cultivation of emotional reciprocity as a result of being cut off from family and friends; the attacks on the self through the humiliating experiences incidental to a prison commitment; the loss of autonomy and responsibility, to which life in a prison inevitably leads; and the lack of security, property, privacy, and so on." However, as Sykes noted in the Society of Captives, men feel much more intensely

---


than women the threat to their security in facing physical violence from other male inmates. As Sykes stated:

The prisoner's loss of security arouses acute anxiety ... not just because violent acts of aggression and exploitation occur but also because such behavior constantly calls into question the individual's ability to cope with it, in terms of his own inner resources, his courage, his 'nerve'. Can he stand up and take it? Will he prove to be tough enough?20

Also, as this author has observed while interviewing women at The Ohio Reformatory for Women, female convicts feel the separation from their children, husbands, and homes much more intensely than men do, which is understandable since their lives tend to be focused around these role relationships; whereas, men tend to be more concerned with occupational roles. Ward and Kassebaum also noted this at Frontera:

Women prisoners suffer more from separation from families and disruptions of familial roles. Women bring to prison with them identities and self-conceptions which are based principally on familial roles as wives, mothers, and daughters, and their related roles (fiancées and girl friends). These differences reflect the division of labor in kinship systems which place on women the principal responsibilities of housekeeping and care of children.21

The manner in which female and male convicts cope with imprisonment varies considerably according to female and male cultural expectations. In contrast to men, women are supposed to be submissive, docile, nonviolent, dependent, and emotionally expressive. Consequently male inmates tend to adhere to the inmate code much more strin-


21 Ward and Kassebaum, Women's Prison, p. 70.
gently than women and are more likely to physically maim a violator whereas women will not; men tend to remain aloof from the staff whereas women are more willing to discuss their personal problems with the professional staff; sexual predators are more likely to be found in male prisons than in female prisons; and women in most correctional institutions tend to form large kinship homosexual structures whereas men do not. Thus, the informal social structure and inmate culture is a distorted reflection of the cultural expectations of the external world as modified in a particular institutional context. 

Characteristics of Female Inmates

The real consequences of the extreme selectivity in labeling a woman a criminal are particularly apparent in the results of an analysis of the characteristics of female inmates. Kay's study on the self conceptions of female offenders indicated that inmates of the Ohio Reformatory for Women, an open prison, are more alienated than are men at the

---

22 The differential manner in which female and male convicts cope with imprisonment has been noted by several different people. Furthermore these differences seem to be related to the differential sex roles of men and women. Gaillombardo, described this relationship in "Social Roles in a Prison for Women," p. 271, and in Society of Women, p. 102. Ward and Kassebaum noted the greater likelihood of physical violence among men than women in Women's Prison, p. 190-191. In addition, the author noted that women tend to discuss problems with professional staff at ORW. Ward and Kassebaum also stated that sexual predators are not to be found among women in Women's Prison, pp. 190-191; however, there is a rumor at ORW that there are some wolves there. Furthermore, Gaillombardo in Society of Women, pp. 158-187, sensitized criminologists to the fact that women tend to form large homosexual kinship families which both the author and Christine Schultz have had reported to them at ORW. However, Ward and Kassebaum in Women's Prison, pp. 139-140, noted only three substitute roles -- husband, lover, and boyfriend -- at Frontera, the largest female prison.
Ohio Penitentiary, the maximum security prison in Ohio. On the other hand, the women are better socialized than the men which is in keeping with societal expectations.

The hypothesized differences between the female and male offenders' samples in socialization and alienation were found to exist at a statistically significant level of confidence. Female offenders were less negative in socialization, and more alienated than male offenders.23

Furthermore, the women are more criminally oriented or in other words more negative towards the law, the courts, and the police than the men.24 In addition to being more alienated and more criminally oriented, Ward and Kassebaum noted that female inmates feel more emotionally deprived than male inmates.25

As a result of the extreme adverse selectivity in labeling a woman as a convict, her "spoiled identity," alienation, criminal orientation, emotional deprivation, her participation in the inmate culture, the liabilities of alcohol, drugs, psychopathy, and prostitution, as well as the disability of belonging to the lower class, the reintegration of the female offender after release from prison is at best problematic. Furthermore, women on parole have the additional problem of having to fulfill the inconsistent and often grossly unrealistic expectations placed upon women in our society to be mother, wife, house-


wife, and economic partner. The reintegration of female offenders and their level of community adjustment after release has not been included in any parole prediction study.

Parole Prediction Studies

Since the idea of predicting outcome on parole was first attempted in 1923 by Sam Bass Warner many attempts have been made to try to predict success or failure on parole. All of these studies have been based on the assumption that the future behavior of parolees can be predicted by categorizing parolees according to pre-parole "hard data" such as type of offense committed, past recidivism record, and age at the time of the first and of the last offense. Burgess developed the first major predictive instrument which was based on 21 pre-parole factors. Each factor was given a weight of one and probabilities of success on parole were determined for each total score. The Gluecks refined the Burgess method by weighting seven factors for men and five for women. This weighting was determined by using the coefficient of mean square contingency. All five of the variables chosen for the prognostic tables for women were pre-reformatory factors.

..., the following five pre-Reformatory factors in the careers of our women were utilized in the construction of the prognostic tables: retardation in school, neighborhood influences within a year of commitment, steadiness of employment, economic responsibility, mental condition.

---


Ohlin developed a predictive instrument for men based on the same types of variables, and this actuarial approach was used for many years in Illinois. It did not gain widespread use throughout the country, and even Illinois has since abandoned it. More recently Gottfredson and his associates in California have been doing some work on base expectancy tables for both men and women which are also based on pre-parole "hard data." None of these prognostic, actuarial, or base expectancy tables have had sufficient predictive power to command widespread use in parole selection.

Exploratory Studies Concerning Women on Parole

In addition to the parole prediction studies, there have been several exploratory studies investigating the interpersonal dynamics and the functioning of women on parole. Parker conducted intensive case studies of five women on parole. Petraglia's study utilized case reviews and unstructured, non-directive interviews with nonviolators and violators. Despite the exploratory nature and inconclusiveness of these studies, both suggest that the parole situation and interpersonal dynamics are important in determining parole outcome. Petraglia found that both the violators and nonviolators had the same types of problems but that the nonviolators had identified with legitimate sources to which they turned for help whereas the violators had identified with

---

The Significance of this Study

This study is an attempt to measure the reintegration of female parolees according to their community tenure, domestic performance, and community functioning. These three criteria will be used since it is our contention that reintegration consists of much more than merely success or failure on parole. In fact, we feel that female parolees must attain a high level of interpersonal competence in order to fulfill even minimally the demands placed upon them in society.

A logical way to help a female parolee to make a satisfactory post-prison adjustment to these demands is to aid her identification with non-criminals who will accept her as a person but not condone her past behavior. In this way, the parolee could be helped to unlearn her past behavior and attitudes and to learn new ones more acceptable and appropriate. Thus, through identification, which in our view is the crux of resocialization and of the development of interpersonal competence, the parolee could be helped to become an acceptable mother, wife, housewife, economic partner, community worker, and transmitter of the moral standards in the community. In other words, the most important factor determining the success or failure of a female parolee and her ability to accept domestic, social, and economic responsibility is

considered to be her relationship to other people who are not outcasts.  

Past efforts at studying the female parolee have been either merely exploratory in nature (Parker's and Petraglia's studies) or else have neglected to deal adequately with interpersonal competence during parole (the Gluecks' study). Even in the extensive male and juvenile offender literature where considerable work has been done on closely related variables such as self concept, criminal identification, associational preference, inmate loyalty, and behavior of associates not a single study has analysed interpersonal competence. Furthermore, the impressive corpus of work on parole prediction over the last three to four decades does not include interpersonal competence as a major predictor, which may be one reason why actuarial experience and base expectancy prediction tables have not commanded widespread use in parole selection.

---


Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study have evolved from the literature on the female offender as discussed above, as well as from the vast literature and research concerning the relationship between alienation, criminal orientation and criminal behavior. Thus, the theme for this study is that alienation and attitudes of criminal orientation are directly related to criminal activity, particularly for women. It is hypothesized that these attitudes of alienation and criminal orientation can be changed through identification with law abiding people. Thus, the development of interpersonal competence (not compliance or imitation, but identification and internalization) is necessary in order to: (1) lessen the impact of alienation and criminal orientation attitudes, (2) make the necessary changes in previous life styles, and (3) make the radical adjustment from institutional living to independent life in the community.


Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the importance of interpersonal competence as a major determinant of post-prison adjustment, domestic performance, and community functioning, the three criteria of reintegration into society. In order to do this, the following hypotheses will be tested:

\[ H_1 \text{ Interpersonal competence is directly related to reintegration into society.} \]

\[ H_2 \text{ Criminal ethos is inversely related to reintegration into society.} \]

\[ H_3 \text{ Alienation is inversely related to being reintegrated into society.} \]

\[ H_4 \text{ Characteristics of parole placement are related to reintegration into society.} \]
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Comprehensive research procedures have been employed in testing the research hypotheses of this study. These procedures include a representative sample, panel research design, various subjective research measures, structured interviews, collateral interviews, and case record reviews.

Sample and Research Design

Sample Design

Every female parolee who left the Ohio Reformatory for Women between November, 1968, and January, 1970, and returned to Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo, Dayton, or Akron was included in the study. This group of parolees in the large urban areas numbered 107 women. None of the cases in this sample was included in the two preliminary studies.

34 The size of the N varied for the two testing periods which will be mentioned in the research design. The institutional interview included the 107 women released from ORW between November, 1968, and January, 1970, who returned to the six major metropolitan areas in Ohio. The findings on the perceptions of institutionalized women are based on these 107 women. The three month interview was completed on 67 women released from ORW between November, 1968, and October, 1969. The findings on community adjustment are based on these 67 women on whom the ORW and three month interviews were completed.
Research Design

This study is part of a six year research project being sponsored by the Division of Psychiatric Criminology of the Ohio Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction. It utilizes a total population, longitudinal, panel design. This design consists of a total of five testing periods: (1) the last month the women were institutionalized and shortly after they had been told that they would be paroled, (2) three months after release from ORW, (3) six months after release from ORW, (4) twelve months after release from ORW, and (5) seventy-two months after release from ORW. The findings of the present monograph are based on the first two tests and on information obtained from the parole officers concerning the behavior of their clients including their reengagement in criminal behavior during an average of eight months in the community. In addition, the parole violators were interviewed upon returning to the Ohio Reformatory for Women.

This total population of Ohio female parolees who returned to the six largest metropolitan areas in Ohio were divided into three different types of community adjustment outcome categories: (1) success-failure populations, (2) high-low scorers on domestic performance, and (3) high-low scorers on community functioning. The success-failure community adjustment groups were determined according to whether the parolees had

---

35 All of the 67 parolees had been in the community a minimum of three months and a maximum of thirteen months.

36 The data obtained at the sixth and twelfth month interviews have not been presented in this write-up except briefly in the case history sketches.
had no difficulty, while the failure group had had difficulty with the law such as having a warrant issued for arrest, being arrested, being placed in jail or the workhouse, being declared a parole violator at large, being returned to ORW as a parole violator or on a new charge. The high-low scorer categories (above or below the median) on domestic performance and community functioning respectively were based on the scores obtained by the women on the domestic performance and community functioning scales after three months in the community.

Problems Encountered

Practical Problems

Despite the seeming simplicity of this research design, problems were encountered at every phase of the research. During the study, the interviewer had to obtain the cooperation and support of persons located in eleven different organizations. Some problems were even encountered at the Ohio Reformatory for Women while collecting data. Understandably, the interviews had to be conducted within the rules and regulations of the institution and around the schedules of the inmates. On one occasion, for example, an inmate was kept in protective detainment until her release date which precluded the possibility of obtaining a complete research interview before her release.

One of the major tasks at the institution was establishing rapport with the women. They were suspicious that confidential information

---

37 These organizations were: the seven district parole offices, the central office of the APA, ORW, the Division of Psychiatric Criminology, and the Ohio State University.
obtained in the interview would become known to the professional staff and possibly even to parole board members. The interviewer tried to act consistently in a trustworthy fashion over a long period of time and succeeded in gaining the confidence of nearly all the women in the study. Still, during some of the original interviews, the interviewer often received the expected answers rather than answers which might have been incriminating.

In addition to the interviewing difficulties in the institution, there were many more that had to be dealt with while collecting data in the community. The interviewer had no legal hold on these women. They did not have to cooperate if they did not want to, and female offenders are generally uncooperative. In fact, there were no direct benefits for the parolees in cooperating nor any negative sanctions for not cooperating. Furthermore, although every attempt was made to contact the parolees before visiting them, it was often impossible to make appointments ahead of time because many parolees did not have a phone and experience indicated that they would have been unreliable in returning post cards. Consequently, the interviewer sometimes had to return to a city two or three times in order to find a parolee at home and complete the community interview.

However great these problems appear to have been, they were minor compared to the major problem encountered while collecting data in the community. The chief problem was that the women frequently had to be interviewed during the evening because they worked during the day. This meant that the interviewer, a white woman, had to enter unfamiliar, riot torn, poorly lit areas, park the car, find the parolee's home or room,
complete the interview, and then return to the parked car. While every attempt was made to locate the residence during the day, before returning to it after dark, the whole procedure was quite dangerous particularly during the summer months when some of the slum areas were very volatile. The possibility of riots and lesser civil disturbances was an ever present threat.

Time was the most crucial element for the interviewer since (1) so much time had to be spent maintaining relationships with people in eleven different organizations, (2) it was necessary to work within the legitimate rules and regulations of the institution and around the inmates' schedules, (3) the ORW interviews frequently took up to twice to three times as long as expected because of the need to establish rapport with the inmates, (4) a tremendous amount of time was spent traveling between and within the six major cities and to the Ohio Reformatory at Marysville, and the Division of Psychiatric Criminology at Chillicothe, and (5) frequently many hours were spent trying to locate a single parolee.

Attrition Rate

Despite these difficulties in carrying out the research design, the interviewer lost only eight cases out of 115 at ORW and had only three direct refusals out of 92 cases in the community. The eight cases lost at the institution occurred mainly during the first five months of the study. These eight refusals at ORW may be attributed chiefly to the lack of trust in and rapport with the interviewer and research program at the beginning of the research project. The later lack of many
additional refusals in the community (only three), conversely, signifies the high degree of rapport finally established by the interviewer with the women of the study. These refusal cases tended to have one or more of the following characteristics: (1) high scores on alienation measures, (2) a long history of incarcerations, parole violations, and/or probation violations, (3) violations of technical rules and/or (4) an extremely low I.Q.

Even though the refusal rate was very low both at ORW and in the community, there were an additional 37 people who had been interviewed at ORW but were not interviewed in the community. These 37 people can be accounted for by: (1) two indirect refusals, (2) four had absconded, (3) three had moved out of the state, (4) thirteen could not be located.

38 The eight people who refused to cooperate at ORW can be described as maladjusted people. Case one stated that she distrusted all research. Case two stated that she refused to talk to people in authority except for her attorney. Case three had been a parole violator three times. Case four had been incarcerated three different times in adult institutions and violated her parole before she even got home. She was on parole for less than one week before she became a parole violator at large. Case five had an extremely low I.Q. and stated that she was extremely nervous and felt she had too many things on her mind to be interviewed. Case six was a lifer who had violated a position of trust at ORW which became known to most of the parolees and parole officers. Case seven was a twenty year old delinquent who had been at Lima and stated that she felt she had been held at ORW illegally. Case eight had a very poor work record and a very low functional education. The three refusals to cooperate in the community were received from the following people. Case one was a young girl who had a low I.Q. and had unfavorable high scores on alienation, isolation, apathy, and inmate loyalty. She became one of the three parole violators, and subsequently was transferred to Lima State Hospital. Case two, a young girl, was contacting other women on parole, did not have a job, was not accepting domestic responsibilities, and was not keeping in touch with her parole officer. Case three was an older woman who had been institutionalized at ORW twice. She had unfavorable high scores on the Criminality Level Index, anomia, isolation, and apathy. She also had an unfavorable low score on the female role.
in the community at a time convenient for them, and (5) fifteen had not yet been in the community for three months when the collection of data for this part of the study had been completed.

Thus the attrition rate for this study was eight cases out of 115 at the institution (6.9 percent) and 25 cases out of 92 in the community (27.2 percent); however, only 12 of those cases can be attributed to uncooperativeness (13.0 percent). Furthermore some of these twelve cases may be interviewed in the future and thus lower the attrition rate even more. It should also be noted that any bias that might be the result of this attrition rate would tend to make it that much more difficult to establish significant differences in the research hypotheses since the people who tended to have difficulty with the law also tend to fall into the noncooperative group.

Data Collection

In order to determine parole adjustment and the degree to which these female offenders were reintegrated into the community, a number of instruments were developed and tested. These included scales and indices dealing with the four major constructs: community functioning and adjustment, interpersonal competence, criminal orientation, and alienation. Also, scales and indices were developed for two minor constructs: community placement and compulsive behavior.

Reliability and Validity of Indices and Scales

Community Adjustment

Community Tenure.—Community functioning and adjustment, the
dependent variable of this study, was assessed by three indices: community tenure, domestic performance, and community functioning. Community tenure was simply the determination of whether or not the parolee had been in trouble with the law as indicated by (1) having a warrant issued for her arrest, (2) being arrested, (3) being detained in a correctional setting, (4) becoming a parole violator at large, and/or (5) becoming a parole violator. Those who had difficulty with the law were considered to have had a difficult community tenure and were placed in the failure population. Those who did not were considered to have had a routine community tenure and were placed in the successful population.

Domestic Performance.—The domestic performance index was a slightly modified version of the index developed by Freeman and Simmons and used by Pasamanick et al. and Angrist et al. 39 (cf. Appendix A, Community Schedule: 3 months, items 45-52 for the specific items of this index). The split half Pearsonian correlation coefficient indicated that the reliability of the scale in this study was +.91 (cf. Table 1).

Community Functioning.—The community functioning index consisted of the domestic performance items, social participation items, social support items, and the like.

### TABLE 1

**RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS OF THE LIKERT TYPE SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pearsonian Split Half Correlation Coefficient&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Self and Others</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Intensity</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Performance</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Functioning</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The coefficients given have been corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula. These coefficients do not necessarily correspond to the coefficients obtained in the original study.

and work performance and satisfaction. The social participation items were greatly modified from those developed by Freeman and Simmons and used by Pasamanick <sup>40</sup> et al. and Angrist <sup>40</sup> et al. The work performance

<sup>40</sup>Freeman and Simmons, *The Mental Patient Comes Home*, p. 56; Pasamanick, Scarpitti, and Dinitz, *Schizophrenics in the Community*, p. 379; Angrist, Lefton, Dinitz, and Pasamanick, *Women after Treatment*, p. 244.
items developed by the author were similar in character to the domestic performance and social participation items. This index contained 23 items which had a split half Pearsonian correlation coefficient of +.83 (cf. Table 1; cf. Appendix A., Community Schedule: 3 months, items 45-67 for the specific items).

Criminal Orientation

Criminal orientation, an independent variable, was measured by four indices: (1) inmate loyalty, (2) criminal identification, (3) associational preference, and (4) the Criminality Level Index. Extensive work has been done by both the author and others to establish the reliability and validity of these scales. In total, these four scales contain 58 items.

Inmate Loyalty.—Ward and Kassebaum had a +.88 coefficient of reproducibility and a +.68 minimal marginal reproducibility on the inmate loyalty scale. The author achieved a +.79 coefficient of reproducibility and a +.62 minimal marginal reproducibility on the same scale (cf. Table 2; cf. Appendix A., Institutional Schedule, items 41-46).

Criminal Identification and Associational Preference.—Stratton reported a +.92 coefficient of reproducibility and a +.71 minimal marginal reproducibility on the inmate loyalty scale. The author achieved a +.79 coefficient of reproducibility and a +.62 minimal marginal reproducibility on the same scale (cf. Table 2; cf. Appendix A., Institutional Schedule, items 41-46).

---


### TABLE 2

**RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS OF THE GUTTMAN TYPE SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Coefficient of Reproducibility</th>
<th>Minimal Marginal Reproducibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Placement Index</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Subculture Index</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marginal reproducibility on the criminal identification scale. The coefficients obtained by the researcher on this same scale were +.89 and +.84 respectively (cf. Table 2; Appendix A, Institutional Schedule, items 47-51). Stratton also had a +.90 coefficient of reproducibility and a +.67 minimal marginal reproducibility on the associational preference scale; whereas, the author found coefficients of +.87 and +.76 respectively\(^{43}\) (cf. Table 2; cf. Appendix A., Institutional Schedule, items 52-56).

**Criminality Level Index.**—In addition to these Guttman type

---

scales, the Likert type scale, Criminality Level Index, developed by Reckless and his students has had its reliability established repeatedly on several criminal and non criminal populations. The greater the criminal orientation of the group, the larger the split half Pearsonian correlation tended to be. Thus, the women at ORW who constituted the most criminally oriented group, had the highest reliability +.88. The present study confirms the reliability of this scale with a split half Pearsonian correlation of +.95 (cf. Table 1; cf. Appendix A., Institutional Schedule, items 57-98).

Alienation

Anomia and Apathy.---Three scales and one index which all total contained 57 items were included to measure alienation, an independent variable: (1) anomia scale, (2) isolation scale, (3) apathy scale, and (4) the female role index. Srole's anomia scale and Lantz' apathy scale are also Guttmen type scales. Their coefficients of reproducibility (CR) and minimal marginal reproducibility (MMR) in the original studies were adequate for both scales. The data in this study indicate anomia had a CR of +.86 and a MMR of +.61 (cf. Table 2; cf.

---


Appendix A., Institutional Schedule, items 99-103). The apathy scale had a CR of +.84 and MMR of +.78. Even though these statistics were not impressive on the apathy scale, it will be noted in Table 3 below that the reliability of apathy was established through the repetitive use of the scale in conjunction with Reckless's Criminality Level Index. In each study, the Pearsonian correlation coefficient was moderate (cf. Table 3; cf. Appendix A., Institutional Schedule, items 113-127).

TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient Between Apathy and Criminality Level Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Penitentiary Inmates, Columbus, Ohio (N=216)</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Penitentiary, Baltimore, Maryland (N=301)</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institution for Men, Chino, California (N=233)</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Female Parolees of Ohio (N=107)</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Isolation.--Dean obtained a split half Pearsonian correlation of +.78 on his pretest and +.83 on his final sample in the development of his scale on isolation. The author obtained a +.56 on the same scale which appears to be an indication that his work can not be replicated.

47 Dean, "Alienation and Political Apathy," p. 50.
on all female population (cf. Table 1; cf. Appendix A., Institutional Schedule, items 104-112).

**Female Role Index.** The fourth measurement of alienation, the female role index, was developed by the author specifically for this study after reviewing the previous literature on the subject and finding that the various scales designed to measure this variable were inappropriate.48 At the suggestion of Professor Alfred C. Clarke, an index was developed to measure mature and immature attitudes towards employment and domestic responsibilities. According to Parsons, if a person does not accept his role, then he is estranged from himself, a personal alien.49 Thus a low score on the female role, would indicate an alienated person. The split half Pearsonian correlation coefficient on this index was +.78 (cf. Table 1; cf. Appendix A., Institutional Schedule, items 128-155).

Validity of the Criminal Orientation and Alienation Scales

Concurrent validity of the criminal orientation and alienation scales was established through the correlation matrix of the data collected on these eight scales at the Ohio Reformatory for Women during the first research interview. Concurrent validity is a form of empirical


validity established by independent criteria measured at the same time. Thus this form of validity is an indicator of some other current behavior or characteristic. In order to establish this type of validity it is preferable to have at least one criterion whose validity has already been established.\(^5^0\)

The validity of the Criminality Level Index has already been established by Reckless and his students by the "known groups" technique.\(^5^1\) They found that the scale was able, "... to discriminate in expected directions among groups reasonably expected to differ in their orientation toward the law."\(^5^2\) Thus the Criminality Level Index which has had its validity established beyond doubt as an independent criterion, measures negativeness towards laws, police, and courts.

It will be noted in the correlation matrix in Table 4 that the correlation coefficients of the Criminality Level Index to the other two criminal orientation scales—inmate loyalty scale and criminal identification scale—were +.54 and +.58 respectively. Furthermore, the


TABLE 4
CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND ALIENATION
(Pearsonian Correlation Coefficients)
(N=107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Associational Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Criminal Identification</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Anomia</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Isolation</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.287</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Apathy</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Female Role</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

correlation coefficients between the Criminality Level Index and the alienation measures—anomia, isolation, and apathy—were +.59, +.47, and +.64 respectively. In the first instance the scales were measuring the same broad concept, criminal orientation. In the second instance, the scales were measuring two different concepts which theoretically are related to each other, criminal orientation and alienation. Since in both instances all the correlation coefficients were moderate, concurrent validity has been established for the anomia, isolation, apathy, criminal identification, and inmate loyalty scales.

The validity of the female role index was also established
empiracally in this study (cf. Chapter 5) by comparing two known groups, high and low scorers on domestic performance. The high score on domestic performance tended to have the high scores on the female role index; whereas, the low scorers on domestic performance tended to have the low scores on the female role. Thus the female role index can serve as an independent criterion to help determine if the associational preferences scale has concurrent validity.

Since the female role index is the opposite of alienation (role estrangement) and the associational preference scale is the opposite of criminal orientation, these two scales should be directly related to each other. The correlation coefficient between these two scales was +.65 (cf. Table 4). Thus concurrent validity was established for the associational preference scale.

In addition, it will be noted in Table 4 that none of the correlation coefficients between these eight measures was high. The coefficients of the relationships between anomia, isolation, apathy, inmate loyalty, criminal identification, and the Criminality Level Index ranged between +.29 and +.64 with the median coefficient being +.53. The relationships of the associational preference scale to the above six scales ranged between +.05 to +.41 with a median coefficient of +.28. Likewise the relationships of the female role index to these eight scales had coefficients which ranged between +.02 and +.41 with a median coefficient of +.25. Thus, even though all of these eight scales measured different aspects of the two broad concepts, none of the scales measured exactly the same aspect of a concept as another scale did.

53 Below, n. 74, p. 72.
Interpersonal Competence

Interpersonal competence, the major independent variable, was operationalized by five Likert type scales and one index. The five Likert type scales were developed specifically for this study and were based on the theoretical work of Kelman and Klein. They measure four aspects of interpersonal competence: compliance, imitation, identification, and internalization (cf. below for explanation of the fifth scale).

Interpersonal competence as conceptualized in this study consisted of the four stages of socialization and learning through interpersonal relationships: compliance, imitation, identification, and internalization. These four types of socialization represented a continuous process of learning from compliance to internalization. Thus if the predominant form of relationships for an individual was compliance she was considered to have a low degree of interpersonal competence; and


55 This conceptualization is similar to Kelman's but is not exactly the same. It is the result of an extensive review of the literature on socialization, learning, and identification. In addition to the work of Kelman and Klein, the writings of Brim, Wheeler, Winch, Sears, Rau, Alpert, Newcomb, Turner, and Converse among others were reviewed on this subject.
if the predominant form was internalization, she was considered to have a high degree of interpersonal competence.

As a consequence of the four stages of socialization representing a continuous process, there was a great deal of overlap between the stages (cf. Appendix C., Interpersonal Competence Theoretical Chart). Many of the items that were appropriate to identification were also appropriate for internalization. These items were removed from both scales and formed the fifth scale, relationship intensity.

From the Interpersonal Competence Theoretical Chart, 197 items were developed to measure the four stages of socialization and relationship between the "significant other" and the subject. Each item was then submitted to six different judges who were asked to state which type or types of learning they thought it measured. Most of the six judges were doctoral degree candidates in Sociology. When five out of the six judges agreed on what the item measured, the item was kept for the pretest schedule, which contained 174 items dealing with compliance, imitation, identification, and internalization, four validity items, and eleven background items (cf. Appendix C., Interpersonal Competence Scaling Schedule).

56Since the items were responded to according to the relationship with one other person and an attempt was being made to measure a general ability to relate to other people, it was necessary to determine if the type of relationship indicated was general or particular to one person. In order to do this, four validity items were included in the schedule (cf. Appendix C., Interpersonal Competence Scaling Schedule, items 175-178). The completed schedules which revealed by the responses to the validity items that the type of relationship indicated was general became criterion group I; and the completed schedules which indicated the relationship described was particular
The completed pretest schedule was administered to 190 college students, 16 settlement house members, and 34 male inmates at Chillicothe Correctional Institute whose achievement was rated at 5th grade or more on the Otis test. Four of the settlement house schedules and two of the inmate schedules had to be discarded because of the unreliability of responses; thus, there were a total of 234 completed and acceptable pretest schedules. The item responses in these schedules were subjected to factor analysis using an orthogonal rotation and the internal consistency scaling technique (Likert). The final selection of items for the four major subscales was determined by eight different criteria: construct validity, a factor analysis criterion, the scale value difference of the total population and of the first
to a person became criterion group II. The former group was then used to establish three additional criteria in the final selection of items for the scales. Thus the validity of these scales was determined by the face validity and jury opinion validity established by the judges and by criterion group I which was selected by the response given to the four validity items.

This was used in determining items in the compliance and identification subscales. A loading of .50 and .44 or greater was accepted respectively. The reason the factor analysis criterion was not used in selecting items in the other subscales was that none of the other factors produced corresponded to the other theoretical constructs. The first factor had 66 items positively loaded from .409 to .765 which corresponded to the compliance subscale. It also had 48 items negatively loaded from -.409 to -.684 which corresponded to the identification subscale. There were two other factors, one of ten items with a factor loading ranging from .40 to .50 and one of seven items with a factor loading ranging from .41 to .50. When these last two factors were submitted to an internal consistency analysis, the corrected reliability coefficients were unacceptable.

The scale value difference (SVD) is used to determine the internal consistency of the items to each other according to Sletto, Construction of Personality Scales By the Criterion of Internal Consistency, p. 2. Table 52 in Appendix B. shows the lowest SVD accepted in the four subscales for the two populations.
criterion group, the scale value difference ratio criterion for the total population and the first criterion group, and the critical ratio criterion for both the entire population and the first criterion group. After the items were chosen, each major subscale was run through the computer six more times analyzing a short form of ten items and a long form of fifteen items for the three populations: the total population and the two criterion groups; and the relationship intensity subscale was run through three more times on eleven items for each of the three populations. The reliabilities obtained in each one of these runs can be seen in Table 5 below.

---

59 Both the total population and the first special criterion group were used in order to choose those items which most reflected true interpersonal competence and also best differentiated between the high scores and low scores for the entire population. It was felt that the latter needed to be done since the majority of the respondents did not give a clear cut indication of responding according to the normal type of relationships they had with other people or if they had responded according to a particular person only. The total N was 234, for the first validity group the N was 64, and for the second validity group the N was 40. By analyzing and choosing the items by the first validity group, as well as by the entire sample, the final scales have been made valid in measuring interpersonal competence and socialization rather than a social role relationship.

60 The scale value difference ratio (SVDR) is the percent of the maximum discriminating power of the item achieved when it is combined with the other items in the scale. The difficulty in using this criterion by itself is that it may restrict the choice of items to the point that only one aspect of a construct is measured instead of the entire construct according to Sletto, Construction of Personality Scales By the Criterion of Internal Consistency, p. 28. Table 52, Appendix B, shows the lowest SVDR values accepted in choosing items for the four subscales for the two populations.

61 The critical ratio (CR) determines whether an item discriminates between low and high scorers. Table 52 in Appendix B shows the lowest CR values accepted in choosing items for the four subscales for the two populations.
TABLE 5

RELIABILITY OF THE FIVE INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE AND SOCIALIZATION SUBSCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Total Population (N=234)</th>
<th>Criterion Group I (N=64)</th>
<th>Criterion Group II (N=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short Form</td>
<td>Long Form</td>
<td>Short Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Intensity</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where possible, the shortened form of each subscale was used. This could not be done for the imitation and identification scales where the reliability fell below +.80 on the short form. Consequently, the long forms were used for imitation and identification and the short forms for compliance, internalization, and relationship intensity. In total these scales contained 61 items (cf. Table 1; cf. Appendix A., Community Schedule, Compliance Scale: items 82-91, Imitation Scale: items 92-106, Identification Scale: items 107-121, Internalization Scale: 122-131, Relationship Intensity Scale: items 132-142; cf. Appendix C., Interpersonal Competence Scaling Schedule from which these 61 items were taken).

In addition, the Perceptions of Self and Others Index was also
developed specifically for this study through the use of a modified closure method. During a preliminary study, eleven final releasees and eleven parole violators were asked why they thought some people completed parole successfully and others failed. Each one was interviewed three times until complete agreement was obtained on four different constructs with all the final releasees responding in one way and all the parole violators responding in the opposite manner. Thus, there were two opposite empty cells in a four cell contingency table on all four constructs: (1) attitude towards the parole officer, (2) perception of having a meaningful life, (3) general attitudes towards self and others, and (4) perception of self as immature. Totally this index consisted of 26 items and had a split half Pearsonian correlation of +.811 (cf. Table 1; cf. Appendix A., Community Schedule, items 19-44 for the specific items).

Parole Placement

The parole placement index and several items were developed to try to ascertain the parole and community placement for each individual

---

which Petraglia and Parker had found to be so important in their exploratory studies. This index was made up of eleven items with each item ranging between one and five and one and six in scoring. The total score on these eleven items was then divided by the appropriate number of items for each individual to form the mean score for the index. (For example, the total score for a woman without children did not include the two items concerning care and custody of children; and the total score was divided by nine items instead of eleven items to obtain the mean score on the index). The reliability of these eleven items as used in this study was inadequate. However, five of the items were scalable when the scoring was changed to one and two. Utilizing the Guttman method, the coefficient of reproducibility was +.91 and the minimal marginal reproducibility was +.70 on the five items (cf. Table 2; cf. Appendix A., Community Schedule: 3 months, items 4-14 for all eleven items).

Compulsive Behavior

An index and a scale were developed to measure the degree of excessive drinking and the influence of bars and taverns in the individual's life style. The chronic drinking index contained 14 items and was based on the symptom list of alcoholism developed by Jellinek. Since the purpose of this index was simply to determine the stage of


alcoholism by yes responses to alcoholic symptoms and not to obtain total scores, reliability for the index was not determined. The index has face validity since the items are representative symptoms of the five stages of alcoholism. The influence of bars upon an individual's life was measured by a Guttman type scale, drinking subculture index which started out as an index of 13 items. It became evident early in the research that if six of these items were removed and the rest slightly rearranged, that they would form a Guttman type scale. This scale was not pretested; however, the coefficient of reproducibility was $.92$ and the minimal marginal reproducibility was $+.71$ (cf. Table 2; cf. Appendix A., Institutional Schedule, items 39-40 for specific items in the chronic drinking index and the drinking subculture index).

Thus all the scales and indices used in this study had high reliability. The statistics concerning the reliability can be reviewed in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 5. Furthermore all the scales and indices developed specifically for this study appeared to have substantial validity as determined by face validity, a panel of judges, known groups, and independent criteria.

**Instruments**

As already mentioned, this study involved two different time periods in which the above variables were measured. Three different

---

interview schedules were used: (1) the ORW interview schedule which was administered at ORW, (2) the community schedule which was used in the three month interview, and (3) the parole violator schedule which was administered after a PV was returned to ORW. The ORW interview schedule consisted of the inmate loyalty index, criminal identification index, associational preference index, the Criminality Level Index, anomia scale, isolation scale, apathy scale, female role index, chronic drinking index, drinking subculture index, background data (obtained from the case records when possible) and additional items concerning individual adjustment patterns and problems, as well as some open ended questions. The community interview schedule consisted of the domestic performance index, community functioning index, community tenure, anomia scale, isolation scale, compliance scale, imitation scale, identification scale, internalization scale, relationship intensity scale, perceptions of self and others index, community placement index, and additional items concerning individual adjustment patterns and problems as well as some open ended questions. The parole violator interview schedule except for the additional items concerning the parole violation and individual adjustment patterns. The open ended questions also were different. Thus, the data collection instruments were many faceted and multidimensional in this intensive and comprehensive study of women on parole. All three of these schedules had been pretested before the final form was written (cf. Appendix A. for the three schedules).

**Interviewing Conditions**

Every attempt was made to conduct a private interview both in
the institution and in the community. At ORW, the interviewer had a small private office where nearly all of the interviews were completed. The interviewer was permitted to provide the inmates with candy and cigarettes which helped them to relax and made interviewing easier. These interviews varied from an hour and a half to four hours in duration with the usual length being about two hours.

The interviewing conditions in the community were not as private or as satisfactory as at the Ohio Reformatory for Women. Frequently another member of the family would insist on remaining in the same room while the interview was being conducted, and even more frequently, the parolee would have to tend to her children or other domestic responsibilities during the course of the interview. Despite these difficulties the interviewer often felt that the data collected were more reliable because of the greater openness of the parolee in her home setting than at the institution. Also much was learned about the women by simply seeing them function in their homes. These interviews lasted between forty-five minutes and four hours with the usual length of time being about an hour and a half.

This chapter has reviewed the methodology employed in this research including the sample composition, research design, the reliability and validity of indices and scales, instruments, and the interviewing conditions. The next chapter will present an analysis of the correctional environment and personal characteristics of the study population.
The hypotheses of this study were tested in two agencies of the Division of Correction of the Ohio Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction: the Ohio Reformatory for Women where the study subjects were institutionalized and the Ohio Adult Parole Authority in the six major cities to which they were paroled. Since the correctional environment of the institution and of parole as well as the female parolees' personal characteristics influence their perceptions and methods developed to cope with the adjustment from independent living to institutional life to community living under supervision, the formal structures of the agencies and the characteristics of the women will be described in some detail.

**Correctional Environment**

**Ohio Reformatory for Women**

The Ohio Reformatory for Women, founded in 1916, is a medium sized, minimum security, open prison with a population of about 300. The guards do not carry guns and there is no fence or wall; in fact, the grounds almost look like a small college campus with trees, flowers, shrubbery, and grass.

The physical plant, valued at approximately two and a half
million dollars, consists of thirteen buildings and 260 acres of land of which 160 are under cultivation. The women are housed in six cottages with an average of 46 inmates and a range of 28 to 57 women per cottage. Most of the women have small single rooms which, within limits, they are allowed to decorate. In addition to the cottages, the plant includes an administration building, warden's home, Ohio Penal Industries power sewing factory, laundry, central food service and detainment building, school, hospital, power house, and garages.

The institution's population has been steadily decreasing since 1964 when the peak population was 489. The lowest census was 280 inmates in February, 1969. The reasons for this decrease are probably multiple: (1) approximately 60 women have been successfully placed on shock probation since 1965 and have not been returned as recidivists, (2) the parole board appears to have relaxed its rules and tends to release more women at their first parole hearing instead of the second, (3) a review committee has been created for the purpose of reviewing long term imprisonment cases in order to release some of the inmates at an earlier date, and (4) the probation services have improved across the state particularly with the employment of state probation officers. Thus, the census of the institution has decreased dramatically. Also, the philosophical orientation has changed from custody to corrective treatment and rehabilitation which is in keeping with the Ohio Reformatory for Women's status as a minimum security prison.

During the period in which the study respondents were institutionalized, the rehabilitation philosophy was carried forward into personnel practices and training programs. There were four full-time
and two part-time teachers, two inmate teachers, and one principal. In addition, there were four case workers, four Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation counselors, two correctional psychologists, one chaplain, one part-time doctor, one part-time dentist, and one consultant psychiatrist. Thus, the ratios of inmates to counselors was 37:1 and to correctional psychologists 147:1. In addition to the professional staff, there was very adequate custodial help, including fifteen male guards and 66 custodial matrons. The custodial help ratios of the inmates to male guards was 20:1 and to custodial matrons was 4:1.

Furthermore, there were many indications that this institution was trying to rehabilitate its inmates: (1) approximately 25 percent of the inmate population was enrolled in a non-accredited school where they could earn their 10th grade and 12th grade equivalency certificates through the General Education Development program operated by the State Department of Education and (2) there were nine different vocational training programs. However, there were only three programs which had trained a significant number of people. These were the clerical work, power sewing, and nurses aide training programs to qualify inmates as attendants in state hospitals or other state institutions. Since the end of the intake period of this research, an accredited school of cosmetology has been established at the institution.

Ohio Adult Parole Authority

Upon leaving the Ohio Reformatory for Women, the women on parole are placed under the jurisdiction of the Ohio Adult Parole Authority (APA). The Ohio Adult Parole Authority was completely reorganized in
1965 and prides itself on its rehabilitation philosophy. The depart-
ment is divided into fifteen districts with a supervisor and six parole
officers in each district. These districts are located in the ten
largest cities in Ohio and are supervised by three regional supervisors
and the Adult Parole Authority central office located in Columbus, Ohio.

The central office staff of the Adult Parole Authority has tried
to instigate and promote rehabilitation by (1) changing the image of the
parole officer from a gun carrying officer to a caseworker, (2) upgrad-
ing the educational requirement for parole officers from a high school
diploma to a college degree, (3) prohibiting parole officers (PO's)
from arresting parolees, and (4) changing the criteria for determining
parole violation. Instead of being able to declare a parolee a parole
violator (PV) for a minor technical violation (cf. Appendix D. for the
Ohio APA Rules), the parole officer has to establish that the parolee
has consistently violated the rules or committed another felony. This
latter change has been a major cause of dissatisfaction among some
parole officers, particularly the older ones, who feel that it has
become more difficult to supervise their parolees. Despite this change,
the majority of the parole violators are still returned to the Ohio
Reformatory for Women on technical violations and not on new felony
charges; however, there is a growing tendency to reinstate the technical
violator on parole.

Within the structure of the Adult Parole Authority, the policies
and practices for women on parole in Ohio differ slightly but signifi-
cantly from those for men on parole. There are seven female parole
officers for women who cover the 88 counties of the state and over 100
officers for men covering the same territory. On the other hand, the average case load of the female officer is 40, and that of the male officer is 55. Other differences include the fact that women on parole usually meet their parole officer before release to the community whereas the men do not.

This study does not include all of the women on parole in Ohio, but instead only those who returned to the six major cities of Ohio of 500,000 population or greater: Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo, Dayton, and Akron. Two-thirds of all the women released from the Ohio Reformatory for Women are returned to these specific urban settings.

One parole officer is responsible for the parolees returned to each of five of these urban areas and two parole officers are responsible for the parolees in the largest city. These parole officers differ markedly: (1) in age (from the early twenties to early sixties), (2) in education (from a high school diploma to college degree), (3) in experience (from less than one year to over 30 years), (4) in marital status (married, widowed, single, divorced), and (5) in color (six are white and one is black). These women differ also in the type and amount of supervision they give their parolees as well as in their orientations towards the job. Despite this great variation in supervision, all seven districts covering the 88 counties of the state have approximately the same rate of parole violation and parole violators at large except for one district which has had no violations for over a year. 66

66 This information was obtained by checking the parole violation records at the Ohio Reformatory for Women.
Characteristics of Women Urban Parolees and the Ohio Reformatory for Women Inmates

As mentioned previously, the behavior and attitudes of the female criminals included in this study are influenced not only by the formal structures of the correctional agencies but also by their demographic personal, and criminal history characteristics. Data concerning these parolee characteristics were obtained from the case records, and when necessary, from interviews. Population data on all Ohio Reformatory for Women inmates were obtained from the institution's annual report.  

Age.—The age of the total inmate population committed between July, 1967, and June, 1968, ranged between 18 and 60 with an average of 29.4. The majority of the inmates were in their late teens or early twenties. The urban parolee sample differed considerably from the inmate population on age. Their ages ranged between 19 and 57 with an average of 32.4. This difference is probably the result of (1) the women being at least a year older at release than upon intake, and (2) the review team reviewed and the parole board released several women who had had inordinantly long sentences during the intake period of this study (cf. Table 6).

Race.—The majority of the Ohio Reformatory for Women inmates (62.4 percent) were white. However, since only one in twelve persons


68 The reason the 1968 annual report was used is that the women committed during that year tended to be released to parole during the intake period of the study.
### Table 6

**Characteristics of the Ohio Reformatory for Women Inmates and the Urban Parolees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade or less</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 9th</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no record</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated, Divorced, Deserted, Widowed</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsive Behavior Habits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used alcohol</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive Drinking&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal-Situational</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal-Against Strangers</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Children</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Reformatory Lockup</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Juvenile Lockup</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Arrest Record</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>29.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>32.4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Excessive drinking was determined by Jellinek's prodromal, crucial, and chronic phases of drinking. This information was not available on the ORW inmates.

<sup>b</sup>The mean rather than percent is given for age.
in this state is black (8.2 percent), they were grossly overrepresented at ORW accounting for 37.6 percent of the inmate population. Furthermore, the blacks in the urban parolee sample were even more grossly overrepresented, since the parolee sample consisted of 55.1 percent blacks. It is not surprising that the ratio of blacks to whites is greater in the parolee sample than for the entire population since negroes tend to live disproportionately in the ghettos of large metropolitan areas (cf. Table 6).

**Formal Education.**—On the whole, the Ohio Reformatory for Women offenders have had very little education and training: 25.4 percent of the inmates had 9th grade or less, 18.5 percent had partial high school, 7.4 percent had high school or better, and there was no record on 48.7 percent. The urban parolees had even less education than the entire inmate population: 70.1 percent of the parolees had 9th grade or less, 15.9 percent had some high school, and 14.0 percent had high school or more. This discrepancy might be explained in part as a consequence of the sample composition. The urban parolees had a higher ratio of blacks, and blacks tend to become school dropouts more often than whites (cf. Table 6).

**Marital Status.**—Women criminals tend to be single, separated, divorced, deserted, or widowed rather than married: 25.9 percent of the inmates were single, 33.4 percent were separated, divorced, or widowed, 69 The Ohio Reformatory for Women's Annual Report recorded no record on education if the institution had not verified it by receiving a school record from the last school attended. Thus they frequently knew how much education the inmate had had, even though it was reported in the annual report as "no record."
and 40.7 percent were married. There was little difference between the inmate and parolee populations on marital status: 29.0 percent of the parolees were single, 37.4 percent were separated, divorced, deserted, or widowed, and 33.6 percent were married (cf. Table 6).

Habits.--Many of the inmates had used drugs illegally (10.5 percent); however, even more of the parolees admitted use of drugs to the researcher (28.0 percent). This disparity in drug usage or experimentation was probably a function of the interview situation. If the offender had told the institutional personnel that she had used drugs, this information probably would have affected adversely her parole. She knew, however, that such disclosure to the interviewer would not affect her parole status. In addition, 60 percent of the inmates had used intoxicants; whereas, 96 percent of the parolees had used them, but only 34 percent of them had used them excessively (Jellinek's prodromal stage of alcoholism). Again the much greater reported use of alcohol by the parolees was probably due to the women's fear of the consequences for parole (cf. Table 6).

Criminal Offense.--The types of offenses for which the total inmate population were incarcerated were: 15.9 percent for personal, situational violence, 6.9 percent for personal violence against strangers, 29.3 percent for property offenses, 29.3 percent for money offenses, 6.9 percent for status offenses, 2.1 percent for peculiarly female offenses, and 9.6 percent for offenses against children. The urban parolees

70 The many types of criminal offenses for which the women were institutionalized were categorized into seven major groups by the author. The personal, situational, emotional violence category included
tended to commit the offenses of situational violence and money more often than the entire population. Their offenses were 25.2 percent for situational violence, 9.3 percent for violence against strangers, 17.8 percent for property offenses, 34.6 percent for money offenses, 9.3 percent for status offenses, 2.8 percent for female offenses, and 0.9 percent for offenses against children (cf. Table 6).

Criminal History.—The majority of the inmates (71.4 percent), had a previous criminal record, (at least an arrest record prior to the present offense if not also a juvenile or adult institutionalization record); however, even a larger proportion of the parolee population had a previous criminal record, 96.3 percent. Also a greater percentage of the parolees than of the entire inmate population had been institutionalized in adult and juvenile institutions. That is, 26.2 percent of the parolees as opposed to 20.1 percent of the inmates had been locked up in adult institutions; and 31.8 percent of the parolees as opposed to 18.5 percent of the inmates had been locked up in juvenile institutions. The more extensive criminal histories of the parolees can be attributed to our selection of subjects from the large metropolitan areas and the exclusion of (1) subjects from the impoverished Appalachian region in homicide, aggravated assault, and maiming against friends, family, lovers, and enemies. The personal violence against strangers was usually done in conjunction with another felony such as robbery. The property offenses were burglary, grand larceny, auto theft, destruction of property, arson in order to collect insurance, and concealing stolen property. The money offenses included forgery, uttering checks, embezzlement, obtaining money under false pretenses, and illegal distribution of drugs. The status offenses were drug addiction and emotionally disturbed arsonists. The female offenses included prostitution and abortion. The last category, offenses against children consisted of child abuse, contributing to delinquency, and contributing to neglect.
southeastern Ohio, small towns, and rural areas, and (2) those who had committed misdemeanors (cf. Table 6).

In summation, the parolee sample tended (1) to be older, (2) to be disproportionately black, (3) to have less formal education, (4) to have a more unstable marital status history, (5) to report greater use of drugs and alcohol, (6) to commit situational violence and money offenses as defined above more often, and (7) to have a longer criminal history than the general entire inmate population.

This chapter has described the correctional setting and personal characteristics of the study subjects. The facts presented above will help to explicate the attitudes and perceptions of incarcerated women set forth in the next chapter.
Data for this study were collected at three different time periods: at the Ohio Reformatory for Women during the last month before the women were released on parole, after three months tenure in the community and after an average of eight months tenure in the community. This chapter will present the data obtained at the reformatory concerning the relationships between the background variables race, age, education, occupation, class, offense, institutionalization, number of lockups, and number of arrests to the criminal orientation and alienation scales.

Race

Race was related significantly to only one of the eight alienation and criminal orientation measures, the Criminality Level Index. The mean scale scores on this index for the whites and blacks were 79.5 and 100.1 respectively. These mean scale scores were statistically different at a .01 level (cf. Table 7). A decade earlier, when Kay collected her data at the same correctional institution, the mean scale scores for these two groups were 122.8 and 137.2 respectively. Thus

---

71Cleaver, Mylonas, and Reckless, "Gradients in Attitudes Toward Law, Courts, and Police," p. 34.
TABLE 7
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND ALIENATION SCALES BY RACE
(N=107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\bar{x})</td>
<td>(\sigma)</td>
<td>(\bar{x})</td>
<td>(\sigma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>79.51</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>100.06</td>
<td>33.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>26.93</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>30.60</td>
<td>7.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>115.29</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>117.86</td>
<td>11.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be noticed that the difference in the mean scale scores was larger in this study than it had been when Kay collected her data; however, the mean scale scores for both the whites and blacks were lower than they had been in her study.

As indicated, race was not related significantly to the other three criminal orientation measures: inmate loyalty, criminal identifi-
fication, and associational preference. The whites' mean scores on these three scales were 17.9, 8.4, and 19.9; the blacks' mean scale scores on the same scales were 19.6, 9.3, and 20.1 respectively. Thus, there was no significant difference in the preference for either criminal or non-criminal friends and associations for the blacks and whites (cf. Table 7).

Since it is very doubtful that the negative attitudes towards the law, courts and police as measured by the Criminality Level Index are less in our society today than when Kay conducted her study, the decrease in the mean scale scores may be a reflection of the testing techniques used as well as the possibility of female prisoners decreasing their negative attitudes towards authority upon learning that they will be paroled in a months time. In addition, the relatively greater negativism of the black parolees in this study than a decade earlier might be attributed to the black identity movement which encourages black pride and upward mobility while at the same time denouncing the workings of the criminal justice system.

Race was not related significantly to even one of the alienation measures. The mean scale scores on the alienation measures—anomia, isolation, apathy, and female role— for the whites were 14.8, 26.9, 29.8 and 115.3; for the blacks, the mean scale scores were 16.5, 26.8, 30.1 and 116.9.

---

72 All of the data for this study were collected after the women knew they would be paroled in a months time; whereas, most of Kay's subjects did not know when they would be released.

73 The awareness and sensitivity towards the meaning of the black identity movement has been obtained during the open-ended part of the interviews for this research.
26.7, 30.6 and 117.9 respectively. The t tests indicated that none of these differences in the mean scale scores by race was significant (cf. Table 7). However, as can be noted in Table 7, the blacks had higher mean scores on the anomia and the female role scales than the whites.

Age

Age, unlike race, was related significantly to all of the measures of criminal ethos and alienation except for two: criminal identification and isolation. The mean scale scores on the inmate loyalty, Criminality Level Index, and associational preference for the younger parolees were 20.5, 97.1, and 19.0; and the mean scale scores on the same scales for the older parolees were 17.2, 82.5, and 20.9 (cf. Table 8). Thus, the parolees thirty years old or younger tended to have higher scores on inmate loyalty and the Criminality Level Index, while the parolees over thirty tended to have a higher score on associational preference.

This latter finding might be explained in two ways. By the time women reach the age of thirty, they tend to settle down emotionally, slow down biologically, and accept an adult female role identification in preference to a criminal identification. In addition, any chronic anti-social (sociopathic) tendencies usually seem to have "burned out," or at least to have decreased in frequency and intensity.

The finding that the younger parolees tended to have greater inmate loyalty and to be more negative towards the law, police, and courts than the older parolees might also be attributed in part, to the black identity movement which stresses the unfairness in the operation
TABLE 8
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND ALIENATION SCALES BY AGE
(N=107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 and under</td>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>20.53</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>19.04</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>97.06</td>
<td>33.79</td>
<td>82.45</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>25.97</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>32.10</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>28.40</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>113.66</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>119.26</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the criminal justice system. This black identity movement is particularly strong among the young blacks.

Not only did the younger parolees tend to feel more negative towards the laws, but they also tended to be more anomic, and apathetic than the older parolees, while the older parolees tended to identify more with the female role than the younger parolees. Thus, the mean scale scores on the anomia, apathy, and female role scales for the
younger parolees were 17.0, 32.1, and 113.7; whereas, they were 14.5, 28.4, and 119.3 for the older parolees (cf. Table 8).

These relationships may suggest that the troublesome and painful period known as adolescence in our society, which is characterized by abrupt, disconcerting changes, and discontinuous socialization in which the individual is neither an adult nor a child and yet considered both according to the situation and the people around him, is still a real factor in the lives of the younger women at the reformatory. Despite the fact that they are chronologically old enough to be adults, the people in authority, frequently their families, and sometimes even their associates consider them to be immature teenagers and treat them accordingly. This very discomfiting age status seems to produce in some people a sense of listlessness, apathy, meaninglessness, and isolation. Consequently, it is not surprising that the younger women at a reformatory tend to be more anomic and apathetic than the older women. Furthermore, since constant socialization and pressure has been brought to bear on women throughout life to accept the mature female role, one would expect the successful transition from adolescence to adulthood to be accompanied by an acceptance of that role.

**Socio-Economic Status**

As has already been shown, race and age are extremely important demographic variables in understanding the attitudes and feelings of female offenders; these same variables probably also play an important role in determining community tenure, success and failure. The next group of demographic variables, class, education, and occupation, which
are measures of socio-economic status, were not found to be as important as race and age but still had an influence on the perceptions of our study women.

Socio-economic status seemed to have had very little effect upon the criminal orientation of the women. None of the mean scale scores on inmate loyalty, criminal identification, associational preference, and the Criminality Level Index, was significantly different (1) for the working class and the lower class, (2) for those with tenth grade education or more and those with ninth grade education or less, and (3) for the semiskilled workers and the unskilled workers (cf. Tables 9, 10, and 11). This lack of relationship is probably a function of the constricted score range on the socio-economic variables which inevitably makes significant differences difficult to obtain.

Despite this constricted score range on the socio-economic variables, there were significant relationships between these variables and the operational measures of alienation. Women in the working class, in semiskilled occupations, and with some high school education tended to identify with the female role more often than those in the lower class, in unskilled occupations, and those with a ninth grade education or less. The relationship between class and female role was significant at the .01 level. The mean scale score for the working class was 120.9, and the mean scale score for the lower class was 114.2 (cf. Table 9). This greater acceptance of the female role by the working class prisoners than by the lower class prisoners is undoubtedly a reflection of the greater acceptance of the traditional female role by the lower middle and working classes compared to other women in our entire society.
### TABLE 9

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND ALIENATION SCALES BY CLASS (N=107)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Working</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp;bar;X &amp;</td>
<td>σ</td>
<td>&amp;bar;X</td>
<td>σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>95.65</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>86.44</td>
<td>33.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>30.72</td>
<td>8.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>120.85</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>114.18</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND ALIENATION SCALES BY EDUCATION (N=107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 9th</td>
<td>9th or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>20.14</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>30.36</td>
<td>92.68</td>
<td>34.05</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>118.11</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>115.92</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND ALIENATION SCALES BY OCCUPATION**

*(N=107)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Semiskilled</td>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>91.57</td>
<td>34.06</td>
<td>87.53</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>26.04</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>30.75</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>117.45</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>115.71</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, as can be seen in Table 10, higher educational attainment was associated with high anormia and apathy scores at the .02 and .01 levels of statistical significance respectively. The mean scale scores for anormia and apathy for those with tenth grade education or better were 13.6, and 26.7, and they were 16.7 and 32.1 for those with ninth grade education or less.

This connection between education, anormia, and apathy is quite understandable since students in the working and lower classes in our country must first conquer many material and psychological obstacles if they are to obtain an education. In order to overcome these obstacles, a concerted effort must be made and the motivation, desire, and will to obtain an education must be present. These attitudes are the opposite of anormia and apathy.

Thus, those who had low socio-economic status, and particularly those with a ninth grade education or less, tended to have higher alienation scores than those who had higher socio-economic status. In addition, the latter tended to accept the female role more often than those of lower socio-economic status.

Criminal History

The number of previous lockups was the only criminal history variable related significantly to any of the criminal orientation and alienation scales. Present offense, previous arrests, and the length of time institutionalized were not related significantly to any of these eight scales. Furthermore, lockups was related significantly to only two of the criminal orientation scales: directly related to criminal identi-
ification and inversely to associational preference, each at a .02 level of statistical significance. Thus, the mean scale scores on criminal identification and associational preference for those with a small number of lockups was 7.9 and 21.0, and the mean scale scores were 9.8 and 19.1 for those with a high number of lockups. The remaining postulated relationships between number of arrests, number of lockups, and length of imprisonment and the measures of criminal orientation were in the predicted direction, but were not statistically significant. Three of the hypothesized relationships between present offense category and the mean scores on the eight scales went in the opposite direction from what was expected. Thus, only two out of sixteen relationships between the criminal history variables and criminal orientation scales were significant (cf. Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15).

In addition, there was only one significant relationship between lockups and the alienation scales. Apathy scores were directly related to the number of lockups, at a .05 level of statistical significance. Thus, the mean scale scores on apathy for those with a small number of lockups was 28.5 and for those with a high number of lockups, 31.9. None of the other fifteen relationships between the criminal history variables and alienation scales was significantly related; in fact, nine of the relationships indicated that alienation and criminal history tended to be directly related to each other while the other six relationships indicated that they tended to be inversely related.

Thus, most of the background variables bore very little relation to the scale scores on criminal orientation and alienation. Only thirteen out of the possible seventy-two relationships were statistically
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Type of Offense Committed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>100.11</td>
<td>34.49</td>
<td>86.26</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>26.59</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>30.07</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>115.13</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>116.96</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND ALIENATION SCALES BY NUMBER OF ARRESTS (N=107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>86.40</td>
<td>33.61</td>
<td>92.67</td>
<td>32.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>27.04</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>26.55</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>29.52</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>30.84</td>
<td>7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>116.89</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>116.29</td>
<td>13.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 14
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND ALIENATION SCALES
BY NUMBER OF LOCKUPS
(N=107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Lockups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>( \bar{x} )</td>
<td>( \sigma )</td>
<td>( t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>84.73</td>
<td>34.12</td>
<td>94.55</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>31.93</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>119.00</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>114.13</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Length of Time Institutionalized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>87.36</td>
<td>33.28</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>32.99</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>26.51</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>117.29</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>114.96</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant. Age accounted for six of these 13 significant relationships and race, education, occupation, and number of lockups accounted for the other seven (cf. Table 16).

Further review of all the significant relationships found in Tables 7-15 of this chapter indicates that the structurally more stigmatized groups of parolees (the blacks, the young, the lower class, those with ninth grade education or less, and those with a high number of lockups) consistently had the less favorable mean scale scores on inmate loyalty, criminal identification, Criminality Level Index, anomia, apathy, associational preference, and female role scales in every significant relationship. Thus it would appear that the structural groups to which the female inmates belonged at the time of inception into this study, structural placement, had an important effect upon their perceptions and attitudes of alienation and criminal orientation.

This chapter has analyzed the data collected at the Ohio Reformatory for Women between November, 1968, and January, 1970, on all the women parolees who returned to the six major cities in Ohio. It has been shown that structural placement, particularly age and race, had a very important influence upon the perceptions of alienation and criminal orientation. The next chapter will deal with the success and failure of these women on parole during their average of eight months in the community -- the most important adjustment period.

---

74 Associational preference is a measurement of the desire to associate with the law abiding citizens and thus is supposed to be the opposite of criminal orientation. The acceptance of the female role by a woman is supposed to be the opposite of being alienated.
TABLE 16
RELATIONSHIP OF THE SOCIAL BACKGROUND AND CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES TO THE MEAN SCALE SCORES\(^a\)
(N=107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Background &amp; Criminal History Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)This table is given in probabilities based on t test scores.
CHAPTER V

THE COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT OF WOMEN PAROLEES

The readjustment of women prisoners to independent living in the community is at best a very tenuous and difficult process. Parolees must (1) become reinvolved with their parents, siblings, husbands, boyfriends, children, neighbors, and friends, (2) reassume responsibility for the care and custody of their children, (3) reestablish and take care of a home, (4) obtain a job or make other financial arrangements, (5) become accustomed to the changes that have taken place in the outside world, (6) learn to cope with their stigmatized status as ex-con, and (7) learn to cope with abnormal reactions brought about through institutionalization. This chapter will present the data collected on the success of the women parolees in making these adjustments at the end of three months in the community. The analysis will be divided into three parts: their community tenure status, domestic performance, and community functioning. Each section will discuss the relationships between the community readjustment and the demographic, criminal history, personal maladjustment (MMPI), parole placement, criminal orientation, alienation, and interpersonal competence variables.

Some of the abnormal reactions are (1) fear of crossing congested streets, (2) fear to travel in cars going over 40 miles per hour, (3) reacting inwardly and sometimes visibly to the sound of keys, and (4) waking instantaneously to light.
Community Tenure Status

The community tenure status of the parolees as successful or as failure was determined by whether or not the parolee had any difficulty with the law. Difficulty with the law included (1) having a warrant issued for her arrest, (2) being arrested, (3) being locked up in jail, workhouse, or detention center, (4) becoming a parole violator at large, or (5) becoming a parole violator. Operationally, the parolees who got into trouble with the law were considered to have had an unsuccessful community tenure, while those who did not have trouble with the law were considered to have had a successful community tenure.

The data to be presented on the community tenure status are based on the experiences of 67 parolees who have been in the community a minimum of 3 months and a maximum of 13 months. The average length of stay in the community was approximately 8 months. Of the 67 parolees 14 or 20.9 percent had experienced some difficulty with the law (as defined above) during their average of 8 months in the community. In this section, the 53 successful parolees will be contrasted with the 14 unsuccessful parolees in terms of their demographic characteristics, criminal histories, parole placements, and perceptions.

Demographic Variables

Five demographic variables—age, race, education, occupation, and class—were related to parole outcome in this analysis. The only one of these variables which was statistically significant was age, and
that alone had a moderate association coefficient of .645. As can be seen in Table 17, 64.5 percent of those 30 years old and under were successful while 91.7 percent of those over 30 years old were successful. In fact, only three of the 36 women who were over 30 years old (8.3 percent) had any difficulty with the law. The importance of age for successful community tenure may be accounted for by (1) reduction in physical activity level and related biological parameters, (2) decreased risk taking of older people, and (3) social maturation.

Although race was not a statistically significant variable,

76 Kendall's Q coefficient is a measurement of association for nominal data that fits into a four cell contingency table. The logic of this statistic is very similar to the logic of chi square and has a formula very similar to one of the formulas for chi square.

\[ X^2 = \frac{N(AD - BC)}{(A + B)(C + D)(A + C)(B + D)} \]

\[ Q = \frac{AD - BC}{AD + BC} \]

The range of Kendall's Q is the same as for Pearsonian's Correlation Coefficient \(r^2\) -- -1.0 to +1.0. The interpretation of the Q statistic differs and yet is similar to the interpretation of \(r^2\). A moderate association utilizing the Q statistic ranges between .40 and .79; whereas, a moderate association utilizing \(r^2\) ranges between .49 and .79. The high association range is .80 to 1.0 for both coefficients. A major difference in the interpretation of these two coefficients is that one empty cell or one cell with a very low frequency in it would tend to produce a higher Q coefficient that \(r^2\) coefficient, if both statistics could be applied to the same data. This is true since the Q association is 1.0 when there is only one empty cell; whereas, total explanation of the variance would require two opposite empty cells in a contingency table (either cells A and D or cells B and C). Thus the Q coefficient represents the amount of explained variance of the total variance for nominal data and is one of the appropriate association statistics to use in conjunction with chi square, a significance statistic. However, this nominal association measure (Q) is not as exacting a measurement of explained variance as the Pearsonian Correlation Coefficient (an interval statistic) since Q does tend to have an exaggerated coefficient of explained variance when only one of the four contingency cells has a very low frequency.
TABLE 17
RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND COMMUNITY TENURE 
(N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Success Percent</th>
<th>Failure Percent</th>
<th>p*</th>
<th>Kendall's Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and under</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade or less</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 9th grade</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiskilled</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86.5 percent of the blacks were successful in remaining free of contact with the law as opposed to only 70.0 percent of the whites (cf. Table 17). This finding is probably, in part at least, the result of the extremely adverse selection exercised in sending a white woman to prison. On the other hand, the reason this relationship was not significant, may have been due to the practice of imposing more stringent restrictions on
the blacks than on the whites during the parole period as a result of prejudice thereby increasing the black failure rate.

Three socio-economic variables—education, occupation, and class—were not statistically significant (cf. Table 17). That is, 80.4, 80.0, and 75.0 percent of those with a ninth grade education or less, the unskilled, and the lower class parolees respectively were successful while 75.0, 78.1, and 85.2 of those with more than a ninth grade education, the semiskilled, and the working class parolees were successful. The explanation may be that a greater degree of social maladjustment for many working class whites may have counterbalanced a lesser degree of social maladjustment for many lower class blacks. More importantly, the parolee population showed a very narrow socio-economic range making significant differences difficult to obtain.

Thus age was the only demographic variable significantly related to successful community tenure.

Criminal History Variables

Another variable significantly related to successful outcome was type of offense—one of five criminal history variables including arrests, lockups, length of institutionalization, type of offense, and narcotic addiction. Only 3.7 percent of the personal offenders as opposed to 32.5 percent of the property, narcotic, and other offenders became reinvolved with the law (cf. Table 18). Since several studies have shown that homicide, a personal offense, has the lowest rate of recidivism, and that property, and particularly the narcotic offenses
have high rates of recidivism for men, it is not surprising that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 18</th>
<th>CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES AND COMMUNITY TENURE (N=67)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History Variable</td>
<td>Community Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 yrs. or less</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 - 4.9 yrs.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 yrs. and over</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotic Addiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*.A adjusted
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similar findings were noted for the women of this study. This relationship between offense and successful outcome had a high $Q$ coefficient of .852 which was statistically significant at a .01 level.

Even though the other criminal history variables did not have statistically significant relationships with community tenure status, they did indicate a very interesting pattern. For example, 88.2 percent of the high scorers on number of arrests, 86.5 percent of the high scorers on number of lockups, and 88.9 percent of those who had been institutionalized over five years were successful. In contrast, the low scorers on these variables were successful 69.7, 70.0, and 75.5 percent respectively. Thus, as will be noted in Table 15, the success group tended to have longer criminal histories than the failure group. It should be noted, by way of explanation, that (1) personal offenders tend to receive longer sentences, (2) the parolees with long criminal histories tend to be older, and (3) as mentioned previously, older parolees tend to have greater social maturation.

Although, only seven of the parolees (10.4 percent) stated that they were addicted to drugs, there was some indication that those

addicted tended to be failures more often than those who were not (42.9 percent as opposed to 18.3 percent). In addition only 57.1 percent of the addicts were successful as opposed to 81.7 percent of those not addicted (cf. Table 18). Probably this relationship would have been significant if all cases of narcotic addiction had been known.

**Personal Maladjustment (MMPI)**

None of the MMPI profiles for the 67 women in this study were wholly within the normal MMPI subscale standards; that is, none of the women had t scores within the range of 46 to 54 on all ten scales. Furthermore, the majority of the women (89.6 percent) had an elevated t score of at least 60, which is one standard deviation above normal, on the psychopathic deviate scale (Pd). Despite their profiles, the majority of the cases were successful in the community, in the sense that they did not become reinvolved with the law.

Closer inspection of the profiles revealed that the majority of the failures and successes tended to fall into one of four categories—elevated psychopathic deviate (Pd) only, extreme maladjustment, psychopathic deviate-hypomania (Pd-Ma), and male interest-paranoid (Mf-Pa). All of the cases with an elevated Pd scale but within normal standards on the other subscales profile were failures (21.4 percent of the failures). All told, there were 18 parolees who were one standard deviation

78The elevated Pd only profile had a t score ≥ 60 on the Pd scale and t scores < 60 on the other nine scales. The extreme maladjustment profile had elevated t scores ≥ 60 on six or more of the ten scales. The Pd-Ma profile had elevated t scores ≥ 60 on the Pd and Ma scales. The Mf-Pa profile had elevated t scores ≥ 60 on the Mf and Pa scales.
or more above the mean on six or more of the ten scales. The failures tended to have this extreme maladjusted profile much more often than the successful parolees, 57.1 percent of the failures as opposed to only 21.7 percent of the successful parolees. All of the cases with a psychopathic deviate-hypomania (Pd-Ma) or a male interest-paranoid (Mf-Pa) profile were successful. The rest of the parolees (34.8 percent of the successful and 21.4 percent of the failures) had one of seven different types of profiles (cf. Plate I).

Accordingly, these profiles revealed some very important relationships. That is, only 47.6 percent of the cases with either an extremely maladjusted or a high Pd profile as opposed to 92.3 percent of the parolees who did not have either of these profiles were successful. Furthermore, all parolees who had either a Pd-Ma or Mf-Pa profile, as opposed to only 65.0 percent of those who did not have these two types of profiles, were successful. These two relationships had Q coefficients of -.882 and +1.000 which were statistically significant at .001 and .01 levels respectively (cf. Table 19).

The MMPI profile findings have obvious implications. Even though all of the women tended to be maladjusted, certain types of maladjustment—Pd only and extreme maladjustment—tend to make it far more difficult to achieve a successful community tenure than other types of profiles—namely the Pd-Ma and Mf-Pa. Thus, possibly one of the main causes of failure and recidivism on parole is extreme maladjustment.

Parole Placement Variables

Another variable significantly related to successful community
PLATE I
COMPOSITE MMPI PROFILES OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PAROLEES

Fig. a.— Successful Parolees; Psychopathic Deviate-Hypomania (Pd-Ma) Type. N=14.

Fig. b.— Successful Parolees: Male Interest-Paranoid (Mf-Pa) Type. N=6.

Fig. c.— Successful and Unsuccessful Parolees: Extreme Maladjustment Type. N=18.

Fig. d.— Unsuccessful Parolees: Psychopathic Deviate Type. N=3.

*aAll of the MMPI profiles used in these composite profiles had acceptable scores on the L, F, and K scales. The mean equals 50 and the standard deviation equals 10. Successful parolees ___________. Unsuccessful parolees __________________.
Table 19
PERSONAL MALADJUSTMENT (MMPI)
AND COMMUNITY TENURE
(N=60)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Maladjustment (MMPI)</th>
<th>Community Tenure</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Success Percent</td>
<td>Failure Percent</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Kendall's Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Maladjustment and Pd only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd-Ma and Mf-Pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>+1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)There were no MMPI profiles on seven of the parolees.

tenure was the parole placement index score. This consisted of items dealing with the custody and care of children, conjugal relationships, family of orientation relationships, friendships, job satisfaction, and family placement. The parole placement index was related to successful community tenure at a .02 level of statistical significance and had a moderate association coefficient of +.654. Only three out of 33 low scorers (9.1 percent) became reinvolved with the law while 32.4 percent of the high scorers on the index were failures (cf. Table 20).\(^79\)

The importance of the parole placement index was mainly due to the living placement, conjugal relationships, custody and care of...
children, and family of orientation relationships as can be seen in Table 20. If the parolee had a family placement, she had an 87 percent chance of succeeding on parole; whereas, only 71.4 percent of those who did not live with relatives succeeded. Furthermore, none of the four women who had good marriages and lived with their husbands were failures. These women, however, were probably the best risks with the lowest amount of social maladjustment.

The next major factor in the parole placement index was family relationships. Only 12.5 percent of the parolees who indicated excellent relationships with their families had difficulty; whereas, 25.6 percent of the parolees who did not have good family relationships had difficulty. In other words, 87.5 percent of those parolees who had excellent relationships with their families of orientation were successful; whereas, only 74.4 percent of the parolees whose family relationships were not described as excellent were successful (cf. Table 20). Thus among the failures, poorer family relationships were somewhat more common than among the successes.

The last major factor in this parole placement index was custody and care of children. Only 18.7 percent of the parolees who had the custody of their children became failures; whereas, 30.4 percent of the parolees who did not have the custody of their children became failures (cf. Table 20). Furthermore, only one of the ten parolees who had total responsibility for her children failed to succeed; whereas, thirteen of the parolees who lacked total responsibility failed (23.2 percent).

Since husband, children, and family are major factors in the
**TABLE 20**
PAROLE PLACEMENT AND COMMUNITY TENURE
(N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Items of Parole Placement Index</th>
<th>Community Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Placement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugal Relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Excellent</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody of Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Total Responsibility</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family of Orientation Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Excellent</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Excellent</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Excellent</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Placement Index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Total Score</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Total Score</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lives of lower and working class women, it is not surprising that an
index formed of these factors is an excellent predictor of parole suc­
cess for women. Furthermore, during interviews with the women, the
interviewer often noted that the women permitted to fulfill their role
of mother seemed to have more than sufficient reason to persevere in
readjusting. In contrast, many of the women who were not permitted the
care of their children tended to feel frustrated and tended to find it
very difficult to cope with their other problems.

In other words, the hard structural facts are that the older
parolees who have committed a personal offense and have a good commu­
nity placement are far more likely to succeed on parole than younger
parolees who have committed property, narcotic, or other offenses and
have a poor community placement.

Criminal Orientation Attitudes and Perceptions

In addition to the hard structural variables of social back­
ground, criminal history, and parole placement, three major groupings
of attitudinal and perceptual variables were analyzed: criminal orien­
tation, alienation, and interpersonal competence.

None of the criminal orientation measurements had a statis­
tically significant relationship to community tenure status. However,
the inmate loyalty, associational preference, and the Criminality Level
Index scores did follow a pattern to which the criminal identification
scores ran counter (cf. Table 21). Of the low scorers on inmate loy­
alty and the Reckless Criminality Level Index 85.7 and 78.1 percent
respectively were successful. Of the high scorers on these two scales
### TABLE 21

**CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND COMMUNITY TENURE**

(N=67)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Orientation Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Success Percent</th>
<th>Failure Percent</th>
<th>P*</th>
<th>Kendall's Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)A few of the parolees were not capable of completing all the items.

70.0 and 75.0 percent respectively were successful. On the other hand, 82.1 percent of the high scorers on associational preference were successful; only 69.6 percent of the low scorers were successful.\(^80\)

---

\(^80\)Associational preference is preference for law abiding friends, thus the direction of the relationship should be the opposite of inmate loyalty, criminal identification and the Criminality Level Index.
Alienation Attitudes and Perceptions

Another variable significantly related to community tenure status was apathy. This relationship was inverse and had a .01 level of statistical significance and a moderate association coefficient of -.732. In fact, 30 out of 33 parolees who scored low on apathy (90.9 percent) were successful; whereas, only seventeen out of twenty-eight parolees who scored high on apathy were successful (60.7 percent). In other words, only 9.1 percent of the low scorers on the apathy scale were failures; whereas, 39.3 percent of the high scorers were failures (cf. Table 22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alienation Scales</th>
<th>Community Tenure</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Success Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aA few of the parolees were not able to complete all the items.
The same trend noted in the relationship between apathy and community tenure status also existed for isolation and anomia and community tenure status, even though these relationships were not statistically significant. Only 73.3 percent and 71.4 percent of the high scorers on anomia and isolation respectively were successful; whereas, 82.9 and 83.3 percent of the low scorers on these scales respectively were successful (cf. Table 22).

Furthermore, this same inverse relationship between alienation and community tenure was further established by the female role index. That is, 81.6 percent of the high scorers on female role as opposed to only 73.1 percent of the low scorers on female role were successful (cf. Table 22).

It may be that the measurements of anomia, isolation, and female role did not indicate a stronger relationship to success on parole because hard facts such as custody and care of children may be more important than subjective attitudes in helping the women to settle down and accept responsibility.

---

81 According to Parsons, a person is alienated if he is unable to identify with his social role. Thus a low score on female role represents the self estrangement aspect of alienation.

82 The determination of who received the custody and care of her children upon returning to the community depended more upon who was responsible for the children and whether or not Child Welfare had made arrangements for their care during the mother's absence, than upon the parolee's ability to take care of the children, maturity, and identification with a mature female role. Usually when the care of the children had been turned over to a grandmother or the father of the children, the custody and care of the children was returned to the mother within a few weeks after she returned to the community; unless the relative was trying to obtain permanent legal custody. On the other hand, if Child Welfare had made arrangements for the care of the
Thus, all of the alienation scales indicated an inverse relationship between alienation and successful community tenure. In addition, the apathy scale scores were significantly related to community tenure.

Interpersonal Competence Attitudes and Perceptions

Another variable that had a statistically significant relationship to community tenure was one of the three measures of interpersonal competence, i.e.—perceptions of self and others. This index, which consisted of negative attitudes towards the parole officer, self, and others, and immaturity was inversely related to community tenure. This relationship was statistically significant at the .05 level and had a moderate association coefficient of +.584. Thus, 90.0 percent of low scorers on this index as opposed to only 70.3 percent of the high scorers were successful. In fact, only three out of 30 parolees who were low scorers on this scale became reinvolved with the law during an average of eight months on parole (cf. Table 23).

However, it should also be noted in Table 23 that there was no

children, they usually insisted that the parolee prove that she could take care of the children by establishing a suitable home and obtaining and maintaining employment for a period of six months or longer. They would then consider taking the matter to court and returning the custody of the children to the mother. In some cases, where for one reason or another, the Child Welfare Agency had decided that the parolee was not a fit mother, it became obvious that the woman would have to hire a lawyer and legally fight the case in court in order to obtain legal custody of her children.

The lower the score on this index, the higher the degree of interpersonal competence.
### TABLE 23

**INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE SCALES AND COMMUNITY TENURE**

*(N=67)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Competence Scale</th>
<th>Community Tenure</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Success Percent</td>
<td>Failure Percent</td>
<td>p*</td>
<td>Kendall's Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Self and others</td>
<td>High 37</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low 30</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to SO a</td>
<td>High 27</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low 26</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Po b</td>
<td>High 28</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low 29</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Several of the parolees claimed that they did not have a significant other.

*b Several of the parolees had a new parole officer at the time of this testing and did not know her.

statistically significant association between (1) relationship to a significant other and community tenure status or between (2) relationship to parole officer and community tenure status. Thus, 77.8 percent of the high scorers and 76.9 percent of the low scorers on relationship to significant other were successful. However, 85.7 percent of the high scorers and only 72.4 percent of the low scorers on relationship...
to parole officer were successful; while 14.3 percent of the high
scorers and 27.6 percent of the low scorers on relationship to parole
officer were failures.

Perhaps these three relationships between the measures of
interpersonal competence and community tenure status found in Table
23 should be interpreted to mean that (1) parole success is partially
dependent upon a good relationship with the parole officer, and (2)
negative attitudes are better predictors of failure than meaningful
relationships are predictors of success. \(^\text{84}\) Indeed, it probably always
has been far more difficult for people to make radical changes in their
life styles than not to make them. Thus, one would expect that a mean­
ingful relationship with another person would have to be far stronger
than the negative attitudes towards others and oneself in order to sur­
mount the inertia against change.

Thus, this study follows in the well established tradition of
studies concerning male parolees. The older parolees and particularly
those who have committed personal offenses are much more likely to suc­
cceed on parole than the younger parolees and those who have committed
property and other offenses. In addition, the women who have a Pd-Ma
or a Mf-Pa MMPI profile, a low score on the parole placement index, a
low score on the apathy scale, and a low score on (negative) percep­
tions of self and others index, are far more likely to succeed on parole

\(^{84}\) Negative attitudes towards authority and the parole officer
were included in the first measurement of interpersonal competence. A
meaningful relationship with the parole officer and significant other
were the second and third measurements of interpersonal competence.
than the women who have an extremely maladjusted or a Pd only profile, a high score on the parole placement index, a high score on the apathy scale, and a high score (negative) on perceptions of self and others index.

The first section of this chapter has attempted to answer the first major question of this study. Who are the women most likely to succeed on parole? The answer is that the older female parolees who (1) have committed a personal offense, (2) are not extremely maladjusted, (3) have a good parole placement, (4) are not apathetic, and (5) have a high degree of interpersonal competence are the ones most likely to succeed in remaining uninvolved with the law. The next two sections of this chapter will attempt to answer the second major question of this study. Who are the women most likely to succeed in fulfilling the many expectations placed upon adult women to be a wife, mother, homemaker, entertainer, employee, and community worker?

**Domestic Performance**

The reintegration of women into society is dependent not only upon their ability to stay out of trouble with the law but also upon their ability to fulfill the wife, mother, employee, and other related roles. Needless to say, not only is it extremely difficult for any one woman to fulfill all of these roles, but it is equally difficult to measure the degree to which she does successfully fulfill them. Two different indices were used to try to measure this aspect of readjustment: domestic performance and community functioning. This section will discuss the relationship between domestic performance and the demo-
graphic variables, criminal history, personal maladjustment, parole placement, and attitudes and perceptions.

Demographic Variables

None of the demographic variables was significantly related to domestic performance. However, there was some indication that older women tended to accept more responsibility than younger women. Only 35.5 percent of those 30 years old and under had high scores on domestic performance; whereas, 58.3 percent of those over 30 years old had high scores on domestic performance (cf. Table 24). This is probably a reflection of a greater degree of social maturation among the older women. Race, education, occupation, and class seemed wholly unrelated to domestic performance (cf. Table 24).

Criminal History

Furthermore, not one of the criminal history variables—arrests, lockups, institutionalization, offense, and known narcotic addiction—was significantly related to domestic performance. In fact, only narcotic addiction came close to being significantly related to the level of domestic performance. Thus, 30.0 percent of the known narcotic addicts had high scores on domestic performance; whereas, 50.9 percent of those who were not known narcotic addicts had high scores on domestic performance. These findings suggest that criminal history variables usually do not negatively influence the acceptance of familial responsibilities but that compulsive behavior does interfere with the acceptance of these responsibilities to some degree (cf. Table 25).
### TABLE 24

**DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND DOMESTIC PERFORMANCE**

*(N=67)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variable</th>
<th>Domestic Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Kendall's Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
<td>Low Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and under</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade or less</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 9th grade</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiskilled</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 25
CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES
AND DOMESTIC PERFORMANCE
(N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal History Variable</th>
<th>Domestic Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
<td>Low Percent</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Kendall's Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 years or less</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.239a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 to 4.9 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 years or more</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotic Addiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aC adjusted.
Personal Maladjustment (MMPI)

The various types of MMPI profiles were not significantly related to domestic performance. However, the extremely maladjusted women tended to exhibit poorer performance than the better adjusted parolees. Only 38.1 percent of those parolees who had either an extremely maladjusted or Pd only profile as compared to 48.7 percent of those who did not, had high scores on domestic performance. Also 50.0 percent of the women who had Pd-Ma or Mf-Pa profiles as opposed to only 42.5 percent of those who did not have these two types of profiles, had high scores on domestic performance (cf. Table 26).

TABLE 26
PERSONAL MALADJUSTMENT (MMPI) AND DOMESTIC PERFORMANCE (N=60)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Maladjustment (MMPI)</th>
<th>Domestic Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Maladjustment and Pd only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd-Ma and Mf-Pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were no MMPI profiles on seven of the parolees.

Apparently maladjustment does not have as much of a negative
influence upon domestic performance as upon community tenure. Perhaps the domestic performance scale measures only whether the person is performing a particular job rather than how well she performs it. More important however, is the fact that if a person is expected to perform certain duties that have to be done and there is no one else to perform them for her, then she does the tasks regardless of sickness or maladjustment. In other words, structural expectations play an important role in determining domestic performance. But, it is also quite possible that extremely maladjusted people would tend not to be in situations that demand high performance levels.

Parole Placement

The first variable that had a statistically significant relationship to domestic performance was parole placement in a conjugal setting (conjugal placement). Of the women who were living with their husbands, only one in ten had a low score on domestic performance. Thus, 88.9 percent of the women who had a conjugal placement had high scores on domestic performance; but, only 40.4 percent of those women who did not have a conjugal placement had high scores on domestic performance (cf. Table 27). This relationship was statistically signifi-

85 If a maladjusted woman was not living with another adult woman, she might have been the only person who did the dishes, washed the clothes, swept the floors, cooked the meals, and took care of the children, even though the way the duties were performed might have left something to be desired. On the other hand, a more adjusted individual living with another woman might have performed fewer duties but have done a better job of them than a maladjusted woman.

TABLE 27
PAROLE PLACEMENT AND DOMESTIC PERFORMANCE
(N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole Placement</th>
<th>Domestic Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
<td>Low Percent</td>
<td>p*</td>
<td>Kendall's Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugal Placement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Placement Index</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cant at the .02 level and had a high association coefficient of .844.

Even though a conjugal placement had a statistically significant relationship with domestic performance, a family placement with any relative (mother, father, sister, brother, aunt, uncle, child, husband, etc.) did not relate significantly to domestic performance. Furthermore, the parole placement index including custody and care of children, family placement, job satisfaction, and conjugal relationship, family of orientation relationships, and friendships did not relate significantly to domestic performance (cf. Table 27).

Thus, it appears as though the major determinant of high-low scores on domestic performance was dependent upon whether or not the parolee was the only adult woman in the home. If she was and had to accept full domestic responsibility instead of sharing it with another adult woman, she generally performed the duties. Perhaps these
relationships are a reflection of the women living with their husbands being the best parole risks and having the greatest degree of social maturation.

Thus, the only hard variable found to be significantly related to domestic performance was parole to a conjugal household.

**Criminal Orientation Perceptions and Attitudes**

Another variable significantly related with domestic performance was one of the criminal orientation scales, associational preference. Only 30.4 percent of the low scorers on associational preference had high scores on domestic performance whereas 59.0 percent of the high scorers on associational preference had high scores on domestic performance (cf. Table 28). Thus, there was a direct relationship between associational preference and domestic performance at the .05 level of statistical significance.

The other criminal orientation variables—inmate loyalty, criminal identification, and Reckless's Criminality Level Index—had inverse relationships with domestic performance; but none was statistically significant. Thus, only 41.4, 41.4, and 42.9 percent of the low scorers on inmate loyalty, criminal identification, and the Criminality Level Index had high scores on domestic performance; whereas, 54.3, 56.3, and 53.1 percent of the low scorers on these scales had

---

87 Associational preference is the preference for law abiding associates. Thus it is the opposite of a criminal orientation, and a direct relationship between associational preference and domestic performance would indicate an inverse relationship between criminal orientation and domestic performance.
### Table 28

**Criminal Orientation and Domestic Performance**

(N=67)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Orientation Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>High Percent</th>
<th>Low Percent</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Kendall's Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inmate Loyalty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associational Preference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminality Level Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) A few of the 67 parolees did not complete all of the items in the scales; therefore, their scores could not be included in these analyses.

High domestic performance (cf. Table 28). Thus, all of the measurements of criminal orientation indicated an inverse relationship between criminal orientation and domestic performance.

In addition, when the relationship between domestic performance and the Reckless Criminality Level Index scores were further categorized

---

\(^{88}\) Above, n. 87.
by race and age there was a statistically significant inverse relationship between these two variables for the whites and the younger parolees (those 30 years old and younger). However, the relationship between these two variables for the blacks and the older parolees (those over 30 years old) tended to be direct rather than inverse. Thus, only 33.3 percent of the whites who had high scores on the Criminality Level Index also had high scores on domestic performance whereas 70.6 percent of the whites who had low scores on the Criminality Level Index also had high scores on domestic performance. This inverse relationship held at the .05 level of statistical significance and had a moderate association coefficient of -.655. On the other hand, 50.0 percent of the blacks who had a high score on the Criminality Level Index also had a high score on domestic performance whereas only 33.3 percent of the blacks who had a low score on the Criminality Level Index had a high score on domestic performance. This last relationship was direct rather than inverse; however, it did not attain statistical significance and the association coefficient was low, +.333 (cf. Table 29).

When this same relationship was controlled for age, only 17.6 percent of the younger parolees who had high scores on the Criminality Level Index also had high scores on domestic performance whereas 57.1 percent of the younger parolees who had low scores on the Criminality Level Index had high scores on domestic performance. This inverse relationship was statistically significant and had a moderate association coefficient of -.655 and +.333 respectively. Goodman's $W^2$ statistic demonstrated that these two coefficients were statistically different at a .02 level of significance.
TABLE 29
CRIMINALITY LEVEL INDEX AND DOMESTIC PERFORMANCE: CONTROLLED FOR RACE
(N=60)^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminality Level Index and Race</th>
<th>Domestic Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
<td>Low Percent</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Seven of the cases did not complete the Criminality Level Index.

\[ W^2 = 6.022 \]
\[ p^* = .02 \]

relationship was statistically significant at the .03 level and had a moderate association of -.723. This same relationship between the Criminality Level Index and domestic performance was direct for the older parolees rather than inverse. That is, 81.8 percent of the older parolees who had high scores on the index also had high scores on domestic performance; whereas only 50.0 percent of the older parolees who had low scores on the index had high scores on domestic performance.\(^90\) (cf.

\(^90\) The Q association coefficients for the younger and older
Table 30.

TABLE 30
CRIMINALITY LEVEL INDEX AND DOMESTIC PERFORMANCE: CONTROLLED FOR AGE
(N=60)\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminality Level Index and Age</th>
<th>Domestic Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\text{N}</td>
<td>\text{High Percent}</td>
<td>\text{Low Percent}</td>
<td>\text{P}\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 30 and under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>.03\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: over 30 years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Seven of the parolees did not complete the Criminality Level Index.

\textsuperscript{b}Fisher's Exact Probability.

\(W^2 = 16.296\)
\(p = .001\)

It appears that a high score on the Reckless Criminality Level Index is an indication of social maladjustment (personal lawlessness) parolees on this relationship between Criminality Level Index and domestic performance were -.723 and +.636 respectively. Even though the difference between these two association coefficients is quite obvious, the \(W^2\) statistic could not be legitimately used to determine a statistically significant difference due to small cell expectancies.
for the whites and younger parolees but not for many of the blacks and older parolees. Instead, for many of the people in the latter two groups, a high score on negative attitudes towards the police, courts, and laws may represent a realistic appraisal of the legal structure in society; that is, an awareness that some laws are unjust or that the enforcement of laws is not always just.

If this is true, then one would not expect these negative attitudes to have an adverse effect upon the black and older parolees; but rather, one would expect that those who can appraise situations realistically would also tend to fulfill their obligations. However, probably not all of the blacks and older parolees who had high scores on the Criminality Level Index had developed this realistic appraisal of the need for a legal structural change; instead for some, it probably still represented a personal lawlessness.

Thus, the examination of the relationships between the measures of criminal orientation (inmate loyalty, criminal identification, Criminality Level Index, and associational preference) and domestic performance have indicated that there is an inverse relationship between criminal orientation and domestic performance. Furthermore, when the relationship between the Criminality Level Index and domestic performance was specified by race and age, an inverse relationship was found for the

91 This realistic appraisal may have developed for some of the blacks by belonging to the black power movement and becoming more aware of the anomie position of the black substructure in comparison to the white substructure in society. On the other hand, this realistic appraisal may have developed for the older parolees during many years of life experiences in which they have had a chance to become aware of many situations where people were not treated justly by the legal structure.
whites and younger parolees (personal lawlessness) and a direct relationship for the blacks and older parolees (recognizing a need for structural change).

**Alienation Perceptions and Attitudes**

One of the alienation measures—Srole's anomia scale—had a statistically significant relationship with domestic performance. Only 30.0 percent of the high scorers on anomia had high scores on domestic performance whereas 62.9 percent of the low scorers on anomia had high scores on domestic performance. This relationship was statistically significant at a .01 level and had a moderate association coefficient of -.596 (cf. Table 31).

**TABLE 31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALIENATION SCALES AND DOMESTIC PERFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N=67)a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alienation Scale</th>
<th>Domestic Performance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Kendall's Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
<td>Low Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few of the parolees were not able to complete all the scales.
The scores on Dean's isolation scale and Lantz's apathy scale were also inversely related to domestic performance but not at a statistically significant level of confidence. Thus, only 35.7 percent and 42.9 percent of the high scorers on isolation and apathy respectively also had high scores on domestic performance. In contrast, 55.6 percent and 51.5 percent of the low scorers on isolation and apathy had high scores on domestic performance (cf. Table 31). Thus the alienation measures--anomia, isolation, and apathy--were inversely related to domestic performance; even though anomia was the only one that had a statistically significant relationship.

Identification with the female role proved to be an important determinant of domestic performance. Thus, 60.5 percent of the high scorers on the female role scale also had high scores on domestic performance; whereas, only 30.8 percent of the low scorers on the female role scale had high scores on domestic performance (cf. Table 31). This relationship was statistically significant at a .02 level and had a moderate association coefficient of +.551. This relationship was expected; and in fact, helps further to establish the validity of the female role index.

The analysis of the relationships between all of the alienation measurements and domestic performance has indicated that alienation has a negative influence upon the performance of domestic duties.

**Interpersonal Competence Perceptions and Attitudes**

None of the three interpersonal competence variables was significantly related to domestic performance; however, negative perceptions
of self and others did indicate an inverse relationship. That is, only
40.5 percent of the high scorers on perceptions of self and others also
had high scores on domestic performance; whereas, 56.7 percent of the
low scorers on perceptions of self and others had high scores on domes­
tic performance (cf. Table 32). There was no relationship established
between domestic performance and a meaningful relationship with either
a parole officer or a significant other.

TABLE 32
INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE SCALES
AND DOMESTIC PERFORMANCE
(N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Competence Scale</th>
<th>Domestic Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Self and Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to SO&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to PO&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Several of the parolees claimed that they did not have a
significant other.

<sup>b</sup>Several of the parolees had a new parole officer at the time of
this testing and did not know her.
Possibly the reason that interpersonal competence is not more important as a determinant of domestic performance is that domestic performance appeared to be more dependent upon whether or not the parolee had a place of her own and was thus expected to accept full domestic responsibility rather than sharing the responsibility with another adult woman. Having her own apartment or home was dependent upon several factors such as social maturation, financial situation, as well as family situation rather than upon interpersonal competence. Furthermore, the reason that the negative perceptions of self and others indicated an inverse trend may have been the fact that part of the index measures immaturity.

This section has given evidence that successful domestic performance is directly related to a parole placement in a conjugal household while on parole, identification with a mature female role, and preference for law abiding associates, and is inversely related with anomia. However, contrary to expectations, interpersonal competence did not have an important influence on domestic performance.

The next section will attempt to specify which women are most likely to fulfill successfully the community roles of employee and community worker.

Community Functioning

Community functioning is the second measure used in this study to assess the degree to which the women parolees fulfilled the obligations expected of adult women. This index includes items concerning domestic, work, and social roles. Thus this index attempts to measure
the totality of community functioning rather than just domestic performance. Needless to say, it is even more difficult to assess the employee, community worker and other social roles included in the community functioning index than just the domestic roles included in the domestic performance scale.\(^2\) This section will discuss the relationship between community functioning and demographic variables, criminal history, personal maladjustment, parole placement, and perceptions.

**Demographic Variables**

Two of the demographic variables were significantly related to community functioning: race and occupation. White parolees had high scores on community functioning more often than blacks, 63.3 percent as opposed to only 35.1 percent. This relationship was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence and had a moderate association coefficient of +.523 (cf. Table 33).

In terms of occupation, the semiskilled women had high scores on community functioning more often than unskilled women, 71.9 percent as opposed to only 24.3 percent. This relationship was statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence and had a moderate association coefficient of +.523 (cf. Table 33).

\(^2\)The community functioning index, like the domestic index, makes no attempt to measure the skill, carefulness, and thoroughness with which the duties were performed, but only the acceptance of the responsibility for performing them. In addition all the women had to accept some, even if not full responsibility for domestic duties; but they did not all have to work. Therefore, there was a strong association between working and high scores on community functioning. All of the parolees who were not working and only 22.0 percent of the parolees who were working had low scores on community functioning. The chi square for this relationship was 38.84 which had a .001 level of statistical significance. Thus, each woman's community functioning score depended to a great degree on whether or not if she had to work and if she was the only adult woman in the home.
### TABLE 33

**DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING**

* (N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 and under</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade or less</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 9th Grade</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiskilled</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

significant at a .001 level of confidence and had a moderate association coefficient of -.761 (cf. Table 33).

The reason why the white and semiskilled parolees had higher scores on community functioning than the black and unskilled women probably lies in the fact that it was easier for them to obtain employment. This was particularly true since there was an economic downturn with high unemployment rates during the period of this study. In fact, in some of
the inner cities, the unemployment rate was as high as 10 percent.

Two additional variables indicated definite patterns, although they were not statistically significant: age and class. The younger parolees (30 years old or less) and the working class parolees had higher scores on community functioning than those over 30 years old and lower class parolees. Thus, 54.8 percent of those 30 years old or younger had high scores on community functioning whereas only 41.7 percent of those over 30 years old had high scores. Also, only 40.0 percent of the lower class parolees had high scores on community functioning whereas 59.3 percent of the working class parolees had high scores. Again, the reason younger and working class women had high scores on community functioning more often than the older and lower class women was probably due to it being easier for them to obtain employment (cf. Table 33).

Education had very little influence upon community functioning, although those with tenth grade education or better did have higher scores on community functioning than those with less education. Possibly the reason that education was not more important is that a skill rather than education may be more of a determinant in obtaining a job in the lower and working classes (cf. Table 33).

Thus, the semiskilled, working class, white, and younger parolees tended to have higher scores on community functioning than the unskilled, lower class, black, and older parolees.

**Criminal History Variables**

None of the criminal history variables was significantly related
to community functioning. In general, parolees who had fewer lockups as opposed to a greater number and those who had committed property, narcotic, and other offenses as opposed to the personal crimes, had higher scores on community functioning. Thus 60.0 percent of those with few previous lockups as opposed to only 37.8 percent of the parolees with many prior lockups had high scores on community functioning. In addition, only 37.0 percent of the personal offenders as opposed to 55.0 percent of the property, narcotic, and other offenders had high scores on community functioning (cf. Table 34).

In general, parolees with fewer lockups may tend to be less socially maladjusted than those who had more. They are likely to have better work records and work referrals which might make it easier to obtain employment. Furthermore, parolees with fewer lockups probably make a greater effort to obtain employment than the other parolees.

The explanation for the narcotic, property, and other offenders having higher scores on community functioning than the personal offenders may be that the former group had more contacts with people who might be able to help them find a job than the personal offenders. In addition, the personal offenders tended to be more isolated and ashamed of their conduct and incarceration.

This analysis of the relationships between the background characteristics and community functioning has revealed that none of the criminal history variables was significantly related to community functioning. However, two of the demographic variables, race and occupation, were significantly related to community functioning.
### TABLE 34
CRIMINAL HISTORY VARIABLES AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING
(N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal History Variable</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 years or less</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 to 4.9 years</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 years or more</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotic Addiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aContingency Coefficient Adjusted.*

**Personal Maladjustment (MMPI)**

Extreme personal maladjustment tended to have an adverse effect upon community functioning but the other profiles did not appear to make much difference. Only 38.1 percent of the extremely maladjusted as compared with 59.0 percent of those parolees who were not extremely maladjusted had high scores on community functioning (cf. Table 35).
TABLE 35
PERSONAL MALADJUSTMENT AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING
(N=60)\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Maladjustment (MMPI)</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>High Percent</th>
<th>Low Percent</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Kendall's Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Maladjustment and Pd only</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd-Ma and Mf-Pa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}MMPI profiles were not available on seven of the parolees.

Apparently extreme maladjustment poses a real handicap and tends to prevent successful functioning in the employment and social realms of activities.

Parole Placement

Parole placement in a family setting was significantly related to community functioning. Those not living with their families tended to have higher scores on community functioning than those living with their families. Thus, 60.0 percent of those who were not living with a relative as opposed to only 35.5 percent of those who were living with a relative had a high score on community functioning (cf. Table 36). The parole placement index, which also included custody and care of children, job satisfaction, family of orientation relationships,
friendships, and conjugal relationship appeared to be unrelated to community functioning.

TABLE 36
PAROLE PLACEMENT AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING (N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parole Placement</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>P*</td>
<td>Kendall's Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Placement Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the analysis of all the hard variables—demographic, criminal history, and parole placement—has revealed that three of the measures—race, occupation and family placement—had statistically significant relationships with community functioning. That is, the women most likely to fulfill the domestic, work and social roles are white, semiskilled women who are not living with a family member. The rest of this section will deal with attitudes and perceptions and their influence upon performance of these roles.

The researcher feels that these findings are probably due to these facts: (1) the parolees tended to obtain their own homes and apartments as soon as they could financially afford them, and (2) a job may have partially given the working women a sense of purpose usually fulfilled for most women by custody and care of children.
Criminal Orientation Perceptions and Attitudes

None of the criminal orientation variables was significantly related to community functioning, and the Reckless Criminality Level Index was the only criminal orientation scale even remotely related to it. Only 39.3 percent of the high scorers on the Criminality Level Index also had high scores on community functioning, whereas, 56.3 percent of the low scorers on the index had high scores on community functioning (cf. Table 37).

TABLE 37
CRIMINAL ORIENTATION AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING (N=67) a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Orientation Variable</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
<td>Low Percent</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Kendall's Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aA few of the parolees were not capable of completing all the items in these scales.
When this relationship was controlled for race, it was found that 17.3 percent of the whites who were high scorers on the Criminality Level Index also had high scores on community functioning, whereas, 70.0 percent of the whites who were low scorers on the index had high scores on community functioning. On the other hand, 60.0 percent of the blacks who had high scores on the index also had high scores on community functioning whereas only 47.6 percent of the blacks who were low scorers on the index had high scores on community functioning (cf. Table 38).

Furthermore, when this relationship was controlled for race and age at the same time, it was found that (1) a statistically significant inverse relationship at a .009 level of confidence existed for the young whites and (2) there was a direct relationship for the young blacks that had a .068 level of confidence. None of the 17 young whites had low scores on both of these variables and only three of them had high scores on both variables. Thus, of the young whites only 25.0 percent of the high scorers as opposed to 100.0 percent of the low scorers on the index had high scores on community functioning. On the other hand, of the young blacks, all of the high scorers as opposed to only 44.4 percent of the low scorers on the index had high scores on community functioning (cf. Table 39)

94 The cell expectancies were too small to apply Goodman's $W^2$ statistic to determine if the difference in the association coefficients for the whites and blacks was significantly different. The Q coefficients were -.735 and +.245. By observation alone, this difference of .980 is large.

95 The cell expectancies were too small to apply Goodman's $W^2$
### TABLE 38

**CRIMINALITY LEVEL INDEX AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING: CONTROLLED FOR RACE**  
\(N=60\)^a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminality Level Index and Race</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aSeven of the parolees were not capable of completing the items in the Criminality Level Index.

^bFisher's Exact Probability.

\(W^2 = 5.524\)
\(p = .02\)

### TABLE 39

**CRIMINALITY LEVEL INDEX AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING FOR THOSE 30 YEARS OLD OR YOUNGER: CONTROLLED FOR RACE**  
\(N=31\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminality Level Index and Race</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Whites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aFisher's Exact Probability.
It appears as though at least a couple of structural elements—a subcultural element and an anomie element— influenced the relationships between the criminal orientation variables and community functioning. The subcultural element is generally known as the "underworld" or the "grey world." Belonging to this subculture may make available many job opportunities that are not available to those who do not belong, particularly in the inner city. In other words, those who indicated a history of and preference for criminal associates by their responses to the inmate loyalty, criminal identification, and associational preference scales probably belonged to the subculture and may have had more jobs made available to them than those who indicated a preference for law abiding associates. However, this greater availability of jobs to those in the criminal subculture may have been counterbalanced by the negative influence that a criminal orientation would have upon wanting to obtain and maintain a job.

Anomie may be the explanation for the black high scorers on the Criminality Level Index also tending to have high scores on community functioning. That is, blacks may be aware of their general anomic position in society, particularly in the legal structure, and this awareness may be very functional for superior community functioning. In contrast, whites have opportunities and tend to be treated justly by the statistic to determine if the difference in the association coefficients for the young whites and the young blacks was significantly different. However, the difference in the Q coefficients for the young whites and young blacks was 2.00 (1.00 - (1.00)). Since the range for the Q association coefficient is from -1.00 to +1.00, this difference could not have been larger.
legal structure. If their high scores on the index represent personal lawlessness, this would explain why the whites who had high scores on the index tended to have inferior community functioning.

In summation, none of the criminal orientation measures was significantly related to community functioning for the entire population. However, when the relationship between Reckless's Criminality Level Index and community functioning was specified by race and age, it was found that there was (1) an inverse relationship between the index and community functioning for the whites, particularly the young whites, and (2) a direct relationship between these two variables for the blacks, particularly the young blacks.

**Alienation Perceptions and Attitudes**

Thus far, the three variables which have had statistically significant relationships to community functioning are race, occupation, and family placement. The fourth variable that had a statistically significant relationship with community functioning was one of the four alienation measures, apathy. Only 32.1 percent of the high scorers as opposed to 60.6 percent of the low scorers on apathy had high scores on community functioning. This inverse relationship was statistically significant at the .05 level and had an association coefficient of -.529 (cf. Table 40).

Anomia also tended to have an inverse relationship. Only 33.3 percent of the high scorers as opposed to 57.1 percent of the low scorers on anomia had high scores on community functioning (cf. Table 40). Furthermore, when this relationship was specified by race, there
A few of the parolees were not capable of completing all the items. 

was a statistically significant inverse relationship between anomia and community functioning for the whites. On the other hand, for the blacks there was a weak direct relationship (cf. Table 41). Thus only 21.1 percent of the white high scorers as opposed to 72.7 percent of the white low scorers on anomia also had high scores on community functioning; whereas, 63.6 percent of the black high scorers as opposed to only 50.0 percent of the black low scorers on anomia had high scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alienation Scale</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Kendall's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)A few of the parolees were not capable of completing all the items.
Table 41
Anomia and Community Functioning: Controlled for Race
(N=65)\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anomia and Race</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Whites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Anomia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Anomia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race: Blacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Anomia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Anomia</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Two of the parolees were not able to complete all the items.

\(W^2 = 8.439\)
\(p = .01\)

on community functioning. This relationship for the whites was statistically significant at a .02 level and had an association coefficient of -.818.

Contrary to expectations, the relationship of isolation to community functioning was not statistically significant. However, when this relationship was further specified by race and age, the findings indicated that for whites and younger parolees there was an inverse relationship between isolation and community functioning and for the blacks

\(\text{The Q association coefficients for the whites and blacks on this relationship were } -.818 \text{ and } +.274 \text{ respectively. The difference in these Q coefficients is 1.093 which is a large difference. However, since the lowest cell expectancy was 4.4, the } W^2 \text{ statistic could not be used legitimately to determine if the difference was significantly different.}\)
and older parolees a significant direct relationship between these variables. Only 42.1 percent of the white high scorers as opposed to 72.7 percent of the white low scorers on isolation had high scores on community functioning. Seventy percent of the black high scorers as opposed to only 20.8 percent of the black low scorers on isolation had high scores on community functioning. This relationship for the blacks obtained a .01 level of confidence and had an association coefficient of .797. In addition, only 41.2 percent of the younger parolees who had high scores as opposed to 57.1 percent of them who had low scores on isolation had high scores on community functioning, whereas, 66.7 percent of the older parolees who had high scores as opposed to only 23.8 percent of them who had low scores on isolation had high scores on community functioning. This relationship for the older parolees was significant at a .02 level of confidence and had an association coefficient of +.730 (cf. Tables 40, 42, and 43).

The last alienation measurement, the female role scale, had only a slight direct relationship to community functioning in the expected direction. Thus, half of the high scorers on female role

97 The Q association coefficients for the whites and blacks were -.571 and +.797. The difference between these Q's was 1.368 which is a large difference. However, since the smallest cell expectancy was 3.5, the W^2 statistic could not legitimately be used.

98 The Q association coefficients for the younger and older parolees were -.311 and +.730. The difference between these coefficients was 1.041 which is a large difference. However, since the lowest cell expectancy was 4.7, the W^2 statistic could not be legitimately used to determine if this difference was significantly different.

99 According to Parsons, if a person rejects her role, then she is estranged from herself which is one of the elements of alienation. Therefore, female role should have a direct relationship to community
### TABLE 42
**ISOLATION AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING: CONTROLLED FOR RACE**
(N=64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolation and Race</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
<td>Low Percent</td>
<td>p*</td>
<td>Kendall's Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race: Whites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Isolation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Isolation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race: Blacks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Isolation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>+.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Isolation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fischer's Exact Probability.

$W^2 = 18.616$

$p* = .001$

### TABLE 43
**ISOLATION AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING: CONTROLLED FOR AGE**
(N=64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isolation and Age</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>High Percent</td>
<td>Low Percent</td>
<td>p*</td>
<td>Kendall's Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: 30 and under</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Isolation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Isolation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age: over 30</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High on Isolation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>.021*</td>
<td>+.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low on Isolation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fischer's Exact Probability

$W^2 = 7.539$

$p* = .01$
also had high scores on community functioning whereas 42.3 percent of the low scorers on female role had high scores on community functioning (cf. Table 40).

Obviously high scores on the measures of alienation, particularly the apathy scale, tend to be related to inferior community functioning. Furthermore, this relationship between alienation (particularly the isolation and anomia scales) and community functioning appears to hold more for the younger parolees and whites than for the older parolees and blacks. Possibly this may be due to the alienation attitudes, that is the anomia and isolation items, having a different meaning for the blacks and older parolees who return to different cultural milieus than the younger and white parolees. The cultural milieus of the blacks and older parolees are probably more characterized by the anomie and anonymity present in large, complex urban centers than the milieus of the younger and white parolees.

**Interpersonal Competence Perceptions and Attitudes**

Two of the three interpersonal competence variables were significantly related to community functioning: (1) perceptions of self and others and (2) relationship to a significant other. Only 35.1 percent of the high scorers on negative perceptions of self and others as compared to 63.3 percent of the low scorers on this scale also had high scores on community functioning. In addition, 59.3 percent of the high functioning in order to reflect the inverse relationship between alienation and community functioning.
scorers on relationship to significant other also had high scores on community functioning while only 30.8 percent of the low scorers on relationship to significant other had high scores on this variable. No trend was established in the relationship between the parole officer and community functioning (cf. Table 44). Thus, the three measurements of interpersonal competence indicated that interpersonal competence is directly related to community functioning but that a positive relationship with the parole officer is not important.

TABLE 44
INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE SCALES AND COMMUNITY FUNCTIONING
(N=67)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Competence Scale</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Self and Others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Significant Other&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Parole Officer&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Several of the parolees claimed that they did not have a significant other.

<sup>b</sup>Several of the parolees had a new parole officer at the time of this testing and did not know her.

This section indicated that community functioning is directly
related to race (being white) and relationship to significant other and inversely related to occupation (being unskilled), family placement, apathy, and negative perceptions of self and others. Thus, the women most likely to fulfill the work and social roles, as well as the domestic roles, are white, semiskilled, do not live with a relative, are not apathetic, have positive perceptions of self and others, and have a high degree of interpersonal competence as indicated by a meaningful relationship with another person.

Summary

Throughout this chapter it became evident that different factors were important in determining community tenure, domestic performance, and community functioning: the three community adjustment variables of reintegration. Age, offense, parole placement index, apathy, and perceptions of self and others were related to community tenure. Conjugal placement, associational preference, female role, and anomia were related to domestic performance. Race, occupation, family placement, apathy, perceptions of self and others, and relationship with a significant other were related to community functioning.

Thus, the two major questions of this study—(1) Who are the women who are most likely to succeed on parole? and (2) Who are the women who are most likely to fulfill their obligations and responsibilities after release from prison on parole? have been answered. The women most likely to succeed on parole are the older ones who have committed a personal offense, have a good parole placement, are not apathetic, and have a high degree of interpersonal competence. The
women most likely to fulfill their domestic roles are those who have a conjugal placement, identify with a mature female role, prefer law abiding associates, and are not alienated. Finally, the women most likely to fulfill their work and social roles, as well as their domestic roles, are those who are white, semiskilled, do not live with a relative, are not apathetic, have positive perceptions of self and others, and have a high degree of interpersonal competence.

The next chapter will present twelve case histories of successful and unsuccessful parolees in order to illustrate the difference found in this chapter.
CHAPTER VI
THE LIVES OF SUCCESSFUL AND UNSUCCESSFUL PAROLEES

It has been the contention of this study that the reintegration of women parolees into society is dependent not only upon the women having no further involvement with the law, but also upon their becoming contributing members of society in a very complex, urban world. Furthermore, this usually has to be accomplished despite many obstacles such as living in the inner city, having a stigmatized status, financial difficulties, poor work records, lack of adequate working skills, inadequate education, marital difficulties, family disorganization, and disturbed children. This chapter will illustrate through twelve case history sketches, the differences between those who succeeded in readjusting to independent living in an urban community and those who did not.

Successful Parolees

Case One

This parolee was a twenty-two year old, single, lower class, black woman. Her mother died when she was young, she was brought up by her father and grandmother. She lived in this home until she was

---

100. The case histories presented in this chapter have not been randomly chosen. Instead, the younger and older, black and white parolees from both the success and failure parolee populations are given. In addition, the success cases have been selected in order to illustrate the readjustment process despite multiple problems.
eighteen which was six years after her initial criminal behavior at age twelve. Furthermore, she stated at the first research interview that she had wanted to leave home at thirteen—only one year after her initial involvement in crime. During the six year period before she left home, she became pregnant by a thirty-three year old man, had a miscarriage, and a case of venereal disease.

After fatally stabbing her older brother, who was demanding money from her, she was sentenced to the Ohio Reformatory for Women for manslaughter in the first degree. Previously she had been arrested a total of nine times for such varied offenses as shoplifting, stabbing a person, incorrigibility, running away, and for an "act of carelessness." As a result of all this criminal behavior, she had been locked up eight times for a total of 51 months. Her institutional record indicated she had adjusted unsatisfactorily to the institution, had received bad work reports, and had been disciplined.

Her parole placement with her uncle and grandmother was excellent. Both relatives were ailing during her parole and she felt needed and wanted in the home. In addition, the uncle was able to establish her in a cosmetology and wig business. As an owner of this beauty shop, she did not have to overcome the prejudice against hiring a black, female, excon, and did not have financial worries during her entire parole.

Psychological testing at the institution during the last admission indicated that her intelligence was borderline normal and that her verbal skills exceeded her performance scores. On the MMPI, she scored more than two standard deviations above normal on the psychopathic
deviate (Pd) scale and more than one standard deviation above normal on
the hypomania scale (Ma).

Sociological testing, preceding her release into the community,
revealed unfavorable, elevated scores on the Reckless Criminality Level
Index and other measures of criminality. She also scored high on the
Lantz apathy scale and on Srole's anomia scale, but she scored low on
Dean's isolation scale. In addition, she had a drinking problem and
often frequented neighborhood bars. After she had been in the community
six months, her test scores on anomia decreased and her scores on inter­
personal competence with her parole officer and "significant other"
increased.

This woman not only succeeded in remaining in the community with­
out any further known criminal involvement, but she also had favorable
scores on adjustment to domestic responsibilities, work performance, and
social participation.

Case Two

This was a fifty-one year old, black woman who had a third grade
education and had been a migrant worker from the South. As a result of
this work, she had completely lost contact with all of her relatives.
She had been married three times and had had two children. She killed
her last husband and was sentenced to the Ohio Reformatory for Women
(ORW) for manslaughter in the first degree. Even though she had never
been institutionalized previously, she spent a little over three years
at ORW for this offense. Her previous criminal record indicated that
she had been arrested eight times for misdemeanors. When admitted to
ORW, she was diagnosed as having syphilis. This parolee's institutional adjustment was only fair. She earned honor status, but she never received a good work report.

Originally this woman's parole placement was as a live-in domestic and babysitter in a young couple's home; however, she was not able to do the work. She was transferred to a residential hotel and placed on Aid for the Disabled. Since she needed more supervision than the parole officer was able to give her, she had her move into a rooming house where the landlady would also give her supervision. This still was not a satisfactory placement because of the people living in the home and the neighborhood. The parolee moved three more times. Each time the living situation was inadequate and located in neighborhoods having high crime rates. Amazingly, this parolee was not influenced to reengage in criminal behavior even though she was highly dependent upon the people around her during her entire institutionalization and parole.

Psychological and psychiatric testing during her institutionalization indicated that she had an inferior intelligence quotient, had suffered organic brain damage, and was paranoid. A psychiatrist reported that the paranoid condition improved before she was paroled.

Sociological testing at ORW preceding her parole indicated unfavorable high scores on Reckless's Criminality Level Index, Lantz's apathy scale, and other criminality and alienation measures. According to her, she had not had a drinking problem and had not frequented local bars very much before or after her institutionalization. The latter was questionable, since both the parole officer and the interviewer had noted that drinking appeared to be a problem. The sociological testing during
her parole period demonstrated that she had an unfavorable low score on interpersonal competence. She did have a favorable high score on identification with the parole officer, however, which increased during the parole period. Also her unfavorable high score on negative attitudes towards herself, others, and the parole officer decreased even though her attitudes of alienation never changed appreciably.

This woman, despite her many inadequacies, succeeded in staying out of known trouble with the law. She had a score slightly above the median on domestic responsibilities but unfavorable low scores on social participation and on work performance. Furthermore, she stated during the research interviews that she felt lost because she was not able to find her mother and did not know whether she was alive or dead. At last report, she was thinking about moving in with a man.

Case Three

This was a forty-four year old, working class, black woman. She had been a nurses aide prior to being institutionalized. She was separated from her husband and had been living with another man off and on for 19 years in a common law relationship. She killed this man and served over six years at the Ohio Reformatory for Women for manslaughter in the first degree. Previous to this, she had run an "after hours joint" in the inner city. As a result of the latter activity, she had been arrested eighteen times and had spent ten days in jail.

This parolee had an excellent institutional record. She earned honor status and had excellent work reports. She also earned twelve different certificates including her twelfth grade equivalency.
During the first community research interview, she stated that she was highly concerned about remaining away from the people who used to attend her "after hours joint." She further stated that in order to accomplish this, she wore dark glasses to and from work, looked in the opposite direction when she recognized one of her past customers, and watched her weight. She had lost a great deal of weight while at the institution. In addition, she stated that she was highly sensitive to the neighborhood gossip concerning her, the man killer.

This parolee had several goals which she accomplished during her parole. She wanted to move out of her sister's and brother-in-law's home and to obtain an apartment of her own, to obtain a driver's license and car, to be a nurses aide at a state hospital, and to further her training. She realized all of these goals during her parole.

Psychological testing showed that she had a normal intelligence quotient. In addition, the MMPI findings indicated that she was more than one standard deviation below normal on the hysteria scale (Hy) and one standard deviation above normal on the tendency to withdraw scale (Si).

Even though this parolee had spent over six years at the reformatory, she had favorable low scores on the apathy and anomia scales, but not on Dean's isolation scale, when she was tested just prior to being released from the institution. Furthermore, her scores on Reckless's Criminality Level Index and other criminality measures were low. During her parole, she scored high on the interpersonal competence measures and had a low score on negative attitudes towards herself and others.

This woman was determined that she would have no further
involvement with the law. In this she succeeded so far as is known. During the early part of her parole, she had a favorable high score on work performance but not on the domestic performance and social participation scales. Towards the end of her parole, she had high scores on work, domestic, and social responsibilities. After she received her final release, she stated that she wanted to obtain a divorce from her husband and get married to another man.

Case Four

This woman was a twenty-one year old, single, working class, white woman. Her widowed mother had done domestic work to support the family. She left her mother’s home at the age of eighteen. This parolee who had completed the tenth grade became a cashier in a store. While working she started to shoplift; then she engaged in forgery. She was arrested twice, spent six months in jail, two months in the workhouse, and fifteen months at the Ohio Reformatory for Women for grand larceny and ten counts of forgery.

During her institutionalization she became known as a "butch homosexual." Her work reports were very bad and she was frequently disciplined. However, one of the other inmates who had honor status told the investigator that she had a very high regard for her because she was a very sensitive, concerned individual to whom she had given motherly advice. While at the institution, this young parolee completed her twelfth grade equivalency.

When she returned to the community, she lived with her mother who was a live-in domestic and shared a room with her. Consequently she
was not able to ask any of her friends over to visit. As soon as she was financially able to have her own apartment, she obtained one.

At first she had a very difficult time in obtaining a job. Eventually she enrolled in a nurses aide program in a hospital and was paid during her training. Having earned the top grades in her class, she was encouraged to take the licensed practical nurse (LPN) training. Later, she planned to enroll in college and take registered nurse (RN) training.

Tests at ORW indicated that her intelligence quotient was in the normal range with her verbal ability far exceeding her performance ability. The MMPI revealed that she was almost three standard deviations above normal on the psychopathic deviate scale (Pd) and almost two standard deviations above normal on the hypermania scale (Ma). Her psychiatric diagnosis stated that she was compulsive, an inadequate personality, but not psychopathic.

Sociological measurements preceding her release yielded unfavorable scores on all the alienation and criminal orientation measures except the apathy scale on which she had a low score. After returning to the community, she had a high score on the scales measuring negative attitudes towards self, her parole officer, her mother, and others. As time progressed, her test scores on compliance towards her mother and parole officer decreased and her scores on interpersonal competence increased. Her test scores on negative attitudes towards self and others decreased after she was encouraged to take LPN and RN training.

This parolee did not become reinvolved in known delinquent behavior and her scores on adjustment to community responsibility
increased so that they were above the median after she moved into her own apartment. Despite her successful readjustment to the community, her homosexual way of life never changed.

Case Five

This parolee was a forty-four year old, middle class, white woman who had been married to an air force major. She had three children with whom she was very close. She was institutionalized at ORW for over twelve years on two counts of second degree murder. According to the institutional case record, her husband had earned a good salary but refused to give her enough money to run their home. Finally she started writing checks, signing the names of her friends next door. When they confronted her with this, she became very upset. Less than 24 hours later, she entered their home and cut both of their bodies into many pieces in their basement. She had never had a criminal record prior to this brutal offense.

Her institutional adjustment was excellent. She earned honor status and had excellent work reports. She completed the psychiatric nurses aide training at the Madison Honor House and was considered a leader not only by the staff but also by many of the not criminally oriented inmates, the "squares."

She told the interviewer at ORW preceding her release, that she was afraid to return to the community for fear that she would make the headlines of newspapers and be completely rejected. This did not occur, and she made an excellent adjustment almost immediately. She became a psychiatric aide at a state institute (school for the retarded) where
she took a real interest in the people for whom she was responsible. She advanced rapidly on this job, as her sense of responsibility and ability to perform the work became known. Later she took a job as a counselor in an employment agency where again she took pride in her work. She lived by herself in a duplex and kept a very neat home. Eventually she reestablished contact with her children. As a result, her daughter who was in college wanted to spend some time with her mother.

Psychological testing at ORW indicated a normal intelligence quotient with her verbal ability exceeding her performance ability. The MMPI findings for her were: (1) more than one standard deviation above normal on the hysteria scale (Hy), (2) almost two standard deviations above normal on the psychopathic deviate scale (Pd), and (3) more than one standard deviation above normal on the hypomania scale (Ma).

Even after spending an extremely long period of time at the institution, she scored low on all the criminal orientation measures. She also had favorable scores on all the alienation measures except for the isolation scale where she scored above the median. Testing in the community indicated that she had a favorable score on attitudes towards self, others, and her parole officer, and unfavorable low scores on meaningful relationship with either a "significant other" or parole officer. After six months, her scores on interpersonal competence had increased and were above the median. This woman had no known reinvolve-ment with the law, and had favorable scores on domestic and work adjust-ment but not on social participation.
Case Six

This parolee was a thirty-six year old, married, middle class, white woman who had a drinking problem. She had been married twice and had one child by the first husband who lived with his paternal grandparents; she had four children still under the age of eighteen by the second husband. Her own mother died when she was twelve years old and she was brought up by aunts and her grandmother. Her father had been an alcoholic and her two siblings had criminal records. She was married first at the age of seventeen.

According to the ORW case record, this parolee had been very dependent upon her second husband and was afraid to go against his wishes. He liked to bet at the horse races where he lost a great deal of money. He made his wife go into the bank where they normally did their banking and cash two illegal checks, each in the thousands of dollars. She served two years at the Ohio Reformatory for Women for cashing bad checks. She had no previous criminal record. Shortly after she was sentenced to ORW, her husband was accused of murder, found guilty, and sentenced to the Ohio Penitentiary for life.

While at ORW, she made an excellent institutional adjustment. She received honor status, had excellent work reports, and completed the twelfth grade equivalency.

Her parole placement was with another woman. However, when she arrived, she was told that she could not live there. Her father helped her obtain an apartment in a working class neighborhood where she lived by herself and kept a very neat home. Her father visited her every weekend and called her frequently during the week. Towards the end of her
parole, her father helped her to move into a town house in a middle class neighborhood in preparation for her children being returned to her custody and care.

Upon returning to the community, she obtained a job her second day home with her former employer. She attended classes three nights a week for a year in IBM computer programming in order to develop a skill that would enable her to support her four younger children.

The major problem this parolee had was in obtaining the custody and care of her four dependent children. The three middle children had been placed in a foster home and the youngest child has been placed with a friend while she was institutionalized. The foster placement was not good, and as a result of it, one of the boys had to have an operation on his ear which had been damaged by mistreatment. The mother became aware that something was wrong in the foster home soon after she returned to the community, but was not able to do anything about it until the children finally had the courage to try to run away from the foster home for a second time. The the Child Welfare Agency decided they would have to remove the children from the foster home and place them in a children's institution until the mother could support them, since welfare was not willing to give her Aid for Dependent Children during this period when she could not support them by herself. Upon the completion of her IBM computer programming course, she was granted the custody and care of her children.

Psychological testing at ORW indicated that she had a superior intelligence quotient with her verbal ability exceeding her performance ability. The MMPI findings showed that she was one standard deviation
above normal on the psychopathic deviate scale (Pd) and more than one standard deviation above normal on the hypomania scale (Ma).

Sociologic testing at ORW revealed a high score on Reckless's Criminality Level Index, particularly on the items concerning the courts. She had low scores on the other criminal orientation and alienation measures. She told the investigator that she felt she had been mistreated by the courts. Her lawyer had promised her probation if she would let them search her home without a warrant in connection with her husband's murder trial. She agreed, but instead of probation, she received a sentence. As a result, her three middle children had been made to suffer. She had a favorable low score on apathy; however, on the isolation scale she had an unfavorable score which was slightly above the median. During her parole, sociological measurements yielded favorable scores on interpersonal competence and perceptions of self and others throughout her entire parole period.

This parolee succeeded in obtaining her final release without any difficulty despite her special problems. In addition to having no further known involvement with the law, she had favorable high scores on community adjustment and demonstrated an extremely high level of maturity concerning the care of her children.

Unsuccessful Parolees

Case Seven

This parolee was a twenty-two year old, single, lower class, black woman. Prior to entering ORW she had completed the eighth grade and was a carhop. She had one illegitimate child about a year old.
During her childhood she was brought up in a broken family where there were eleven children. Only one of her siblings had a criminal record. She left her family of orientation when she was nineteen years old.

This woman started her career in crime at age thirteen. She had been arrested thirteen times and had been placed on probation three times, which she violated twice. She had been locked up six times including two commitments for observation at a maximum security state mental hospital. She had been institutionalized for a total of four years. She had been sentenced to a reformatory only once, which was for violation of a drug law. She was a drug addict and had contacted gonorrhea.

While at the institution, she only made a fair adjustment. She never earned honor status and she had very poor work reports from the power sewing industry where she had a very bad attitude toward work. She was also known as a lesbian. Despite these problems, she had the reputation of being a very nice person and did complete the twelfth grade equivalency.

Upon returning to the community, she lived with her mother and stepfather for a short period of time. The mother distrusted her and wanted to obtain the legal custody of her granddaughter. One evening, her mother locked her out of the house, then called the police when she began making a commotion outside. She was arrested and put in jail for a short period of time. Next, she was released to her sister's home and was supposed to attend school and work part-time. She refused to work and practically never attended classes. She was arrested a second time for another misdemeanor and kept in jail several months by her parole
officer while new parole placement plans were being made for her. Finally she was arrested a third time on charges of armed robbery. She was found not guilty, but her parole officer thought she was guilty. She was never reaccused of violation of drug laws despite the fact that the researcher attempted to interview her on one occasion when she was definitely high on drugs and nodding as a result.

Psychological testing at ORW indicated that she had a normal intelligence quotient. The MMPI showed that she was more than one standard deviation above normal on the depression (De) and hypomania (Ma) scales, and more than three standard deviations above normal on the psychopathic deviate scale (Pd).

On the sociological testing preceding her release into the community, she scored low on Reckless's Criminality Level Index and the other measures of criminal orientation. She also scored low on the alienation measures except for apathy. While in the community, her score on the isolation scale increased from what it had been at the institution. She had a high score on the index measuring negative attitudes towards herself and others. Furthermore, she had low scores on the second and third measures of interpersonal competence. As the parole period progressed, her low degree of interpersonal competence decreased; that is, her unfavorable scores on the three scales of this variable became even more unfavorable than they had been.

This woman was one of the three cases in this study returned to ORW as a parole violator. This occurred during the eleventh month of her parole. While paroled, she was arrested three times, spent more than two months in jail, refused to work, refused to attend school, and
returned to drugs. Furthermore, her scores on domestic and social adjustment which were low at three months were even lower when she was tested later.

Case Eight

This parolee was a twenty-one year old, married, working class, black woman. Prior to being admitted to ORW she had completed the ninth grade in school and was taking a course in cosmetology. She grew up, the oldest child, in a disturbed family situation and left home at the age of seventeen. Not only did her father have a criminal record, but so did her husband by whom she had two children who were three and four years old.

This parolee was found guilty of forgery on 16 different counts for which she served fourteen months at ORW. In addition, she had been arrested five times previously starting at age fourteen for such things as incorrigibility, sexual activity, and fighting. Furthermore, she had been a probation violator and had been locked up previously. While institutionalized, she received very poor work reports and had to be disciplined by the institutional staff. On the other hand, she did complete the tenth grade equivalency.

This parolee was a pleasing and likable person, but lied very cunningly and had little empathy for other people. She claimed she wanted to take care of her children and would have no difficulty in reestablishing a relationship with them. In point of fact, however, the mother-in-law ended up taking care of the children and the parolee spent all of the Aid for Dependent Children on herself and hardly ever visited
her children. She claimed that she was looking forward to living with her aunt and uncle who had a very nice home and that she had learned that she could not always have her own way. Her behavior was such, however, during the first few months of her parole, that her relatives refused to permit her to return to their home after she was locked up again for six months in the workhouse. She declared that she would have no trouble in finding and holding a job. She did find a job and was doing well until she misused a credit card which she found in the store where she worked and consequently lost her job. She stated that she would have no difficulty with parole, but then she absconded from parole supervision. In summation, she was arrested for petty larceny and sentenced to the workhouse for six months, she used ADC money fraudulently and she absconded from parole supervision.

Psychological testing at ORW revealed she had a normal intelligence quotient and was more than two standard deviations above normal on the psychopathic deviate scale (Pd) of the MMPI. Her scores on perception and attitude tests before release were favorable on Reckless's Criminality Level Index, and on the criminal identification, and inmate loyalty scales. Her scores were unfavorable on the anomia, isolation, and apathy scales. Sociological testing during her parole showed that she continued to have unfavorable scores on the alienation measures. In addition, she had an unfavorable score on perceptions of self and others. The testing also indicated she had a dependent relationship with her husband who had also just been released to parole. Furthermore, he helped to influence her to use illegally the credit card she had found.
She accepted the responsibility of work and made an excellent adjustment to it before becoming reinvolved with the law. While at the workhouse, she was doing excellent work in a prerelease program. The difficulty was that she did not remain employed very long. In addition, she had unfavorable low scores on the social and domestic adjustment indices. This woman was a highly immature individual who was easily influenced by her husband.

**Case Nine**

This parolee was a thirty-seven year old, working class, black woman. She was 29 when she married and had since then obtained a separation. Prior to that she had had two illegitimate sons who were seventeen and nineteen years old. When she was thirteen, her parents obtained a divorce. Somewhat later, her brother hung himself in the county jail.

All told, she had been arrested 15 times, had violated probation, and had been locked up three times for a total of 17 months. There was a great diversity of offenses in her criminal record: forgery, prostitution, narcotics, larceny by trick, insufficient funds, petty larceny, and fraud. She had gone by seven different aliases in addition to her own name. Her institutional record was not much better than her community record. Honor status was never obtained by her and she received very poor work reports.

A parole placement was obtained for her with her mother. After being on parole for two months, her parole officer managed to obtain employment for her as a psychiatric aide in a state hospital. Before
she knew this, she absconded and was picked up in a city almost 300 miles distant and put in the county jail as a suspicious person. While locked up, she started having extremely severe withdrawal symptoms from drugs. After several months in the county jail, she was sent for treatment at a federal hospital for drug addiction.

Psychological and sociological testing at ORW revealed reasons for this parolee's failure. Her intelligence quotient was in the inferior range and her emotional status was highly unstable. The MMPI readings ranged between 1.8 to 3.1 standard deviations above normal on seven of the ten scales: hysteria (Hh), psychasthenia (phobias and compulsive behavior (Pt), hypochondriasis (Hs), paranoia (Pa), schizophrenia (Sc), hypomania (Ma), and psychopathic deviate (Pd). In addition to her emotional maladjustment, she had unfavorable high scores on the Criminality Level Index, inmate loyalty, criminal identification, and apathy scales.

Furthermore, the interviewer noted that the mother was overprotective, but was not able to offer much supervision, encouragement, or support. Thus, it is not surprising that she became reinvolved with the law and had unfavorable scores on work, social, and domestic adjustment.

Case Ten

This parolee was a twenty-two year old, single, southern, white woman who was from the lower class. She had grown up in a broken home and her father was an alcoholic. She ran away from home and asked a judge to place her in a correctional institution for teenage girls rather than send her back home. A few years later, she went on a hunger
strike and was admitted to a state hospital for observation. After these two institutionalizations, she left her home town and traveled the roads of an industrial state. A truck driver took her in to be his housekeeper and mistress. According to her, this was, "... a convenient arrangement." The ex-wife appeared on the scene and used abusive language to the parolee. In response, the subject shot her. The ex-wife survived. This "convenient arrangement" came to an abrupt end and she was sentenced to ORW for shooting with intent to kill.

Even though she had had no arrests prior to the shooting, she had been institutionalized for four and a half years by the time she was released to parole. Despite the fact that she had honor status, her work reports indicated that she had made a very unsatisfactory work adjustment.

Psychological testing at ORW indicated that this young woman's intelligence quotient was in the inferior range according to the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. In addition, she ranged between 1.1 and 3.1 standard deviations above normal on six of the ten MMPI scales: depression (De), hysteria (Hy), male interest (Mf), paranoia (Pa), schizophrrenia (Sc), and psychopathic deviate (Pd).

Sociologic testing at ORW revealed that she was a crucial alcoholic according to Jellinek's criteria and that she had often frequented neighborhood bars. On the other hand, she had favorable scores on the Criminality Level Index, criminal identification, inmate loyalty, anomia, isolation, and apathy scales.

This parolee's attorney took great interest in her, sent money to her while she was institutionalized, and even accepted a parole place-
ment of this parolee as a live-in domestic and babysitter for her own family. She drank fairly heavily and after some disagreement with the attorney, the parolee left the home. Following this episode, her parole officer told her to find another place to live and another job. She did not do either for herself. The parole officer had her arrested and proceeded to look for another parole placement and a job for her. She refused several of the jobs found for her and did not like the new living arrangement in a hotel. Finally she was arrested a second time and sent back to ORW as a parole violator on a technical violation: not finding or accepting "suitable employment."

Upon being returned to ORW she became very distraught and developed hallucinations. She was transferred to a maximum security state hospital where the interviewer talked to her. It was evident that she had little understanding of the interpersonal dynamics that took place between her and her parole officer other than the fact that they did not get along.

**Case Eleven**

This parolee was a twenty-two year old, divorced, upper middle class, white woman. She was adopted by her mother and father who had no other children and lived with them until she was seventeen when she married. There were no children in this marriage. Prior to entering ORW for grand larceny, she worked as a barmaid. She had a tenth grade education.

This parolee had had contact with the police previously but not very often. She had been arrested three times, had been locked up once
in the county jail, and had violated probation. Her institutional adjustment was poor although her work reports from the power sewing industry were fair.

The original parole placement was very unsatisfactory to her. It was in a rooming house on a riot torn street in the inner city of a metropolitan area with over a million population. In addition, the landlady seemed to her like a . . . "second parole officer who was always present." Furthermore, she did not like the fact that she was not permitted to obtain a job as a barmaid.

Rather than adjusting to her parole placement, the parolee absconded, started living with another woman in a white, middle class section of town, and obtained a job as a barmaid. Eventually some of the other parolees convinced her to contact her parole officer who decided to accept the living arrangement, and the job. However, the parolee did not settle down. She moved six more times during her parole and usually did not let her parole officer know for several weeks each time where she was living. Also she was tried and found guilty of larceny offenses for which she had not already been tried. Her sentence was to make financial restitution in regular payments, which she did not do. Furthermore, she became reinvolved in the street subculture. As a result of these and other episodes, she was placed in jail a few days for the shock therapy effect. However, nothing worked with this young woman until she met a young man who decided to take charge. Subsequently the restitution payments were made. She stopped working in bars and stayed home. She helped this man, now her husband, to manage an apartment complex in an upper middle class suburb. She obtained her final
release from parole. However, her parole officer feels that she is still an extremely unpredictable person, and that if her husband should ever leave her, she would be in trouble again.

Psychological testing at ORW indicated an intelligence quotient in the bright normal range. The MMPI reading was four and a half standard deviations above normal on the psychopathic deviate scale (Pd). The sociologic testing revealed that she had a favorable low score on the Criminality Level Index and apathy scale but that she had a unfavorable high score on the isolation scale. During her parole, testing showed that her score on isolation decreased while she was a barmaid but increased when she started living with her second husband. On the other hand, her score on interpersonal competence decidedly increased to where it was a favorable score above the median following her second marriage. In fact, she improved remarkably in her ability to relate to people.

Thus, although this parolee had a great deal of difficulty during her parole, she did complete it successfully with the help of a second husband. Furthermore, at the end of her parole, she had favorable high scores on work and domestic responsibilities; however, she had an unfavorable low score on social participation which was understandable since she and her husband were not able to do very much socially.

Case Twelve

This parolee was a thirty-one year old, lower class, divorced, white woman who had been an adopted child. She had been married twice and had two children whom she was not permitted to see. During the first research interview at ORW she stated, "... It doesn't matter any more."
She also said that her mother had never liked her. Prior to being admitted to ORW for three counts of uttering checks, she had worked as a barmaid. She had completed the eleventh grade in school.

Her criminal record was short but involved. She had been arrested twice, had been a probation violator and a parole violator, and had been locked up three times, twice at ORW. This woman was a very difficult case to handle both at the institution and on parole. She had the worst work report of any subject included in this study, even though her work supervisors stated that she had the capability and skill to be a good power sewer.

This parolee had been completely rejected by her adopted family and other relatives. For this reason her community placement was at the YWCA and her parole officer obtained a job for her as a power sewer. She refused to go to work claiming that her legs were too swollen and hurt her too much as she traveled to and from work; however, her legs never bothered her so much that she could not dress up, go to a bar, and turn a "trick" as a prostitute. Furthermore, she was able to relocate her residence five times in a six month period. Each time she moved, the rent was paid by a black man who was keeping her that month, usually in a walk-up in the inner city.

Her parole officer attempted several times to help her. When she lost her job, the parole officer convinced her employer to rehire her. When she was placed in jail for prostitution, the parole officer had them keep her in jail for a while as shock treatment. Upon her release from jail, the parolee immediately let another black man keep her again and made no attempt to hold the job that her parole officer
had obtained for her a third time. Policemen arrested her a second
time for prostitution, intoxication, and disorderly conduct. While in
the county jail, she attempted to commit suicide. She was returned to
ORW as a parole violator.

Psychological testing at ORW indicated she had a normal intelli-
gence quotient. The MMPI showed that she ranged between 1.0 and 3.8
standard deviations above normal on seven of the ten scales: hypomania
(Ma), hysteria (Hy), psychasthenia (phobias and compulsive behavior,
Pt), paranoia (Pa), social (tendency to withdraw, Si), depression (De),
and psychopathic deviate (Pd) scales.

Sociologic testing revealed that she was a crucial alcoholic
according to Jellinek's criteria. In addition, she had unfavorable high
scores on the anomia, isolation, apathy, criminal identification, and
inmate loyalty scales, and on Reckless's Criminality Level Index.
During her parole, she continued to score high on the alienation scales.
Furthermore, she had unfavorable scores on the interpersonal competence
measurements. These scores did not improve during her parole.

Not only did this woman have several minor difficulties with the
law resulting in her being returned to ORW but she also had the lowest
scores in this study on domestic, social, and work responsibilities.

Summary

Having reviewed these histories of six successful and six unsuc-
cessful parolees, several dynamic factors concerning the readjustment
process to independent living have become obvious. (1) The successful
parolees tended to improve in their ability to relate to people; whereas
the unsuccessful parolees tended to obtain lower scores on the interpersonal competence scales at the end of their parole than they had at the beginning of their parole. (2) The successful parolees tended to decrease in the number of negative attitudes towards themselves and others; whereas, the unsuccessful parolees tended to increase in the number of negative attitudes towards themselves and others. (3) The successful cases may have had unfavorable scores on some of the alienation and criminal orientation scales; the unsuccessful parolees tended to have unfavorable scores on most of these scales.

Thus, these illustrative case history sketches have further delineated the importance of interpersonal competence as a major factor in the determination of success or failure on parole for female offenders. The next chapter will attempt to interpret the findings of this study concerning the readjustment of female parolees to independent living.
CHAPTER VII

OVERVIEW OF THE ADJUSTMENT PATTERNS OF WOMEN PAROLEES TO INDEPENDENT LIVING

While there have been many studies of post-institutional adjustment patterns of adult and juvenile males, the female offender literature is sparse. This research, in fact, constitutes the first projected longitudinal investigation of women on parole. As such, extensive empirical data have been gathered on the demographic factors, criminal history, parole placement, psychological adjustment, interpersonal competence, and other variables relevant for analysis of post-institutional outcome and functioning.

Review of Methods

All prospective parolees to be returned to the six major metropolitan areas in Ohio (Cleveland, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, Toledo, and Akron) between November, 1968, and January, 1969, were interviewed at the Ohio Reformatory for Women prior to release as a means of obtaining base line information. These parolees were then followed into the community and reinterviewed on a regular basis—at the end of three months, six months, and twelve months. This analysis, which is part of a larger study, included 67 women who were interviewed at ORW and three months after release; and some of them were interviewed at six and twelve months after their return to the community. This longitudinal, panel design permitted a phased monitoring of the changes in adjustment
patterns over time.

In order to evaluate the preparole and parole statuses of the discharged female offenders, an interview schedule was devised, pre-tested, and administered at all these time series points in the study. The interview schedule was modified by the inclusion or exclusion of the appropriate scales and indices depending upon whether the assessment was in the prison, after release, or after failure on parole. In short, there were three separate interview schedules—institutional, community, and failure. Depending upon the schedule, the following variables were studied: demographic, criminal history, parole placement, criminal orientation, alienation, interpersonal competence, and personal maladjustment (MMPI). The failure schedule attempted to ascertain the reasons for the parolee's inability to remain in the community.

The demographic variables included age, race, education, occupation, and social class position. Number of arrests, number of lockups, length of institutionalization, type of offense, and presence or absence of narcotic and other drug dependence were reviewed in order to assess the criminal history. Parole placement emphasized living situation to which the parolee returned and her relationships to significant others. Criminal orientation variables included Glaser's associational preference and criminal identification, Reckless's Criminality Level Index, and Ward's and Kassebaum's inmate loyalty scale. The alienation measures included anomia, isolation, apathy, and female role (role estrangement). Another, and the last major grouping of scales dealt with interpersonal competence involving perceptions of self and others, and relationships to significant others including the parole officer.
All of these individual scales and measures were pretested and their reliability established either by the split-half technique, or, in the case of the Guttman scales, by their coefficients of reproducibility and minimal marginal reproducibility. In addition, all of the scores on the subjective measures obtained from the inmates while still at the reformatory were intercorrelated in order to determine the extent to which they were tapping the same attitudes and perceptions. All the scales and measures included in the final schedule were found to have high reliability coefficients and relatively little overlap with one another.

Findings

The results are as follows:

1. **Recidivism Rate.**—During the course of the study, 14 out of the 67 women (20.9 percent) experienced difficulty with the law, but only three (4.5 percent) returned to the institution as parole violators during the average of eight months since their release from the Ohio Reformatory for Women. 101

2. **Age.**—Age was inversely related to difficulty with the law. The older the parolee, the greater the likelihood of success in the community.

3. **Race.**—Black women tended to succeed more often than white women on parole.

101 The Gluecks found that 65.4 percent of their women reengaged in delinquent behavior during parole and that an additional 19.4 percent of the women engaged in delinquent behavior after they were off parole. Thus they found a total recidivism rate of 84.8 percent among female offenders in *Five Hundred Delinquent Women*, pp. 252-253.
4. **Criminal History.**—All of the criminal history variables—number of arrests, number of lockups, length of time institutionalized, type of offense, and narcotic addiction history—were related as predicted to case outcome on parole. However, only the type of offense was statistically significant as a variable. Personal as opposed to property and narcotic offenders appeared to do well on parole.

5. **Personal Maladjustment (MMPI profile).**—The majority of the success and failure cases had one of four types of MMPI profiles—psychopathic deviate-hypomania (Pd-Ma), male interest-paranoid (Mf-Pa), extreme maladjustment, or psychopathic deviate (Pd) only. The success profiles consisted of Pd-Ma (30.4 percent), Mf-Pa (13.0 percent), and extreme maladjustment (21.7 percent); whereas, the failure profiles consisted of Pd only (21.4 percent) and extreme maladjustment (57.1 percent).

6. **Parole Placement.**—Family placement, that is return to a relative, and positive relationships with others were highly related to successful community tenure.

7. **Criminal Orientation.**—Measures of criminal orientation at the time of release to parole were not significantly related to case outcome.

8. **Alienation.**—Even though all of the alienation measures indicated that alienation had an adverse effect upon success, only one of the alienation measures—apathy—was significantly related to parole outcome. The higher the apathy score, the more likely was failure in the community.

9. **Interpersonal Competence.**—Only one of the interpersonal
competence measures—perceptions of self and others—was significantly related to parole outcome. The more positive the attitude to self and others the less likely was failure as an outcome.

10. Recidivism versus Reintegration. The variables most highly related to success or failure in the community were not necessarily those related to domestic performance and community functioning. Thus there was not a one to one correspondence between success on parole and reintegration and assimilation into the community.

11. Domestic Performance. Conjugal placement on parole and favorable scores on associational preference, anomia, and female role scales were significantly related to superior domestic performance. All four of these variables were related as anticipated.

12. Community Functioning (Work). White, semiskilled women who did not live with their families and who had favorable scores on apathy, perceptions of self and others, and relationship to a significant other were found to be the parolees who had the highest scores on community functioning. These findings are summarized in Table 45.

Significance of the Findings

This study tried to do something no previous parole study has attempted—to measure the reintegration and assimilation of parolees into the community as well as to measure their recidivism rate. These are two different phenomena. Recidivism-non recidivism is simply the outcome of becoming reinvolved in criminal activity that is reported and acted upon by legitimate social control agents. While remaining uninvolved with the law is a great achievement for an ex-convict, it
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Community Adjustment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Community Tenure</td>
<td>Domestic Performance</td>
<td>Community Functioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal History Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Arrests</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Lockups</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Offense</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Addiction</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Maladjustment (MMPI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Maladjustment and Pd</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd-Ma and Mf-Pa</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugal Placement</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Placement</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole Placement Index</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Self &amp; Others</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to S.O.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to P.O.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* The direction of the relationships with the probabilities enclosed in parentheses ( ) was opposite the direction predicted.

*b* Several of the parolees claimed that they did not have a significant other; some had a new parole officer at the time of this test and did not know her.
is only one, and not necessarily the best criterion of community reintegration.

Recidivism-nonrecidivism tells us little about (1) the prisoner's acceptance of adult role responsibilities, (2) the individual's acceptance by the community despite her stigmatized status, or (3) the degree to which she is able to lead a normal life. Has the ex-convict been assimilated into her neighborhood and community or does she always remain a marginal person confronted with a multiplicity of "problems of living" such as unemployment, eviction from residence, marital dissolution, family feuding, difficulties with children, poor health, mental disorder, suicide, alcoholism, drug addiction, civil suits, or re-involvement with the law?

While the individual must first remain in the community as a necessary condition to her reintegration, remaining uninvolved with the law is only the first step in this process. The second step—acceptance of family, work, and community responsibilities—is equally important in aiding the individual to lead a normal life and overcome the status of "outsider" or in the case of this study, "marginal woman."

When this study was conceived, these two steps of reintegration into society—nonrecidivism and assimilation—were considered to be a continuous process with the same variables having a positive influence on both stages of readjustment to independent living. However, this study, even though it is not entirely completed and is based largely on institutional and three month interviews, suggests that this is not the case.

Adequacy of role performance and avoidance of trouble with the
law are two separable things. One major factor cluster—the maladjustment syndrome—seems to account for much of the difficulty with the law.

In contrast, the cultural and structural expectations, the major role interest of the women parolees, as well as the maladjustment syndrome seemed to be of utility in predicting the parolees' adequacy of domestic, work, and other role performance.

Those most likely to be free of reinvolvevment with the law were the older, black parolees who had committed a personal offense, had a family placement, had excellent relationships with significant others, had total responsibility for their children, were not apathetic, had positive perceptions of self and others, and did not have an extreme Pd scale score or an unusually aberrant MMPI profile.\(^{102}\) It stands to reason that those parolees who can live with family members, have good relationships with their families, friends, husband, and children and have been given the total responsibility for the care of their children, are likely to be far better adjusted than the women who are rejected by their families, have poor relationships with significant others, and have not been permitted the care of their children.

On a somewhat different level, nearly all this study has shown, as have studies in the past concerning male parolees, is that age is an excellent predictor of recidivism.\(^{103}\) Indeed, given but one choice as

\(^{102}\) The Pd profile consisted of an elevated t score \(\geq 60\) on the psychopathic deviate scale and t scores \(< 60\) on the other nine scales of the MMPI. The aberrant MMPI profile consisted of t scores \(\geq 60\) on six or more of the ten scales of the MMPI.

\(^{103}\) Daniel Glaser, The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System, pp. 36-37; Daniel Glaser and Vincent O'Leary, Personal
a predictor, that choice would have to be the age variable. The goodness of age as a prediction variable rests on two bases. Generally speaking, most people tend to become more mature as they get older, some people faster than others. However, more important for a parolee population is that for those who are psychopathic deviants, however labeled, their deviancy seems to "burn out" between age 30 and 45. Thus, the impulsivity, lack of life goals, guiltlessness, lack of anxiety and of motivation characteristic of many in a criminal population seem to subside or disappear through the natural process of aging. In other words, the fact that older parolees seem to be more successful in the community may simply be due to their "burning out" and thus having a lesser degree of maladjustment than the younger parolees as the Gluecks for example argue convincingly in the latest of their follow-up studies of delinquents and matched non-delinquents.

Black women tend to do better than white women on parole. As discussed previously, the criminal justice system tends to be more protective of the white woman than of the black woman. That is, there is the tendency to keep the white woman in the community if at all possible and to sentence her to an institution only if her criminality and behavior are such as to make her a serious threat in the community. Thus, because of the adverse selection process of the criminal justice system,

an institutionalized white woman is usually more highly maladjusted and disturbed. The chief exceptions are those women who have committed a violent offense. In other words, the reason black women tend to be more successful in the community is attributable to the greater selectivity of the white prisoners and probably also the greater tolerance of deviant behavior in the black lower class community.

Another factor established in study after study including the present one, is that the "squares" in the institution (the non-criminal criminals) tend to be far more successful after release than those who have been imbued in the cultural "life" of crime (the criminal criminals).\(^\text{104}\) In general, situational personal offenders, forgers, and embezzlers usually have not been part of a criminal subculture and have not therefore defined themselves as criminals. Even though such women may be institutionalized for 3 to 20 years as some of the women in this study were, they never really came to define themselves as criminals, but rather as unfortunate people who committed an immoral, criminal act. They are sorry, frequently want to make restitution, and feel enormous guilt and shame as illustrated by cases 5 and 6 described in chapter VI. As will also be recalled from the case history sketches of these two "squares" plus three of the other success cases who were also personal offenders, their degree of psychological disturbance and maladjustment, as indicated by the MMPI profiles and psychiatric diagnoses, was far less than the failure cases described. In other words, the personal

offenders may have been more successful in the community than the
property and narcotic offenders because they had never defined them­
selves as criminals despite the length of time institutionalized, and
because they were far less disturbed to begin with than the property
and narcotic offenders.

Thus it is that age, race, offense, parole placement, apathy,
perceptions of self and others, and MMPI profile were each signifi­
cantly related to community tenure, because each in its own way is a
measure, indication, or consequence of acceptable or unacceptable
adjustment and coping. If this is the case, then in a real sense, the
failures in the community must be considered the more highly inadequate
women (even as compared to other offenders) who need help in learning
how to cope with the vicissitudes of life rather than as criminals in
need of punishment.

Even though the maladjustment syndrome—psychological disturb­
ance plus social and interpersonal inadequacy—seems to be the most
important factor cluster influencing trouble with the law while on
parole, it appears that cultural and structural expectations and major
role interests are the more important determinants of domestic perform­
ance and community functioning. The results strongly suggest that
simply because a woman did not have trouble with the law was no guar­
antee that she would function well in the community. Likewise, the
fact that a parolee had trouble with the law was no guarantee that she
would not do well in the performance of her daily duties. In other
words, individual psychological status and general maladaptation is not
the sole determinant of her successful reintegration into the community.
The cultural milieu from which she comes and to which she returns, as well as the structural expectations placed upon her, are major factors influencing her community adjustment patterns.

Thus, the women who had superior domestic performance scores were those who returned to a conjugal home, preferred law abiding associates, identified with the female role, and were not alienated. Preference for law abiding associates, identification with the female role, and not being anomic are indications of social rather than psychological adjustment. Women returned to a conjugal family setting are expected to be housewives and to take care of the children, usually without the assistance of another adult woman. Thus, the structural expectations inherent in a conjugal placement as well as a major interest in fulfilling the traditional female role are probably the major factors influencing successful domestic performance.

On the other hand, superior community functioning appeared to be associated with psychological adjustment, a non-traditional female role interest, and the cultural and structural expectations. Thus the white, semiskilled parolees who did not have a family placement, were not apathetic, had positive perceptions of self and others, and had a meaningful relationship with a significant other were the ones who exhibited superior community functioning.

Thus the successful assimilation of female parolees into society was a function of three different factor clusters—the maladjustment syndrome, cultural and structural expectations, and major role interests—while community tenure appeared to be mainly a function of the degree of personal maladjustment. Consequently, success in one area did
not guarantee success in another area.

The cultural milieu not only had an effect upon the case of reintegration of female parolees, but also upon the meaning of a high score on Reckless's Criminality Level Index and on Srole's anomia scale. When these two scales were controlled on race, the whites who had high scores on the Criminality Level Index and the anomia scale had low scores on domestic performance and community functioning. In other words, high scores on these two scales were an indication of personal and social maladjustment and personal lawlessness for the whites.

However, the blacks who had high scores on the Criminality Level Index and on the anomia scales also tended to have high scores on domestic performance and community functioning. In other words, the ground rules are different for the whites and blacks. Negative attitudes towards the law, police, and courts are not predictors of poor functioning for the blacks even though they are for the whites.

This latter fact gives rise to three different thoughts. First, we really do not know what social factors prevent reintegration into a black neighborhood other than narcotic addiction and extreme personal maladjustment. More attention needs to be allocated to deciphering the factors which determine reintegration into a black neighborhood. Second, the high scores on the Criminality Level Index and on the anomia scale for the blacks may be an indication of their awareness of belonging to a black community which has more unemployment, poorer housing, poorer schools, fewer recreational centers, more medical problems, and more social problems than the white community. In addition,
they may also be aware of the differential treatment of blacks and whites in the criminal justice system. Thus, the blacks high scores on the Criminality Level Index and anomia may be representative of structural frustrations rather than personal maladjustment. Third, the effect of race on the meaning of negative attitudes towards the law, police, and courts and perceptions of anomie leads to a focus on cultural milieu as an important influence for the reintegration and adjustment patterns of women parolees.

Throughout this discussion it has been evident that the factor cluster which seemingly has the most adverse effect upon success in the community is the psychological and social maladjustment syndrome. This syndrome also tends to have a modest negative influence upon the acceptance of adult responsibilities. Indeed one of the best predictors of failure in the community appears to be an elevated psychopathic deviate (Pd) or an extreme aberrant MMPI profile.

On the other hand, the variable which appeared to be the best predictor of success was interpersonal competence. Even though the analysis of the data for the three measures of interpersonal competence, when split at the median, allows only a modest claim for their predictability of success and integration, the case history sketches clearly suggested that if a woman parolee fares well in her interpersonal relationships or increases in her ability to relate to people, she will probably be able to make the necessary adjustments to independent living.

This is not in the least surprising since one of the implicit criteria of success is one's ability to relate easily and meaningfully
with other people. The success that women have in fulfilling their various family, work, and community roles is clearly dependent upon their empathy, maturity, unselfishness, warmth, and affect. In other words, one of the major elements of most of women's roles is interpersonal competence and attractiveness. Therefore, satisfaction in interpersonal relationships particularly when the satisfaction is the effect of improvement in ability to relate to people should result in greater success than the parolee had known before. Even a modest increase in success in this area should serve to increase motivation to continue to improve one's level of interpersonal attractiveness and become that much more successful.

Accordingly, this study offers suggestive but by no means conclusive evidence that interpersonal competence as a dynamic process of change may be able to reverse the vicious cycle of chronic maladjustment and criminality and set into operation the beginning of a successful cycle of adjustment.
APPENDIX A

RESEARCH SCHEDULES

Institutional Schedule

NAME ___________________________ DATE _____________ ORW NO.________

BACKGROUND DATA

Epidemiology
1. Birthdate ____________________
2. Age __________________
3. Race __________________
4. Education ____________________
5. Occupation ____________________
6. Class ___________________

Criminal Background
7. Offense _____________________
8. Total number of lockups __________________
   a. Juvenile lockups __________________
   b. County and City Jail lockups __________________
   c. Workhouse lockups __________________
   d. Prison and Reformatory Lockups __________________

9. Total time Incarcerated __________________
   a. Delinquent institution time __________________
   b. County and City Jail time __________________
   c. Workhouse time __________________
   d. Prison and Reformatory time __________________
   e. Time spent in state hospitals for observation __________________

10. Police Contact: total __________________
    a. Number of arrests __________________
    b. Number of probation violations __________________
    c. Number of parole violations __________________

Institutional Life
11. Total score on the 16 items in the last work report __________________
12. Institutional adjustment __________________
13. Lesbian tendency __________________
14. Completion of an educational equivalency test __________________

Family Background
15. Duration of parolee's home life __________________
16. Type of childhood family __________________
17. Siblings: Total number _____ Number with a criminal record ____
18. Inmate's description of home __________________
19. Mother: Criminal record _____ Addictions _____ Marital status _____
20. Father: Criminal record _____ Addictions _____ Marital status _____
21. Inmate's marital status __________________
22. Age of first marriage __________________
23. Number of times married __________________
24. Children: Total No. ______ Under 18 ______ Illegitimate ______
25. Crim. record: No. of husbands ______ Last Husband ______ Boyfriend ______ Child ______

Medical History
26. Chronic Illness __________________
27. Venereal Disease __________________
28. Psychiatric diagnosis __________________

Psychometric Testing
29. I.Q.: Test ______ Total ______ Verbal ______ Performance ______
30. MMPI t scores: Hs ___ D ___ Hy ___ Pd ___ Mf ___ Pa ___ Pt ___ Sc ___ Ma ___ Si ___

PAROLE PLACEMENT
31. Parole Officer __________________
32. City __________________
33. Address __________________
34. Phone __________________
35. Living with __________________ Relationship __________________
36. Employment __________________ Finances __________________

COMPULSIVE BEHAVIOR AND ADDICTIONS
37. Have you used drugs without a doctor's prescription? ______
38. Drug Addiction ______ Kind of Drugs ______
   a. Have you experimented with drugs?
   b. Have you used them on a regular basis?
   c. Have you had withdrawal symptoms?
   d. Have you received treatment for addiction to drugs?
   e. Have you been hospitalized for addiction?
39. The use of Alcohol is ______
   a. Have you had an alcoholic drink?
   b. Did you drink in order to relax?
   c. Have you fainted or blacked out due to drinking?
   d. Did you ever purposely take a drink while others were not watching you?
   e. Have you been disgusted with yourself for drinking?
   f. Do you think your drinking may have cost you a job?
   g. Did you drink as soon as you got out of bed in the morning?
   h. Have you had the d.t.'s?
   i. Have you been on benders lasting over 3 days?
   j. Have you felt terrified without knowing why?
   k. Have you used white lightning or wood alcohol?
40. Drinking Subculture: Total Score ______
   a. Where did you do most of your drinking?
   b. How often did you go to a bar?
   c. Did you usually go to a bar in order to socialize with people?
   d. Did you spend most of your leisure time at a bar?
   e. When did you usually go to a bar?
   f. When you went to a bar, did you do things that you would not have done otherwise?
   g. Did you feel as though you had to go to a bar or die socially?
THE STATEMENTS IN THE NEXT PART OF THIS INTERVIEW ARE TO BE RESPONDED TO ACCORDING TO WHETHER YOU AGREE, PARTIALLY AGREE, DON'T KNOW, PARTIALLY DISAGREE OR DISAGREE WITH THEM.

41. In her dealings with the staff the inmate should stick up for what she feels is right and not let the staff set her standards or morals for her.
42. When the inmates stick together it is a lot easier to do time.
43. The best way to do time is to grin and bear it and not let the staff know that anything is getting you down.
44. In some situations, it is all right to inform on another inmate.
45. In prison, a good rule to follow is to share any extra goods with your friends.
46. There are basically just two kinds of people in the world, those in the know and those who are suckers.
47. People who have been in trouble with the law have the same sort of ideas about life that I have.
48. I think more like other inmates than people on the outside.
49. People who have been in trouble with the law are more like me than people who don't have trouble with the law.
50. I'm more like the people who can make a living outside the law than I am like those who only break the law occasionally.
51. I don't have much in common with people who never break the law.
52. When I get out I don't want to associate with the kind of people that are always getting into trouble.
53. I would rather associate with people who obey the law than those who don't.
54. I don't care to associate with the kind of people that are in prison.
55. I want to keep in touch with inmates I have met here after I get out.
56. The people that I usually prefer as friends have little respect for the law.
57. It is all right to evade the law if you do not actually violate it.
58. Law is the enemy of freedom.
59. Police almost always respect constitutional rights of suspected criminals.
60. A person is justified in giving false testimony to protect a friend on trial.
61. Police hound ex-convicts.
62. The law does not benefit the common man.
63. Laws are so often made for the benefit of small selfish groups that a man cannot respect the law.
64. Almost anything can be fixed in courts if you have enough money.
65. Life would be better with fewer policemen.
66. The judges' sentences are determined by their prejudices.
67. Police put on a show by arresting people.
68. On the whole, lawyers are honest.
69. Most juries are fixed.
70. It is all right for a person to break the law if he doesn't get caught.
71. For the most part, police and the courts are just.
72. Police work rests mainly upon information given by stool pigeons.
73. Juries seldom understand a case well enough to make really just decisions.
74. In order to get ahead these days, one has to realize that the laws are made to be broken.
75. Policemen are more loyal to the police than to the citizens.
76. The law is for the poor to obey, and for the rich to ignore.
77. Policemen show favoritism to politicians.
78. The law is rotten to the core.
79. A cop is a friend to people in need.
80. Prosecutors are nothing but politicians.
81. Police are careful not to arrest innocent persons.
82. On the whole, judges are honest and kind-hearted.
83. Fake witnesses are often produced by the prosecutor.
84. The policeman's standing in his Department depends upon the number of arrests he makes.
85. All laws should be overthrown.
86. Cops often carry a grudge against men who get in trouble with the law and treat them cruelly.
87. The law enslaves the majority of people for the benefit of a few.
88. You can seldom find a policeman who doesn't take bribes.
89. No decent lawyer would ever be a prosecutor.
90. I believe in the use of force to get rid of laws.
91. Laws are usually bad.
92. You can't get justice in courts.
93. On the whole, policemen are honest.
94. It is more wrong to get caught than it is to steal.
95. The individual who refuses to obey the law is a menace to civilization.
96. Policemen are just as crooked as the people they arrest.
97. The big criminal always has a good chance to escape conviction in court.
98. Almost any jury can be fixed.
99. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse.
100. It's hardly fair for adults to bring children into the world the way things look for the future.
101. Nowadays a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
102. These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.
103. There's little use for anybody to complain to public officials because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.
104. Sometimes I feel all alone in the world.
105. I don't get invited out by friends as often as I'd really like.
106. Most people seldom feel lonely.
107. Real friends are as easy to find as ever.
108. One can always find friends if he shows himself friendly.
109. The world we live in is basically a friendly place.
110. There are few dependable ties between people any more.
111. I don't get to visit friends as often as I'd really like.
112. People are just naturally friendly and helpful.
113. People in authority should be trusted and shown respect.
114. Man is at the mercy of nature and there is little he can do to try to change what nature has in store for him.
115. The worst thing that a person can do is to watch out for himself and let others do the same.
116. A person living in this country today cannot expect his children to have more than he has of the things that make life enjoyable and comfortable.
117. Nowadays a person does not have to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
118. If the way a person does a thing gets the job done, he shouldn't try new ways to do it.
119. If in trying to learn something new a person runs into great difficulty, he should keep at it.
120. I don't like to admit it, but a person shouldn't feel sorry for persons less fortunate than himself because those are the breaks of the game.
121. As a rule, a person should trust other people.
122. If you become involved with other people and interested in them, you will end up by getting hurt.
123. When I want to stick to a task I can do so without continually changing my mind.
124. It is best for a person to do enough to get along and no more.
125. Even though there is so much disappointment in this world, a person still should keep wishing.
126. If a person has wishes he is just asking to be disappointed.
127. If a person is realistic he will expect much out of life.
128. If I do my job, and no more, my employer has no right to expect anything else from me.
129. I like to do the little extra things for my husband/boyfriend that makes him feel good.
130. I am concerned about how the people working around me feel.
131. I prefer not to wear real tight sweaters.
132. Where ever I work, I try to make the place look attractive.
133. What happens in my neighborhood outside of my home is no concern of mine.
134. When I'm tired or not feeling well, I don't really care how my home looks.
135. I try to help make things run smoothly at work.
136. I don't see anything wrong with leaving small children alone for fifteen to twenty minutes while running down to the corner or next door when I have to.
137. My children know exactly what I want them to do and what I don't want them to do.
138. When someone gets sick where I'm working, I try to see to it that he/she gets the care he/she needs.
139. On the job, I have the right to do what I think ought to be done even if, my employer doesn't agree with me.
140. If a man steps out on me, I have the right to step out on him.
141. I see nothing wrong with using obscene or profane language once in a while.
142. Men frequently try to take unfair advantage of women.
143. When I have a bad headache, I don't want to be bothered by my children or anyone else.
144. Men are not to be trusted.
145. No one has the right to tell me how to take care of my children.
146. No one has the right to correct my children except me and their father.
147. I try to be considerate of others.
148. In my family, I take the responsibility for remembering birthdays, anniversaries and other special occasions.
149. Being neat and attractive on the job is important to me.
150. When you are working, if you can't get things done one way, you can always get them done another way.
151. I like to try new recipes.
152. I don't think an employer should be concerned about what his employees wear.
153. I usually know the things my employer wants me to do and do them without his telling me.
154. Most of the time, I would rather cook than eat out.
155. I feel that children are gifts to be molded with love and affection.
Community Schedule: Three Months

NAME ______________________ DATE ______ PHONE ________

CITY _______________________ ADDRESS __________________________________

OCCUPATION ___________ COMPANY ___________ HRS. AT HOME ______

DIFFICULTY WITH THE LAW ______________________________________________

PAROLE OFFICER'S COMMENTS

DYNAMICS OF PAROLE
1. Has your parole been difficult or easy?

2. Is there anything in particular bothering you?

3. How are you and your parole officer getting along?

PAROLE PLACEMENT

4. Living with ______________________ Relationship __________________
   (1) conjugal-procreational   (5) alone
   (2) parental-orientational    (4) other

5. Type of dwelling
   (1) single family home   (4) rooming or boarding house
   (2) duplex, double        (5) halfway house
   (3) apartment

6. Condition of home
   (1) good - painted, neat, clean, attractive
   (3) average - safe, needs some repairs, liveable
   (5) poor - unpainted, dirty, unsafe

7. Geographic mobility: Number of times moved since released from ORW.

8. Parental Family Relationships
   (1) excellent - visit often, discuss personal problems with each
       other, can depend on each other
   (3) average - visit occasionally, formally polite, help each other
       occasionally, can depend on each other occasionally
   (5) poor - fight, rude, hate each other, don't visit

9. Taking care of children
   (1) totally responsible (parolee is the only adult female in the
       home)
   (2) partially responsible (former mother surrogate for the child
       is still in the home)
   (3) children are grown
(4) may visit children  
(5) no children  
(6) may not visit children

10. Custody of children: 
(1) has custody of her children  
(2) will definitely have custody of her children in the future  
(3) wants the custody of her children and is seeking it through legal channels  
(4) does not want the custody of her children  
(5) wants the custody of her children but may not have it

11. Husband/Boyfriend Relationship 
(1) stays with her husband and has a companionship relationship to him  
(2) stays with husband, has a companionship relationship to her boyfriend  
(3) wants to return to her husband, dating a boyfriend  
(4) is looking for a man  
(5) is forgetting about men  
(6) wants to divorce/separate from her husband

12. Relationship to Friends 
(1) her best friends are not in the streets  
(2) she has some acquaintances who are not in the streets  
(3) she has no friends, has been ostracized, is very lonely  
(4) she has some acquaintances in the streets  
(5) her best friends are in the streets

13. Job Satisfaction: 
(1) good - likes type of work, gets along with boss and peers  
(3) average - likes type of work, gets along with boss, or gets along with peers  
(5) poor - dislikes type of work and does not get along with boss and peers

14. Finances: 
(1) husband supporting  
(2) has a job  
(3) family supporting temporarily  
(4) on welfare or pension  
(5) no finances

COMPULSIVE BEHAVIOR

15. Since you have been home, have you used drugs without a doctor's prescription? __ Kind of Drugs ________

16. Drug Addiction ________
   a. Have you been experimenting with the drugs?  
   b. Have you been using them on a regular basis?  
   c. Have you had withdrawal symptoms recently?  
   d. Have you been receiving treatment for addiction to drugs?  
   e. Have you been hospitalized for addiction?

17. The use of alcohol is ________
   a. Have you been having alcoholic drinks?  
   b. Have you been drinking in order to relax?  
   c. Have you fainted or blacked out due to drinking?
d. Have you been purposely drinking while others were not watch­ing you?
e. Have you been disgusted with yourself for your drinking?
f. Do you think your drinking may have cost you a job recently?
g. Do you feel sorry for yourself?
h. Do you feel that it is necessary to have alcohol in your home?
i. Have you been hospitalized for your drinking recently?
j. Do you drink as soon as you get out of bed in the morning?
k. Have you had the d.t.'s recently?
l. Have you been on benders lasting over 3 days?
m. Have you been feeling terrified without knowing why?
n. Have you been using white lightning or wood alcohol?

18. Drinking Subculture Index: Total Score ________
   a. Where have you been doing most of your drinking?
      (1) bar (2) home (3) friends
   b. How often have you been going to a bar?
      (1) more than once a week
      (2) 2-4 times a month
      (3) less than twice a month
   c. Do you usually go to a bar to socialize with other people?
   d. Do you spend most of your leisure time at a bar?
   e. When do you usually go to a bar?
      (1) morning (3) evening
      (2) afternoon (4) all of the time
   f. When you go to a bar, do you do things that you would not do otherwise?
   g. Do you feel as though you have to go to a bar or die socially?

ANSWER THE ITEMS IN THE NEXT PART OF THIS INTERVIEW WITH EITHER YES OR NO.

19. Are you honest with your parole officer?
20. Do you think she is honest with you?
21. Do you trust your parole officer?
22. Do you think she trusts you?
23. Do you discuss your problems with her?
24. Do you understand her?
25. Do you think she misunderstands you?
26. Do you enjoy her visits?
27. Do you ask her for permission before you do things?
28. Do you have a goal or aim to work for while on parole? Do you feel as though you will not be able to accomplish this goal, or that it will take you too long?
29. Do you have a responsibility while on parole? Is anyone dependent on you? Were you allowed to fulfill your responsibility?
30. Were you taking care of your children or grandchildren?
31. Do you feel resentful, hateful, or bitter? Do you feel let down and hurt?
32. Do you feel needed and wanted?
33. Do you feel rejected?
34. Do you feel as though you were a burden to other people?
35. Do you respect yourself?
36. Do you feel as though you had been wronged?
37. Do you run away from frustrating situations and disappointments?
38. Do you feel as though you have settled down?
39. Do you enjoy staying at home most of the time?
40. Are you honest with yourself?
41. Do you feel insecure?
42. Are you patient when you are not able to control what is happening?
43. Do you have perseverance and determination when the going gets rough?
44. Do you have peace of mind?

ON THE NEXT ITEMS PLEASE INDICATE THE CORRECT ANSWERS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DO YOU</th>
<th>(1) No (2) Sometimes (3) Usually (5) Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Prepare the morning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and evening meals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Do the grocery shopping?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Handle the grocery money?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Do the other household shopping?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Dust, sweep, and do the other usual cleaning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Take care of the laundry and mending?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. (Preschool children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress and bathe the children?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. (School children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure the children get to school on time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN DO YOU</th>
<th>(1)never (2)1/mo. (3)2/mo. (4)3-4/mo. (5)4+/mo.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53. Visit friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Entertain friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Visit relatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Entertain relatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Have friends and relatives over for dinner</td>
<td>1/3 mo. 1/3 mo. 1/1-2mo. 1/mo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
58. No. of organizations you belong to
   none 1  2 3  4+

59. No. of meetings attended
   1/mo. 2-3/mo. 4/mo. 4+/mo.

60. Number of hours working per week:
   (1) not working
   (2) 1-19 hrs/wk.
   (3) 20-39 hrs./wk.
   (4) 40 hrs./wk.
   (5) 40+ hrs./wk.

61. Reporting to work on time:
   (1) late 5+/mo.
   (2) late 3-4/mo.
   (3) late 1-2/mo.
   (4) always on time
   (5) usually early

62. Job performance: fulfilling expectations
   (1) does less than what is expected
   (3) does only what is expected
   (5) does more than expected

63. Job performance: ability
   (1) feels she is inadequate for the job
   (4) feels she is capable of doing her work
   (5) feels she is capable of doing much more difficult work

64. Job performance: pride in work
   (1) does not take pride in her work and does a sloppy job
   (3) takes pride in her work or performs it carefully
   (5) takes pride in her work and performs it carefully

65. Employer's evaluation of work
   (1) her employer has told her that she must improve the quality of her work
   (3) her employer has said nothing to her about her work
   (5) her employer has told her that her work is good

66. Job satisfaction
   (1) she absolutely hates her work
   (2) she dislikes her work
   (4) she likes her job but would prefer to be doing something else
   (5) she would prefer to do this type of work over everything else

67. Relationships to employer and peers
   (1) she does not get along with either her boss or peers
   (3) she gets along either with her boss or her peers
   (5) she gets along with both her employer and peers
THE REST OF THIS INTERVIEW CONSISTS OF STATEMENTS WHICH I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IF YOU AGREE, PARTIALLY AGREE, DON'T KNOW, PARTIALLY DISAGREE, OR DISAGREE WITH THEM.

68. In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse.
69. It's hardly fair for adults to bring children into the world, the way things look for the future.
70. Nowadays, a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
71. These days, a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.
72. There's little use for anybody to complain to public officials, because often they aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.
73. Sometimes I feel all alone in the world.
74. I don't get invited out by friends as often as I'd really like.
75. Most people seldom feel lonely.
76. Real friends are as easy to find as ever.
77. One can always find friends if he shows himself friendly.
78. The world we live in is basically a friendly place.
79. There are few dependable ties between people any more.
80. I don't get to visit friends as often as I'd really like.
81. People are just naturally friendly and helpful.

I WOULD LIKE FOR YOU TO RESPOND TO THE REST OF THESE STATEMENTS FIRST ACCORDING TO THE WAY YOU FEEL ABOUT YOUR PAROLE OFFICER AND SECOND ACCORDING TO THE WAY YOU FEEL ABOUT THE PERSON YOU FEEL THE CLOSEST TO. AGAIN THESE ARE AGREE, PARTIALLY AGREE, DON'T KNOW, PARTIALLY DISAGREE, AND DISAGREE STATEMENTS.

82. The relationship between us is unfriendly.
83. I would rather not associate with him/her, but I have to.
84. He/she doesn't trust me.
85. I obey his/her orders only when I have to.
86. I try to avoid him/her.
87. I do what he/she wants me to do only in order to get what I want.
88. He/she has punished me excessively.
89. He/she doesn't mind hurting me.
90. I find it hard to relate to him/her.
91. His/her job is to make me conform to his/her demands.
92. He/she is not concerned about me or my family.
93. He/she is only concerned about me doing a good job for him/her.
94. I want to learn the way he/she does things because it will enable me to obtain the things I want.
95. I am indifferent to his/her values.
96. He/she doesn't care how I feel.
97. My beliefs have changed so that they are more like his/hers.
98. He/she doesn't care if I agree with him/her or not.
99. He/she doesn't care what effect his/her decisions have on me.
100. If I don't follow his/her directions, I'll lose material goods and/or my freedom.
101. He/she is only concerned about my behavior.
102. His/her job is to teach me his/her line of work.
103. We are not concerned about each other.
104. It wouldn't bother him/her if I died tomorrow.
105. We neither trust nor distrust each other.
106. I have no influence on him/her.
107. His/her supervision is very helpful to me.
108. He/she frequently receives rewards which makes me feel good.
109. I want to learn his/her way of doing things because I like his/her personality.
110. I don't try to do the things that please him/her.
111. I need his/her help.
112. He/she knows I admire him/her.
113. I am not happy when I am with him/her.
114. I don't try to act the way he/she does.
115. I am willing to learn from him/her.
116. I want to follow his/her directions.
117. Some of the things I have learned from him/her are very important to me.
118. When he/she disapproves my behavior, I feel a desire to act according to his/her expectations.
119. He/she is helping me to learn how to get along in this world.
120. When he/she approves my behavior I feel good.
121. I believe that the way he/she expects me to act is the right way.
122. Some of the things he/she taught me are now a major part of my personality.
123. The relationship between us is unfriendly.
124. I find myself saying the same types of things he/she says.
125. I find myself thinking the same way he/she does.
126. His/her policies are just and good and agree with my values.
127. I feel satisfied with myself when I have acted according to his/her policies.
128. He/she enjoys being with me.
129. I have found that I can apply the things he/she taught me to many different situations.
130. I don't feel accepted by him/her.
131. He/she is not concerned about my welfare.
132. He/she influences my behavior because I like him/her and want to be friends with him/her.
133. I feel bad when I know I have done something that he/she disapproves of.
134. I enjoy his/her friendship.
135. I accept his/her evaluation of me even when it hurts.
136. I want his/her approval.
137. I don't think he/she will be willing to help me in the future.
138. He/she has helped me to realize my best potential.
139. His/her friendship is important to me.
140. It makes me feel good to see him/her happy.
141. I don't want him/her to be concerned about me.
142. I do little things for him/her because I want to.
Parole Violation Schedule

NAME _________________________________ DATE ____________________

MONTH OF VIOLATION ______________   NUMBER OF MONTHS ON PAROLE ___

TYPE OF VIOLATION

(1) TECHNICAL (specify)

(2) NEW CRIMINAL OFFENSE (specify)

PAROLE OFFICER'S COMMENTS

DYNAMICS OF PAROLE VIOLATION

1. What happened?

2. Did anything happen in the last couple of months that made your parole difficult for you or made you feel like giving up?

3. How did you and your parole officer get along?

(The rest of this schedule is identical to the community schedule: 3 months except that the dynamics of parole violation replaces the dynamics of parole).
## APPENDIX B

### TABLES

### TABLE 46

**THE RATIO OF MALE to FEMALE OFFENDERS IN 1967**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Male-Female Ratio</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>0.2:1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>3.1:1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>3.4:1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery and Counterfeiting</td>
<td>3.7:1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>4.7:1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>5.1:1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly</td>
<td>6.0:1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>6.3:1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotic Violation</td>
<td>6.4:1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenses$^a$</td>
<td>7.2:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>7.8:1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assaults</td>
<td>8.6:1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses</td>
<td>8.6:1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligent</td>
<td>9.0:1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagrancy</td>
<td>9.2:1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Family</td>
<td>9.7:1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>10.2:1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Property</td>
<td>12.3:1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk</td>
<td>13.5:1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Under Influence</td>
<td>14.1:1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>14.1:1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>17.4:1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>22.1:1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>23.3:1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^a$See Reckless and Kay, The Female Offender," pp. 4–5, for the methodology used where the offenses with a smaller ratio than the ratio for total offenses are considered more female than male in nature. See also FBI, *Uniform Crime Reports—1967*, p. 119, for the raw data used.
TABLE 47

THE RANK ORDER OF OFFENSES FOR WHICH WOMEN ARE MOST FREQUENTLY ARRESTED\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Percent of Total Female Arrests</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assaults</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Under Influence</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotic</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagrancy</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery and Counterfeiting</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offenses</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Family</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Property</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negligent</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcible Rape</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}Federal Bureau of Investigation, \textit{Uniform Crime Reports—1967}, p. 119.
TABLE 48

CRIMINAL CASE MORTALITY RATE FOR ALL OFFENDERS AND FEMALE OFFENDERS IN 1966\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Case Mortality Rate Category</th>
<th>All Offenders</th>
<th>Female Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offenses Known</td>
<td>1,790,947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Offenses Cleared by Arrest</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Offenses which have Persons charged</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Offenses which have Persons Found Guilty</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Offenses which have Persons Receiving Probation</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>(.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Offenses which have persons Being Institutionalized</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)The data for 1966 were used since the sources of data for 1966 were more complete than the sources for 1967. These sources were: Uniform Crime Reports, 1967, p. 104, 125; Federal Offenders in United States District Courts 1966, p. 26; California, 1966, p. 57, 117, 143; and National Prisoner Statistics, 1966, p. 14.

The methodology used in this table for all offenders is similar to the methodology used by Van Vechten. The percentages for the women were obtained by dividing the percentages for all offenders by the national male-female ratio for each category when available. When the latter ratio was not available, the California ratio was substituted. The national ratios used for cleared by arrest and institutionalized were 7.2:1 and 19.7:1 respectively. The California ratios for cleared by arrest, found guilty, and probation were 8.0:1, 19.2:1, and 6.8:1 respectively. It will be noted that the California ratio for cleared by arrest is greater than the national ratio. Thus, it is probable that the national percent for found guilty and probation are larger than indicated in the table where the California ratios were used. No ratio was available for persons charged; therefore, this category had to be left blank.

The actual number of offenses committed by women is not known. Pollack argues in Criminality of Women, pp. 1-5, that women probably commit as many offenses as men; but that their offenses are less visible and tend to go unreported. The assumption of this table is that if the offenses committed by men and women were reported in the official statistics in an unprejudiced manner, the number of known offenses for men and women would be approximately equal.
TABLE 49
THE NUMBER OF MALE AND FEMALE INSTITUTIONS FOR ADULTS AND JUVENILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Institution According To Sex</th>
<th>Type Of Institution According To Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Male Institution</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Institution With Small Section For Women</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Female Institution</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 50
THE SIZE OF ADULT MALE AND FEMALE INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Institution According To Sex</th>
<th>Size Of Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500 - 1000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Male Institution</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Institution With Small Section For Women</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Female Institution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 51
THE LEVEL OF SECURITY IN MALE AND FEMALE INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type Of Institution According To Sex</th>
<th>Level Of Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Institution With A Small Female Section</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Female Institution</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 52
THE LOWEST SVD, SVDR, AND CR VALUES ACCEPTED TO DETERMINE INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE SUBSCALE ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic And Population</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Imitation</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale Value Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Group I</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Group I</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Value Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion Group I</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 53

**SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSOCIATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses And Subhypotheses</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Kendall's Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Competence Is Directly Related To Reintegration Into Society.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of self and others are inversely related to community tenure.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of self and others are inversely related to community functioning.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with a significant other is directly related to community functioning.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>+.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Ethos Is Inversely Related To Reintegration Into Society.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational preference is directly related to domestic performance.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>+.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alienation Is Inversely Related To Reintegration Into Society.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy is inversely related to community tenure.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female role is directly related to domestic performance.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>+.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia is inversely related to domestic performance.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy is inversely related to community functioning.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parole Placement Is Related To Reintegration Into Society.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole placement index is inversely related to community tenure.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugal placement is directly related to domestic performance.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>+.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family placement is inversely related to community functioning.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 54

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE PERCEPTUAL AND COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT VARIABLES
(Given in Q Association Coefficients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptual Variable</th>
<th>Community Tenure</th>
<th>Domestic Performance</th>
<th>Community Functioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Loyalty</td>
<td>-.459</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Identification</td>
<td>(. )a</td>
<td>-.291</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associational Preference</td>
<td>+.333</td>
<td>+.533b</td>
<td>( . )a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>-.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>-.596</td>
<td>-.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>-.333</td>
<td>-.385</td>
<td>( . )a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apathy</td>
<td>-.732</td>
<td>-.172</td>
<td>-.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Role</td>
<td>+.240</td>
<td>+.551</td>
<td>+.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Self and Others</td>
<td>-.584</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>-.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to S. O.</td>
<td>+.024</td>
<td>+.034</td>
<td>+.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to P. O.</td>
<td>+.391</td>
<td>+.040</td>
<td>+.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aThe coefficients which indicated the relationship was opposite that predicted were deleted from the table. They were +.122, -.120, and +.289 respectively.

bThe relationships that obtained a .05 level of confidence were underlined.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses And Subhypotheses</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Kendall's Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Orientation (personal lawlessness meaning) Is Inversely Related To Reintegration Into Society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index is inversely related to domestic performance for the whites.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index is inversely related to domestic performance for the younger parolees.</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index is inversely related to community functioning for the whites.</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index is inversely related to community functioning for the young whites.</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Orientation (structural malfunction meaning) Is Directly Related To Reintegration Into Society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index is directly related to domestic performance for the blacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index is directly related to domestic performance for the older parolees.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index is directly related to community functioning for the blacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminality Level Index is directly related to community functioning for the younger blacks.</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>+1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 56
SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSOCIATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE ALIENATION RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS WHEN SPECIFIED BY RACE AND AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses And Subhypotheses</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Kendall's Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alienation (personal maladjustment meaning) Is Inversely Related To Reintegration Into Society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia is inversely related to community functioning for the <strong>whites</strong>.</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation is inversely related to community functioning for the <strong>whites</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation is inversely related to community functioning for the <strong>younger parolees</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation (structural malfunction meaning) Is Directly Related To Reintegration Into Society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomia is directly related to community functioning for the <strong>blacks</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation is directly related to community functioning for the <strong>blacks</strong>.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>+.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation is directly related to community functioning for the <strong>older parolees</strong>.</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>+.730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE

Scaling Schedule

The Way People Relate to Each Other

Sponsored and Conducted by
Division of Psychiatric Criminology

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS PAPER. This is not a test. The purpose of this survey is to find out how people really relate to others. The 'right' answer for you is how you feel you relate to another person.

Now please think about three people who have a great deal of influence upon you and your life at present. List the initials of these three people and their relationship to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, please decide which one of these people has the most influence upon your life at present. Put an (X) in front of this person's initials.

Below you will find many statements describing the relationship that exists between two people. How they feel and relate to each other. These statements are to be answered by drawing a circle around one of the following:

- SA for strongly agree,
- A for agree,
- U for undecided, don't know, not applicable,
- D for disagree,
- SD for strongly disagree.

Please answer these statements according to the way you and the person who has had the most influence on you relate to each other. Remember the right answer is what you think is true. BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY STATEMENT.
1. I would rather not do the things he has taught me, but I have to.

2. Some of the things he taught me are now a major part of my personality.

3. I follow his directions only when someone is watching.

4. He has been unduly rough on me.

5. I feel bad when he feels bad.

6. I am not completely honest with him.

7. He feels that he is a success when I do what he tells me to do.

8. If I were to move 500 miles away, I would not continue to act the way he does.

9. He is concerned about teaching me the rules and demands of the job to be done.

10. When he disapproves my behavior, I feel a desire to act according to his expectations.

11. I don't try to meet his needs.

12. He knows I want to be like him.

13. When I confide in him, I trust him not to tell others.

14. He determines if I am to get and keep the things that I want to have.

15. I don't like his attitudes.

16. He accepts my dependence upon him.

17. I have resisted him every inch of the way.

18. I am no more like him now than before I knew him.

19. I am indifferent to his values.

20. We are not concerned about each other.

21. I want to learn his way of doing things because I like his personality.

22. He is not concerned about my private life.

23. I don't want him to help me change my behavior.

24. His attempts to help me change have succeeded.

25. I express opinions he disapproves of when he is not around.

26. I am concerned about the way he feels.

27. We are not dependent on each other.

28. I try to avoid his disapproval.

29. I try to avoid his punishment.

30. I am afraid that he will harm me if I don't do the things he tells me to do.

31. I don't daydream about being like him someday.

32. I feel as though he looks down on me.

33. I don't try to do the things that please him.

34. He doesn't care how I feel.

35. The relationship between us is friendly.

36. I outwardly conform to his demands while inwardly disagreeing with him.

37. I don't like him.

38. I think and feel quite a bit like he does.
SA A U D SD 39. I don't like the way he acts.
SA A U D SD 40. My private attitudes and opinions have changed
due to him.
SA A U D SD 41. If I changed my occupation, I would not continue
to act the way he taught me.
SA A U D SD 42. I do what he tells me to do even though I dis-
approve of it.
SA A U D SD 43. When he withholds his approval, it doesn't up-
set me.
SA A U D SD 44. If I did not have to associate with him, I would
go my own way.
SA A U D SD 45. I have found his policies very helpful and agree
with them.
SA A U D SD 46. I do not want to associate with him.
SA A U D SD 47. He influences my behavior because I like him and
want to be friends with him.
SA A U D SD 48. I need his help.
SA A U D SD 49. I don't agree with the things he says when he is
not around.
SA A U D SD 50. I do things I don't want to do in order to get
things I want.
SA A U D SD 51. I don't care what his values are.
SA A U D SD 52. I have learned his rules.
SA A U D SD 53. I don't want to occupy the same position that he
has.
SA A U D SD 54. He is helping me to learn how to get along in this
world.
SA A U D SD 55. He has control over my power, prestige, and/or
status.
SA A U D SD 56. He is not concerned about why I do the things I do.
SA A U D SD 57. I am not happy when I am with him.
SA A U D SD 58. After he has been rewarded, I try to do what he
was rewarded for doing.
SA A U D SD 59. He has helped me to learn my particular responsi-
bilities in life.
SA A U D SD 60. I am willing to learn from him.
SA A U D SD 61. I do not withhold information about myself from
him.
SA A U D SD 62. He is not really concerned about me.
SA A U D SD 63. I enjoy acting the way he does because it makes
sense to me.
SA A U D SD 64. He is only concerned about me doing a good job for
him.
SA A U D SD 65. We neither trust nor distrust each other.
SA A U D SD 66. I believe that the way he expects me to act is the
right way.
SA A U D SD 67. His supervision is very helpful to me.
SA A U D SD 68. I find myself saying the same types of things he
says.
SA A U D SD 69. He has not tried to change my way of acting.
SA A U D SD 70. I obey his orders because it will enable me to have the things I want.
SA A U D SD 71. I feel as though he does not like me.
SA A U D SD 72. I feel bad when I know I have done something that he disapproves of.
SA A U D SD 73. I have resisted learning everything he has tried to teach me.
SA A U D SD 74. I have no influence on him.
SA A U D SD 75. When he disapproves of my behavior, he does it for my own good.
SA A U D SD 76. I want to follow his directions.
SA A U D SD 77. He doesn't even know when he has hurt me and when he hasn't.
SA A U D SD 78. The things he taught me apply only to one type of situation.
SA A U D SD 79. I feel dissatisfied with myself when I have not followed his policies.
SA A U D SD 80. He enjoys asserting his authority over me.
SA A U D SD 81. I would like to be able to do the things that he does.
SA A U D SD 82. I expect the same things of myself that he expects of me.
SA A U D SD 83. He doesn't care what effect his decisions have on me.
SA A U D SD 84. I enjoy his friendship.
SA A U D SD 85. We are independent of each other.
SA A U D SD 86. I don't want his supervision.
SA A U D SD 87. I now believe some of the things he believes.
SA A U D SD 88. I do little things for him because I want to.
SA A U D SD 89. His recommendations are good.
SA A U D SD 90. I don't know exactly why I follow his directions other than the fact that I like him.
SA A U D SD 91. Since I've known him, I expect different things of myself.
SA A U D SD 92. He frequently receives rewards which makes me feel good.
SA A U D SD 93. I would rather not associate with him, but I have to.
SA A U D SD 94. I find myself thinking the same way he does.
SA A U D SD 95. I have modified the behavior I learned from him in order to fit my situation.
SA A U D SD 96. He doesn't like to hurt me, but will if he feels it is necessary.
SA A U D SD 97. He knows I admire him.
SA A U D SD 98. The main reason I follow his directions is I like him.
SA A U D SD 99. He is not concerned about me or my family.
SA A U D SD 100. When he approves my behavior, I feel good.
SA A U D SD 101. I want to learn the way he does things because it will enable me to obtain the things I want.
Some of the things I have learned from him are very important to me.
I feel elated when he achieves one of his goals.
His job is to make me conform to his demands.
I am dependent on him.
I neither approve nor disapprove of his values.
My beliefs have changed so that they are more like his.
We do not really know each other.
My own values and opinions have not changed as a result of knowing him.
I feel inwardly satisfied with myself when I have done the things he has taught me to do.
He doesn't care if I agree with him or not.
He has tried to influence me to do the right things.
Our association will not have a lasting influence on me.
I feel satisfied with myself when I have acted according to his policies.
I don't envy him for the power he has.
It really bothers him when I disapprove of his behavior.
The main thing about him that I admire is his knowledge.
I find it difficult to talk to him.
He enjoys being with me.
I haven't worked hard at learning how to do the things that he does.
His behavior has been influenced by mine.
He hasn't taught me anything that matters.
His job is to teach me his line of work.
He doesn't trust me.
I accept his evaluation of me even when it hurts.
I don't want the material goods, power, and/or freedom that he has.
I want his approval.
I have not tried to do what he expects me to do.
My opinion of myself has not changed as a result of knowing him.
I have found that I can apply the things he taught me to many different situations.
I feel that it will do no harm to follow his policies.
When I don't follow his directions, he disapproves.
I find some of his actions useful in solving some of my problems.
He does not expect me to be realistic about situations.
I obey his orders only when I have to.
It doesn't bother me to be criticised by him.

He determines if I can do what I want.

If I don't follow his directions, I'll lose material goods and/or my freedom.

I don't think he will be willing to help me in the future.

I don't feel accepted by him.

I try to avoid him.

I don't try to act the way he does.

He has helped me to realize my best potential.

He is not concerned about my welfare.

I do what he tells me to do even though I don't want to.

If I fail to live up to his requirements, he will have no more to do with me.

He has no control over my behavior.

His friendship is important to me.

It makes me feel good to see him happy.

I have told him things about myself that I don't want most people to know.

He is only concerned about my behavior.

I don't want him to be concerned about me.

I do what he wants me to do only in order to get what I want.

I am afraid that he will punish me.

I do things I don't want to do in order to avoid his punishment.

I follow his directions only when I have to.

We don't share things with each other.

He has punished me excessively.

He doesn't mind hurting me.

He hasn't taught me the ropes of the game (job, etc.).

I find it hard to relate to him.

I do not need him.

I act like him not only in public but also in my private life.

His policies are just and good and agree with my values.

I am not grateful for the frequent contacts I have with him.

He expects too much of me.

I disagree with many of his opinions.

I have not thanked him for his help.

I do not want to be friends with him.

He has not really tried to change my way of thinking.

It wouldn't bother him if I died tomorrow.

I act the way he expects me to act not only in public but also in private life.
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SA A U D SD 173. He is not concerned about my feelings towards him.
SA A U D SD 174. I do the things he does in order to obtain the things he has.

Now I would like for you to go back and think about the other two people whose initials you listed in the beginning.

Yes ___ No ___ 175. Would you answer most of the above statements in the same way for these two people as you did for the first one.

Now I would like for you to think about your relationships to most people.

Yes ___ No ___ 176. Are most of your answers to the above statements different for the first person from what they would be with everyone else.

Yes ___ No ___ 177. Would you like to relate to other people the same way as you relate to the first person.

Yes ___ No ___ 178. Do you think it would be possible for you to relate to other people the same way that you relate to the first person.

Now I would like some information about you. Please place an "X" after the words that describe you. Finally fill in the blanks concerning education and occupation.

179. Sex: Male __________________ Female __________________
180. Race: White ___________________ Negro ___________________
181. Age: 20-30 __, 31-40 __, 41-50 __, 51 and over ___
182. Education: (last grade completed) _____________________________
183. If you are a student, what was the last year of school your father completed? __________________
184. If you are a married woman, what was the last year of school your husband completed? __________________
185. Occupation __________________
186. If you are a student, list your father's occupation. __________________
187. If you are a married woman, list your husband's occupation. __________________
188. Marital Status: Married ____, Separated or Divorced ____, Single ___
189. Group: College Student ____, Inmate ____, Other __________________
    Member of a settlement house __________________

PLEASE BE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL STATEMENTS. THANK YOU.

If the person who has influenced you the most is a woman, substitute the words she, her, and hers for the words he, him, and his in the above statements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Imitation</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Subject’s Relationship To The Significant Other</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>not important</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not wanted</td>
<td>not wanted</td>
<td>wanted</td>
<td>wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>not necessary</td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cold</td>
<td>cold</td>
<td>warm</td>
<td>warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td>don't know each other</td>
<td>friendly, understand</td>
<td>friendly, understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>not control</td>
<td>control</td>
<td>not control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>not dependent</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>not dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distrust</td>
<td>no trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards And Punishment</td>
<td>tangible resources</td>
<td>tangible resources</td>
<td>tangible resources</td>
<td>tangible resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>love/withdrawal</td>
<td>love/withdrawal</td>
<td>satisfaction/ dissatisfaction</td>
<td>peace/guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concern</td>
<td>concern</td>
<td>concern</td>
<td>concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>enforced</td>
<td>accepted</td>
<td>adopted</td>
<td>adapted, assimilated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Internalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conform only if</td>
<td>Conform in public</td>
<td>Conform in public</td>
<td>Conform if considered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td>and private</td>
<td>right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics Of Behavior</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Public and private</td>
<td>Public and private</td>
<td>Public and private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific situation</td>
<td>Specific situation</td>
<td>Specific situation</td>
<td>Diversified situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Of Cognition</td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Emotional and rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values Of S.O. And Subject</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>(doesn't matter)</td>
<td>Conform</td>
<td>Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Of Norms</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Beliefs and rules</td>
<td>Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Result</td>
<td>Obey orders</td>
<td>Learn role</td>
<td>Change self concept</td>
<td>Develop conscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change of value</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obey orders</td>
<td>Self confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 57 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Imitation</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Internalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Of Interpersonal Competence:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Stages Of Socialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Internalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Significant Other's Relationship</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To The Subject</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>intimate</td>
<td>intimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>sadistic</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>wanted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>independent</td>
<td>accept</td>
<td>interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distrust</td>
<td>no trust</td>
<td>dependence</td>
<td>trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>selfish</td>
<td></td>
<td>trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>control</td>
<td></td>
<td>selfless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reject</td>
<td></td>
<td>influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supportive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Of Rewards And Punishment</td>
<td>don't mind and/or unaware of hurting</td>
<td>don't mind and/or unaware of hurting</td>
<td>don't like to hurt but will if necessary</td>
<td>don't like to hurt but will if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Effective Form Of Rewards And</td>
<td>tangible resources</td>
<td>tangible resources</td>
<td>approval/disapproval</td>
<td>approval/disapproval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject's Control Of S.O.</td>
<td>want compliance</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>want approval</td>
<td>want approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Imitation</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Internalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>ruler-dictator controller</td>
<td>supervisor, teacher employer</td>
<td>guider</td>
<td>companion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assertive dogmatic</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>teaching</td>
<td>sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Of Material</td>
<td>obedience to rules</td>
<td>role expectations information</td>
<td>motives, values</td>
<td>emotional and rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Of Cognition</td>
<td>rational</td>
<td>rational exchange</td>
<td>emotional and rational</td>
<td>emotional and rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Result</td>
<td>control</td>
<td>taught a role</td>
<td>influenced values</td>
<td>shared values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

PAROLE RULES

STATE OF OHIO
Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction
Division of Correction
ADULT PAROLE AUTHORITY

CONDITIONS OF PAROLE

Introduction

You have been granted a parole by the Adult Parole Authority because the Parole Authority is of the opinion that you are ready for return to civilian life. This gives you the opportunity to serve part of your sentence outside of the institution, to earn a final release and to retain the privileges and responsibilities of citizenship.

A parole officer will be assigned to work with you to help you adjust to civilian life. The officer will help you in every way possible, will be available for counseling when problems arise, and will submit regular reports of your progress to the Adult Parole Authority.

It is also the parole officer's duty to require you to live by the conditions of parole. The officer has the authority and responsibility to enforce these conditions by notifying the Adult Parole Authority of any violations and recommending your return to the institution as a parole violator. The parole officer has the power to arrest you or may order your arrest.

Your goal is to terminate your sentence before the maximum by final release. This can be accomplished if you will continue the same progress which led to your parole. The Adult Parole Authority will grant a final release, however, only after you have shown satisfactory
conduct during your parole period. Until you get a written final release you remain under the legal custody of the Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction, under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Adult Parole Authority.

The conditions of parole have been carefully designed as guidelines for acceptable parole behavior. If you should violate one or more of these conditions of parole, the Adult Parole Authority has the legal authority to return you to the institution to continue serving your sentence.

It is the wish of the Adult Parole Authority that you accept this parole with all its conditions in the same spirit in which it is granted; that you use this opportunity to prove to yourself and to others that you are capable of living a socially acceptable life as a productive and responsible, law-abiding member of society.

RULES OF PAROLE

1. Upon leaving the institution I will go directly to the place to which I have been paroled and will report as directed to my parole officer.

2. I will remain in the county and state to which I have been paroled unless I obtain written permission to leave through my parole officer. I will consult with my parole officer and obtain the officer's approval before changing my address or residence within the county to which I have been paroled.

3. I will submit true written reports of my activities to my parole officer as directed. A false report will constitute a violation of my parole.

4. I will reply promptly to any communication from the Adult Parole Authority or any of their officers.

5. I will report in person to such person or persons at such time and in such place and manner as may be directed by the Adult Parole Authority.

6. I will make every effort to obtain and keep satisfactory employment as is approved by my parole officer. If my employment should stop for any reason I will immediately report this fact to my parole officer. I will not voluntarily change my place or type of employment without first obtaining permission from my parole officer.

7. I will support to the best of my ability those persons for whom I am responsible.
8. I will enter into marriage only after I have received the written permission of my parole officer. Under no circumstances will I cohabit with anyone not my legal spouse.

9. I will associate and communicate only with persons of good reputation. I will avoid contact with persons who have criminal records or persons who are on probation or parole. I will not visit persons or frequent places or areas forbidden by my parole officer.

10. I will get written permission from my parole officer before purchasing, owning or operating any motor vehicle, aircraft, or powerboat, in addition to satisfying any conditions which might apply to my particular case. I understand this permission will be given only after I have a valid operator's license and such liability insurance as is approved by my parole officer.

11. I will not purchase, own, possess, use or have under my control any deadly weapon or firearm. I understand there will be no exceptions to this rule while I am on parole.

12. I will not have in my possession, use, sell, distribute or have under my control any narcotic drugs, barbiturates, marijuana, paregoric, or extracts containing them in any form or instruments for administering them except on prescription of a licensed physician.

13. I will not use intoxicants to such an excess that in the opinion of my parole officer my health or the safety or welfare of others is placed in jeopardy, or that it interferes with meeting financial obligations, employment, my family relations, or acceptable behavior.

14. I will obey all municipal ordinances, state and federal laws, and will at all times conduct myself as a respectable law-abiding citizen.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

In addition to agreeing to abide by the above conditions of parole, I understand and accept that while on parole I do not have the right to vote, serve on juries, or hold public office.

I further understand that if I am granted permission to be in another state or if I should be there without permission and my return to Ohio is authorized, I hereby waive extradition to the State of Ohio and agree not to contest efforts to effect such return.

By affixing my signature below I signify my acceptance of these conditions of parole and any other special conditions which the Adult Parole Authority might impose. I agree to abide by and follow any instructions given by the Adult Parole Authority or any of its supervisors or officers and I accept them as part of the conditions of my parole.
These conditions of parole have been explained to me and I understand them.

WITNESS................................ Signed....................................

Date........................................

APA-CP-CCIP-427 (D-214)
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