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CHAPTER I

THE USE OF LABELS IN A CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM FOR YOUTH

The primary aim of this work is to examine the operation and effects of two labels employed in the correctional structures for youth in Ohio. In order to do so adequately, it is necessary to define the subject of the investigation. Therefore, before turning in detail to the particular goals, methodology, and results of this research, it is necessary to briefly present the specific labels involved.

The "R" and "E" Suffixes

The Ohio Youth Commission is the state agency in Ohio to which delinquent youth under eighteen years of age are committed by the juvenile courts. The Youth Commission is charged with the rehabilitation of these delinquent youth, and operates a number of programs and institutions for their handling and treatment.

Every youth assigned to the Commission is given an identification number. It is possible that a youth will have an "R" or an "E" suffix added to this number.
These suffixes serve to single out the boy concerned. An "R" or "E" suffix relates to the general character or behavior of the boy. It is designed to identify those youth, who, in the opinion of the staff member, "may be considered as dangerous or potentially dangerous to the community or to themselves." Generally, this is interpreted to mean those boys who are hostile or aggressive.

The "Designation of R-Suffix" directive from the Ohio Youth Commission states: "In the 'Recommendations' at the end of the Juvenile Diagnostic Center report, the last paragraph shall be 'SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS.' A statement must be included calling attention to the nature of the youth's problem and recommending a review by a psychiatrist before community placement....No youth with 'R' suffix shall be placed on AWL [Absent With Leave, e.g. released permanently or temporarily] from any institution or camp without prior written approval from Classification and Assignment Section, the Psychiatric Division of Juvenile Diagnostic Center, or a Psychiatrist previously approved by the Director of the Commission or Deputy Director for Correctional Services of the Youth Commission."

Of the two, the "R" suffix appears much more often than the "E." However, in rare cases one does find an "E" attached to a boy's number. It, too, appears first in the "SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS" section of the JDC report.
The "E" suffix is intended to locate and identify those boys whose "emotional status is such that it may result in serious acting out or other type of mental or emotional deterioration." The official directive states, "Further, if there are indications that a child is experiencing personality disorders which can deteriorate and become fixed even with apparent good institutional adjustment being maintained...JDC will attach the 'E' suffix." The "E" boy, like the "R," must be interviewed and cleared by an approved psychiatrist before he can be released permanently.

The Research Problem

Whatever behavioral changes take place in an institutional setting occur within the social relationships which exist in that institution. Favorable behavioral changes are those which may be looked upon as rehabilitation, for rehabilitation amounts to the development and maintenance of better social relationships. To understand the rehabilitation process, therefore, one must be fully aware of factors that affect relationships within the correctional system.

The "R" and "E" designations are two such factors. They affect the boys who bear such labels in terms of their identification and separation from the normal population,
and they affect the boys who are not so labeled and the staff members who interact with all these youth in that they are undeniable and unavoidable parts of institutional life. The fundamental goal of this research, then, is to assess the sociological aspects of these "R" and "E" designations and their significance for institutional interaction.

However, "R" and "E" have meaning at two levels. First, they are official categoric designations of individuals, abstract conceptualizations in use within the formal structures of the Ohio Youth Commission. Second, as labels they are applied to real, specific individuals in specific situations for specific reasons. It cannot be assumed that the nature of "R" or "E" in one of these structures corresponds to its nature in the other. It is conceivable that these two perspectives differ, and may even conflict.

The central problem for this study, then, is to describe the sociological significance of "R" and "E" designations as they exist at both levels, and to determine the relationship between these labels as manifested in the perceptions of "R" and "E" held by the interactants in the institutional setting.

There are, therefore, three major concerns or directions for this research. The first is to establish the
formal situational context in which these labels are operative, the official nature of the "R" and "E" categories. This involves not only a description of the official model for the "R" and "E" designations, but a determination of the pragmatic, actual nature of "R" and "E" categories employed daily within the Youth Commission. In addition, understanding "R" and "E" as categories involves determination of the process by which certain boys have these labels officially attached to them.

The second goal is to determine to what sort of boys the "R" and "E" labels apply. What are the common characteristics of the boys who are labeled "R" or "E," boys with whom the non-"R" and "E" boys and staff must interact on a day to day basis?

Finally, how do "R" and "E" boys perceive themselves? How are they perceived by other students and by the staff? This investigation will involve analysis of the perceptions held by each group, and analysis of the relationships among these perceptions.

**Previous Research**

The only previous work which deals specifically with "R" and "E" boys is a doctoral dissertation by Stuart Miller at the Ohio State University. The purpose of Miller's work was to determine the post-institutional adjustment of some
443 boys from another institution under the OYC, the Training Institution, Central Ohio. One of the factors he discusses is the adjustment of boys with the "R" suffix.

The results of Miller's research indicate a confusion concerning "R" as a category and, in fact, cast doubt as to its worth within the agency. Miller observes "a difference of opinion exists among Ohio Youth Commission personnel as to whether the R's are treated differently than other boys ....The fact that such a difference of opinion exists would seem to indicate the lack of a well defined program for the "R's." Indeed, Miller suggests, "It may be that this suffix served merely as a labeling device and not as an indicator that the boys so designated were to be treated any differently than others in the institution."7

If the "R" category exists to designate and identify boys who are hostile, aggressive, and potentially dangerous to themselves or the community, one should expect differences between "R" boys and the non-"R" boys in terms of post-institutional adjustment. Further, Miller notes, "If the institution's rationale for attaching the ('R' designation) is valid, the scales (which he employed relating to boys attitudes toward TICO) should clearly distinguish those classified as 'R's' from those who were not."8

In both cases the results of the research do not bear out the expectations about "R" as a category. Relative to
distinguishing "R's" from normals, Miller finds that "analysis of the data indicated...that it was not possible to distinguish the 'R's' from the rest of the population."\(^9\) Most surprising, however, is that "the 'R' suffix...was unrelated to outcome at placement release." In fact, boys in the "R" category tended to do slightly better in terms of post-institutional adjustment. It is Miller's final contention that "it would appear that the OYC practice of classifying certain boys as hostile and aggressive is dubious and indeed expensive...."\(^{10}\)

But how is it possible to explain this apparent contradiction? Why would these categories continue to exist in the OYC organization in the face of evidence suggesting that they are "dubious" at best? Two themes appear in the literature which may explain this situation. The first concerns the need for deviant categories within any group. The second relates to the priority of categories and labels within any bureaucratic organization.

A number of persons have commented on the functions which deviance performs for a group. Dentler and Erickson suggest that a group induces and sustains deviance to locate the boundaries of the group in social space and to aid in the identification and maintenance of these boundaries.\(^{11}\) In a manner of speaking, delinquency is created and sustained by the group to locate precisely where normality or
"being a good boy" ends. Delinquency in this sense refers to the concept of delinquency, for it is a tenet of this position that "delinquent" is not some characteristic inherent in any boy, but is rather a socially defined quality conferred upon the boy by society.\textsuperscript{12}

However, once a number of "delinquent" boys have been placed together in a social situation, such as in the Fairfield School for Boys, a social group has been created. It then becomes necessary to define the limits of that group. It may be suggested that "R" and "E" designations are functional in this respect. If so, these "R" and "E" categories should enable the agencies of control to isolate boys from the group of "normal" boys.

In addition, the existence of categoric labels is, in itself, sufficient to explain their continued use. It has been an oft-repeated theme since Weber's initial statement that bureaucratically organized agencies come to have an existence independent of the ends for which they were originally established. The means necessary for the operation of the organization come to supersede the ends which created the agency. In an agency composed of officially designated positions and operated in terms of formal relationships between these positions, the positions themselves and the avenues of communication among them become the prime reality or concern.
Howard Becker specifically states that the individual responsible for enforcing rules has his enforcement activity conditioned by the necessity to justify the existence of his position.\textsuperscript{13} This necessity is the focus of articles such as Donald Cressey's Achievement of an Unstated Organizational Goal" and "Contradictory Directives in Complex Organizations: The Case of the Prison," and in Stanton Wheeler's "Role Conflict in Correctional Communities."\textsuperscript{14} Erving Goffman summarizes the point when he observes, "To get out of the [institution], or to ease their life within it, [inmates] must show acceptance of the place accorded them, and the place accorded them is to support the occupational role of those who appear to force this bargain.\textsuperscript{15}

Cressey stresses the importance of the constant reminders to staff from administration for the staff to "handle inmates without favoritism and without giving special consideration to the problems of individual prisoners."\textsuperscript{16} This is to say that the staff must handle the individuals with whom they deal in terms of categories, rather than as individuals, since handling them as individuals admits of favoritism, personal likes, dislikes, and individualized programs which the system simply is not designed to handle.

Likewise, almost no literature exists which discusses
"R" and "E" students as human beings. There is a wealth of information about delinquent boys generally, but there is very little which discusses categories or types of delinquents within the institutional structure. Even the existant literature concerning specific sub-groups of delinquent boys--the violent, psychopathic, and hostile--cannot be employed, because one cannot yet be sure into which sub-group "R" and "E" boys actually fit.

Again turning to Miller's dissertation, he observes, "One of the most important findings concerned those boys who...had been assigned an 'R' suffix. The six scales [which he used to measure institutional impact] were unable to differentiate respondents who had been classified as 'R's' from boys not classified as 'R's.' It should be pointed out, however, that the boys classified as 'R's' had scale scores very slightly...more unfavorable toward TICO than the total population scores on the six impact scales." In short, one can not distinguish "R's" from non-"R's" on the basis of their responses on these scales.

This conclusion indicates a lack of difference in positive impact for the two categories of boys. It implies that there may be no real difference between "R's" and normals. Miller's other finding regarding "R" boys not only tends to bear this out, but suggests that any difference which does exist may be in the opposite direction
Miller, in investigating the relationship of suffix to post-institutional adjustment, finds that "an examination of cell frequencies, however, indicates that the 'R's' recidivated less often than expected." Further, he states, "The 'R's,' in fact, had the highest per cent of satisfactory outcomes, 63 per cent, and the lowest per cent of re-institutionalization, 15 per cent, of any of the categories examined. . . . Although the chi square did not indicate a significant relationship (.20) between outcome at placement discharge and suffix number, a definite trend existed.18 Those boys who were believed to be hostile and aggressive and were so designated apparently performed better upon release than the normals.

Why this departure from expectation? Goffman repeatedly observes that an individual must make a number of behavioral and attitudinal adjustments based on his "classification" by inmates and staff in a total institution. It may be, then, that the "R" label produces certain responses in boys so labeled: responses conducive to better release adjustment.

Unfortunately, Miller's dissertation does not discuss the labeling process directly. He does, however, point up certain factors at TICO which apply to the process: factors which also apparently exist at Fairfield. In addition,
there is a wealth of information about the process of categorization to be found in the writings of authors called labeling theorists.

Kitsuse states that "in modern society, the socially significant differentiation of deviants from the non-deviant populations is increasingly contingent upon circumstances of situation, place, social and personal biography, and the bureaucratically organized activities of agencies of control." In the group of boys at Fairfield, this differentiation is the one between "R" and "E" and normal. Factors such as the situation, place, and activities of the institution suggest or imply that organizational needs are central in understanding why certain boys come to receive these labels. The decision to investigate the labeling process is based upon this premise.

If the persons responsible for attaching certain labels to individuals within their jurisdiction are called the "labelers," then there are two types or positions of labelers. First, there are those labelers responsible for initial identification of "deviants." Second, there are those labelers responsible for official attachment of the label. Where these two positions or types intersect in one person or organizational position, that person or position is vested with considerable power relative to
the population over which the position has jurisdiction.

Howard Becker discusses the problem of labeling, and suggests three factors are involved in the process. First, "enforcement of a rule is an enterprising act. Someone--an entrepreneur--must take the initiative in punishing the culprit." Second, "enforcement occurs when those who want the rule enforced publicly bring the infraction to the attention of others." And third, "people blow the whistle, making enforcement necessary, when they see some advantage in doing so." This is consonant with his view that enforcement activity is conditioned by the enforcer's need to justify the existence of his position.

Even after any individual has been identified or brought to the attention of "others," it is necessary officially to attach the proper label to that individual. Harold Garfinkel suggests the conditions which must exist for any such proper or successful labeling to occur.

He sets forth eight propositions relating to this process. Four of these deal with the question of the values of the group responsible for the labeling and the relation of the labeler to these values. Specifically, "the denouncer [or labeler] must arrange to be invested with the right to speak in the name of these ultimate values. [He] must make the dignity of the suprapersonal values of the (group) salient and accessible to view,
and his denunciation must be delivered in their name... (Finally, he) must get himself so defined by the witnesses that they locate him as a supporter of these values."²¹

In a situation which as the Ohio Youth Commission, where labeling is performed by members of the staff and where their positions are official positions, these four requirements are met. The staff takes for granted the values of the OYC. The initial labelers in the system then, are the official agents for imposing the values of the OYC.

Garfinkel notes that for this labeling or denunciation to be complete or successful, "the party to be denounced (let us call him the 'perpetrator,') and the thing that is being blamed on the perpetrator (let us call it the 'event') must be transformed in a number of ways." Four of these ways relate to values and have been discussed. In addition, he states, "Both event and perpetrator must be removed from the realm of their everyday character and be made to stand as genuinely unusual. The process of labeling, the person to be labeled and the event for which he is to be labeled must be shown to be out of the normal realm for operation within the system."²²

In addition, Garfinkel says: "Both event and perpetrator must be placed within a scheme of preferences that shows the following properties: The preferences must not
be for event A over event B, but for event of type A over event of type B. The same typing must be accomplished for the perpetrator." This amounts to a restatement of the necessity for categoric reactions and outlook. Further, "the witnesses must appreciate the characteristics of the typed person and event by referring the type to a dialectical counterpart."\(^2^3\) The labeled boy must stand as dialectic counterpart to the normal and preferred boys.

Also, "not only must the denouncer fix his distance from the person being denounced, but the witnesses must be made to experience their distance from him also. Finally, the denounced person must be ritually separated from a place in the legitimate order, i.e., he must be defined as standing in a place opposed to it."\(^2^4\) These conditions define the process which must occur if successful labeling is to occur at any point within any social system.

An investigation of these processes for official placement of a boy within the "R" or "E" categories, as well as analysis of the processes for initial identification, constitute the foundation for our analysis of labeling. As the literature suggests, one must determine how the process operates, who is responsible at each stage, and what relationships exist among those responsible.

Finally, one of the central axioms of sociology states, "If men define situations as real, then they are real in
their consequences." One of the central facets of this investigation of the reality or nature of the "R" and "E" designations must be a discussion of the perceptions held and employed by all interactants regarding "R" and "E."

The "self" has undergone prolonged discussion, testing, and conceptualization since its explicit formulation in the works of Cooley and Mead. As Kuhn and McPartland observe, "one of these many designations of the self has been as attitudes...(and) this conceptualization is most consistent with Mead's view of the self as an object which is in most respects like all other objects." An attitude is a plan of action toward any social object. Since any thing becomes an "object" only through our definition of it and our reaction to it, attitudes are our ways of viewing things.

Perception, technically, refers to the ways in which organisms respond to the stimuli picked up by their sense organs. In the human being, however, this perception is invariably affected by the social definitions which already exist in our minds toward those stimuli. Further, perception affects attitudes, which affect subsequent perceptions, and so on. The two phenomena are thus tied up in a pattern of interplay in which distinguishing one from the other is viable only in terms of abstract definition of either term. Often, the two terms are used in such a
way that they are synonomous with each other. For the purposes of this research, it is preferable to view them as being the same thing.

These perceptions or attitudes, then, are the ways in which the person views those objects around him—physical things and other persons. Kuhn and McPartland (and others) have attempted to discover the ways in which people organize views of themselves and others to discover how they define situations and react to the world. The results of their research suggest that a large part of self and other definitions revolves around consensual, social, categoric definitions or identities; specifically, for normal persons, "the consensual more directly socially anchored component." For the boys defined by the system as "R" or "E" this definition must assuredly have some effect upon their self-definition. This self-definition, in turn, has ramifications for their view of the world and the social and rehabilitative situation in which they exist.

In addition it is important to understand the degree to which institutionalized boys understand and accurately perceive others' views of "R" and "E." At the simplest level of such consensus, this amounts to recognition of the perceptions of others. In other words, the "R" and "E" boys view himself in a certain way. Also, other boys
and the staff view "R" and "E" in certain ways. The "R" and "E" boys, in turn, view the ways in which the staff and others view "R" and "E." If the "R" and "E" boys' perceptions of others' perceptions of them are accurate, then a degree of consensus exists among the interactants as to "R" and "E." The boys so labeled recognize the ways in which they are seen by others.\(^{30}\)

However, the manner in which one acts, the role he plays, is only partially determined by his own decisions or attitudes. As Goffman has pointed out, and Weinstein and Deutschberger and others have expanded, the individual's behavior is affected by the definitions of the situation which the others bring to the interaction. The perceptions and concurrent expectations of an individual's behavior by others serve to mold that behavior to fit with those expectations.\(^{31}\)

To fully understand an interactional situation, then, it is necessary to discover the perceptions of the "R" and "E" boys by other boys. In addition, it is equally necessary to determine the perceptions that normal boys have of the staff's perceptions of "R" and "E" boys.

The overriding importance of the staff in the life of the boys has been reaffirmed time and again. Miller notes findings from empirical studies to the effect that, "the lower-priced, non-professional staff members create
more impact on the inmates than do the higher priced, professional staff members." Further, "it is the non-professional personnel more than the professional who come closest to the inmates, help them most, understand them best, and generally exert the greatest impact on them.  

Miller states, "The staff officer's ability to predict actual [post-release] success...was very limited. [They] were more optimistic about case outcome and the effectiveness of the [rehabilitation process]." This, however, agrees with Becker's theorization about justification of the role of enforcer, and does not deal directly with perception of "R" and "E." In investigating staff evaluation of the "R" boys, Miller found that these boys were not scored differently by the staff. The "R" suffix apparently had no effect upon the staff worker's evaluation of post-release adjustment or institutional impact on the boy. He states, "It would appear, then, that boys classified as 'R's' were perceived no differently than others."
Organization of Subsequent Chapters

The fundamental problem for this research is to describe the sociological significance of "R" and "E" as official categories within the structures of the Ohio Youth Commission, as real boys within the interactional structures of institutions within the Commission, and to determine the relationship between these two perspectives.

Chapter II consists of a discussion of the methods, research strategies, research setting, and samples used in attempting to provide a solution to this problem. Each of these is presented relative to the aspect of the thesis problem they are designed to answer.

Chapter III deals specifically with the formal context and official structure within which "R" and "E" categories exist. It also concerns itself with the labeling process for these categories. It presents the history, design, and official conceptualization of "R" and "E" as categories. It also deals with the attitudes toward these categories and their official use held by administrative personnel. Further, it contains a discussion of the formal and informal processes which are employed within the Commission by which certain boys come to be labeled as "R" or "E."
In Chapter IV, the focus is on "R" and "E" designations as they apply to specific boys. It is an attempt to determine the nature of the "R" and "E" designations as they exist as real boys in the institutional interactive setting. The social background, criminal career, and psychological attributes of these boys are investigated.

Chapter V deals with the perceptions of "R" and "E" held by "R" and "E" boys, normal boys, and staff members at the Fairfield School for Boys. On the basis of these perceptions, an understanding of the integration of the perspectives presented in Chapters III and IV is to be reached.

Chapter VI is a summary of the findings. In addition, an attempt is made to draw certain conclusions which seem to follow from the analysis regarding the effects of the "R" and "E" designations for the process of institutionalization.
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CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Background of the Study

This study is a part of a larger project initiated as a replication of the Eynon, et. al. "TICO Study," and as a companion investigation to studies by Miller and, more recently, by Mosier.¹

This phase of the larger project is an attempt to produce an accurate sociological description of the meaning of "R" and "E" designations within the Ohio Youth Commission and the Fairfield School for Boys, the site chosen for the major project. It was felt that no one particular methodological technique was sufficient to cover the range of information desired for this study. For this reason, and because of the availability of different types of data, a variety of methods were employed. Each aspect of the problem involved different data, and the methods employed in gathering this data are discussed below in their order of appearance in the text of this study.
Correspondence, Interviews, and Directives

The first aspect of the thesis problem related to the organizational use of the "R" and "E" labels. To determine the nature of this context within which perceptions of "R" and "E" are formed, the contents of the official directives from the Youth Commission were obtained and studied in detail.

Two such documents relate to the "R" and "E" suffixes. These are the "Designation of 'R' and 'E' Suffixes of 1970." Copies of these directives are found in Appendix A. These directives discuss the nature and purpose of "R" and "E", and describe the procedures for implementation, clearance for community placement, psychiatric review, and recommitment. Discussion of official Youth Commission policies regarding these suffixes was taken from these directives.

In addition, a copy of the "Criteria and Program Statement for Fairfield School for Boys," an organizational table for the school and an outline of the June 1971 Monthly Report for the Fairfield School for Boys (FSB) (both found in Appendix A), were secured to verify a description of the setting of the research.

To obtain the necessary information relating to the history and day-to-day use of these suffixes, a number of personal interviews were conducted with personnel of the Ohio Youth Commission. There was also correspondence on this matter. These interviews were conducted during
November of 1971. They were unstructured, in that there was no set of common prepared questions presented to each individual interviewed. Instead, the discussions consisted of three parts. First, questions were raised and suggestions offered concerning the sort of problems to be dealt with in examining the "R" and "E" designations. Second, questions dealing with specific facts and perceptions necessary to deal with those problems and areas were raised. Third, suggestions for further information sources were presented by most respondents, suggestions which were generally followed up. Although not contained in their entirety in the study, these interviews are noted where appropriate.

The Research Setting and Samples

Subsequent analyses of "R" and "E" as boys and of the perceptions of "R" and "E" were based on responses from a sample of boys from the Fairfield School for Boys. The Fairfield School for Boys is located in Fairfield County in central Ohio. It houses approximately nine hundred boys in fifteen separate two story cottages. It is not a walled or maximum security institution, but in layout and program attempts to fulfill its stated nature as a school.

To be admitted to Fairfield, a youth must be "...an
adjudicated male delinquent by an Ohio County Juvenile Court as a permanent commitment." Further, he must be at least fifteen years of age and no older than eighteen. The only boys accepted under age fifteen are those receiving Commission approval following referral from the Bureau of Classification and Assignment of the Ohio Youth Commission. The offenses committed by boys admitted to Fairfield cover the range of juvenile violations from curfew violation to armed robbery and assault.

The purpose of the institution is to educate, retrain, and rehabilitate the fifteen to eighteen year old adjudicated male youths and to prepare them for a successful return to community life. The official function is "to help youth assume the responsibilities that they will face when returning to the community by guiding and developing a positive attitude toward authority, constructive value systems, and by giving them opportunities to improve their self images and self esteem through successful experiences." Toward this end, the school has a series of programs covering education, individual and group therapy, religious services, recreation, and health and supportive areas. Though chronically understaffed, all boys at the school are involved in many, if not all, of the programs.
The General Sample and "R" & "E" Sub-sample

As part of the larger project, an Institutional Impact Schedule such as that used by Eynon et. al. and Miller was administered to all boys consecutively released from the Fairfield School during the period from April 13 to June 22, 1971. This resulted in a sample of 300 boys. This sample was found to correspond to the general population of the School in terms of a series of variables, and was accepted as non-biased.

Within this larger sample, there appeared 23 boys classified as "R's" and 2 classified as "E's." These 25 boys comprise the "R" and "E" sub-group. However, it was impossible to locate the Youth Commission files for three of the "R's," which necessitated eliminating them from the sample relative to social background and criminal history investigation. This left a total of 20 "R's" and 2 "E's" who comprised the final group of "R" and "E" boys, although the full 25 were used in the analysis of the perceptions of institutional impact.

Although the small number of "E's" prevented their separation from the "R's," the boys who were labeled "R" or "E" appeared to be sufficiently similar to treat both "R" and "E" boys as one group.
In an attempt to assess the social, criminal career, and psychological attributes of the "R" and "E" boys, detailed information on each boy was obtained from the files of the Ohio Youth Commission. Although these OYC files vary in terms of completeness of recorded data, certain common information is generally contained in each file folder.

The files are kept in the Juvenile Diagnostic Center buildings in Columbus, Ohio. The contents of the case history folder varied from 10 or 20 single source sheets to two full folders with large quantities of material. Since there was no systematic organization of material in the folders, data collection was extremely difficult. After a preliminary examination of a number of files, a general fact sheet was constructed to facilitate recording the information desired for each student.

Three criteria guided the selection of background variables to be included. First, the theoretical importance of any given variable was considered. Thus, variables which have historically been related to aggressive behavior were included.

Second, the selection was guided by suggestions as to the importance or significance of certain variables from Stuart Miller's TICO study. Third, it was felt that no information should be used which was not available in the
majority of cases. Thus, if reliable information was not available in the majority of the case folders for any given variable, that variable was not included.

Social Factors

The most important social data were available in the "General Admission Summary" or face sheet which was contained in every folder. A copy of the face sheet is contained in Appendix B. This summary is taken for every boy on induction into the Youth Commission, and records general information as to race, family status at the time of incarceration, offense for which committed, and so on.

Further social information was gained primarily from the report of the social worker who investigated the boy's home conditions prior to incarceration, and the Social Section of the Juvenile Diagnostic Center's report from the induction screening. In these cases, the data were less systematic but often more detailed.

General problems encountered with data collection in regard to any specific variable are discussed in the text concerning that variable. In addition, measures which had to be devised from what data was available (such as the height-weight comparison in Chapter IV) are explained in the text.
The social factors which were routinely investigated included:

1. Physical Characteristics
   a. Race
   b. Physical condition
   c. Physical stigma
   d. Physical type

2. Family situation
   a. Parental status
   b. Home status on incarceration
   c. Family conditions
   d. Parents characteristics

Criminal History Data

There proved to be adequate data in most files on the criminal career of each youth. Because of the lack of systematization, however, there was often some inconsistency regarding the facts of the youth's criminal career. Where such inconsistency was unimportant to the study, as in cases of different dates reported for offenses other than the first or last, the inconsistencies were simply ignored. However, in the few instances where the details were felt to be important, it was possible to find some other source of information in the file which agreed with one report or the other, and such agreement was taken as verification of that report.

Since the "R" boys were considered to be hostile and aggressive and stand out from normal in this respect, it was
necessary to determine if their offenses were, in fact, worse than those of the normal boys. In dealing with the boys' offenses, then, offenses were classed as serious, moderate, or slight. This typology is adapted from a study by Reckless and Dinitz and was employed in the Miller study.5

In the classification, serious offenses are those which constitute major crimes, and include any offense normally considered a felony or a Part I crime in the Uniform Crime Report. The slight offenses are those usually considered as minor misdemeanors with the moderate offenses being those which do not fit into the serious or slight offense category. Most of the moderate offenses are Part II crimes in the Uniform Crime Reports. A full listing of the offenses is found in Appendix B.

The following variables were derived from the boy's criminal history.

1. Criminal Career
   a. Age at commission of first recorded offense
   b. Seriousness of first offense
   c. Type of offense - first offense
   d. Subsequent offenses by seriousness
   e. Subsequent offenses by type
   f. Type of offense for which committed
   g. Seriousness of offense for which committed

2. Behavioral Trends in OYC
   a. Times in OYC
   b. Youth Commission report on general behavior
Psychological Data

General psychological and/or psychiatric data were available in a number of locations in the boy's files. In many cases, a rather complete psychological report from the Psychological or Psychiatric Section of the Juvenile Diagnostic Center detailing the diagnosis of the boy upon intake was available.

In addition, in most cases the letter to JDC from the psychiatrist detailing his findings in the pre-release interview was available. This letter not only reviewed the diagnosis of the boy when the label was attached, but discussed the interview and offered a general statement concerning the improvement of the youth and his current condition. Finally, various reports by staff members in contact with the boy appeared in scattered forms in some of the files.

Although none of these sources of data was consistently available in all files, the combination of sources provided the necessary information to create a psychological ideal-type of the "R" and "E" boys. Two variables were treated, the first being the general diagnosis of the boy's psychological condition. The second variable examined was the
boy's I.Q. as measured by the Weschler Adult Intelligence Scale.

**Perception Data Collection Strategies**

**The Boys' Schedules**

The full questionnaire administered to the boys at Fairfield before their release consisted of 96 items and was an expanded version of a schedule developed by Eynon et al. to measure institutional impact. A full copy of the schedule is contained in Appendix C. The original schedule was factor analyzed into six scales named, according to the dominant item or items in the schedule, interpersonal approach, inmate code of acting, rejection of the institution, inmate pressure, rejection of positive impact, and self-labeling. Each of the 60 items in the original schedule were scored using a Likert type response pattern varying between four and five point response categories, and was arranged so that high scores indicated unfavorable attitudes and low scores, favorable impact of the institution.

The version of this schedule administered at Fairfield contained three attitudinal sets of items: 17 additional "impact" items included at the request of the staff of the Diagnostic Classification and Treatment Project; 20 "helpfulness" items, calling for ratings of various of the youth's
contacts as to their helpfulness (or lack thereof) during the youth's stay at Fairfield; and 20 items designed to measure the boys' perceptions concerning the "R" and "E" designations.

The schedule was administered via a tape-recording to groups varying in size from fewer than five to more than twenty. This administration occurred approximately a week before the boys were released from the institution on home or community placement. Each item in the schedule was read twice, and the subjects marked their response on an answer sheet. Each session, lasting roughly one hour, was conducted by an Ohio State University student who, after repeating a brief set of verbal instructions, started the tape recorder. The answer sheets were collected at the end of the session. Identification (name and ID number) was required on the answer sheets. This identification proved to be no problem to the boys.  

Boys' Perceptions of "R" & "E" Scale

The Perception of "R" & "E" Scale, found in Appendix C, consisted of 20 items with Likert type response categories of one to five. These items related to different aspects of the boys' perception of "R" and "E" status. The number of items relating to various aspects of perception were:
a. 5 items relating to perception of "R" boys
b. 5 items relating to perception of "E" boys
c. 2 items relating to boys' perception of staff attitudes toward "R" & "E" boys
d. 6 items relating to perception of "R" and "E" as categories
e. 2 items relating to boys' perceptions of parents attitudes toward "R" and "E"

Using these twenty items, three techniques of analysis were employed. First, each item was analyzed separately. The means and standard deviations of each item from each sample population were investigated to indicate the perception of that population on that item.

Second, each item for "R" had a complementary item for "E." Each "R" item was paired with its complementary item to determine any differences perceived between "R" and "E" by the students. The differences were evaluated in terms of the directionality of difference and the statistical significance of the difference measured by 't' tests.

Third, the perceptions of the normal boys were compared to the perceptions of the "R" and "E" boys for the items. Again, the differences were investigated in terms of directionality and statistical significance.

The Staff Member Assessment

After determining which staff member was most familiar
with each boy, this staff member was requested to fill out a Staff Member Assessment Form, a copy of which appears in Appendix D. This form is identical to one used in the TICO study, except that it contained two extra items relating to "R" and "E."

The first fifteen items on this form relate to behavioral or attitudinal attributes of the boy being evaluated. Each item has a scalar response from zero to nine. Item sixteen calls for a prediction of outcome for the boy after release.

The two final items request the staff member to respond on a nine point scale from very true to very false to the following questions:

"Regardless of this boy's actual status, he seems to have all of the characteristics of an 'R.'"

"Regardless of this boy's actual status, he seems to have all of the characteristics of an 'E.'"

Each of the items on the form were analyzed separately, and staff perceptions of "R" and "E" boys were compared to their perceptions of non-"R" and "E" boys in terms of directionality and significance of difference.
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CHAPTER III

THE "R" & "E" CATEGORIES AND THE LABELING PROCESS IN THE OHIO YOUTH COMMISSION

The goal of this chapter is to determine the basic formal context within which the "R" and "E" designations exist. These "R" and "E" designations apply within the official context of the Ohio Youth Commission and as categoric labels describe a group in terms of a set of characteristics or criteria which define and delimit this group. At this level, "R" and "E" labels do not pertain to any specific individuals within the Youth Commission but are simply shorthand designations for a position or status within the organizational structure of statuses within the Commission.

As categories, they are also in daily use by the staff within the Commission. When discussing "R" and "E" as categories there are at least three situational aspects with which to deal. First, the reality of the category as it is formally set down in official dictates by the Commission will be presented. Second, the reality of the category as it is actually employed in the daily operation of the Fair-
field School for Boys will be discussed. Third, the formal and actual procedures for implementation of these categories (the labeling process) will be presented to understand the methods by which the categories are used.

Since the central function of the Youth Commission is the rehabilitation of the youth in its control, the fundamental question for this chapter is whether the "R" and "E" designations, when conceptualized as abstract categories within the organizational make-up of the Youth Commission, serve to define and set apart certain groups of boys to aid in the program of rehabilitation for these boys. A number of specific questions follow which must be asked to determine the answer to the primary question.

1. Do "R" and "E" exist as well defined categories in official and formal structures of the Youth Commission?
2. Is the difference between these two categories clearly specified, and are the criteria for placement in one or the other clearly set forth?
3. What is the relationship, in terms of actual use, of "R" to "E" and both of these categories to other categories in use within the OYC structures?
4. What functions do the "R" and "E" categories serve as they are actually used, and do these functions relate to the official reasons for their use and existence?
5. How are boys labeled "R" or "E"; what is the process by which these labels are attached to specific boys?

6. What is the relationship of the labeling process to the overall goal of rehabilitation?

7. What are the effects of the labeling process on the boys and staff immediately concerned?

The following sections deal with each of these questions in turn.

The "R" Category

In 1967 a young boy was released on Absent With Leave (AWL) status by the Ohio Youth Commission on Christmas leave. During the period in which he was AWL, he raped and killed two young girls in his home town. The resulting public outcry against the Youth Commission was tremendous. Largely in response to this pressure, the "R" category was created within the O.Y.C. It was felt that youths such as this boy, "children who may be considered as dangerous or potentially dangerous to the community or to themselves," should be identified and differentially treated.¹

As the original OYC "Designation of 'R' Suffix" observes: "In the total population of the Youth Commission, a small number of children appear to be a threat to the community or themselves. The purpose of this directive is to establish
a system of identification of these children as well as a method of insuring re-evaluation by a psychiatrist prior to their return to the community.\(^2\) In short, the "R" category came about as an initial attempt to locate and handle "acting out" boys who might prove dangerous once returned to the community.

The administrative personnel of the OYC "decided they had better label these youth in some fashion to avoid these oversights."\(^3\) Initially, these youths were to have an "R" suffix attached to their ID number to indicate that a review was necessary before the boy could be released. This review was to involve a return to the Juvenile Diagnostic Center for two weeks before release. During that time, the youth was to undergo psychiatric, psychological, and social re-evaluation. If the child was no longer found to be dangerous, the "R" was to be removed from his number and file.

However, over the course of time this procedure has changed. The nature of the "R" classification has remained basically the same, but the nosological specifications have become more detailed. The latest "R" and "E" directive states in regard to the "R" that:

"If there are indications that a child actually does present a threat to the community or to himself, based upon demonstrated assaultive or attempted suicidal behavior, JDC will attach the 'R' suffix. Children who are dangerous to themselves or to others due to covert or overt hostility, aggressiveness, delusional or paranoid ideation, impaired judgement or absence of concern for others, may fall into this category. These characteristics are most frequently
seen in children with a history of fire setting, physical or sexual assault, or suicidal attempts."

Currently, the only procedure necessary for release of an "R" boy is a psychiatric clearance. Before a boy labeled "R" can be released to community placement (released on AWL status) or otherwise allowed to leave direct control of the Youth Commission he must undergo a psychiatric evaluation. Clearance no longer involves an hour's interview with an OYC psychiatrist or a psychiatrist designated by OYC.

The last major change in the "R" suffix involves its permanence. It is no longer possible to have an "R" removed. Once the boy has successfully cleared the psychiatrist's re-evaluation, the "R" simply becomes inactive. It remains as a permanent part of his record, file and ID number.

It does appear, therefore, that the "R" suffix designates a specific and rather well defined category within the official structure of the Ohio Youth Commission. The criteria for placement within this category are set forth in official directives. Although the procedures for identification and removal have changed, the criteria have remained basically the same, becoming, if anything more explicit.
The "E" Category

By 1970, however, many persons felt that the "R" designation had gone beyond the "just dangerous," and had come to include many other youths with all sorts of emotional or psychological problems. It was believed that some other designation was necessary to identify these latter youths. In March of 1970 the "E" suffix was therefore initiated within the OYC.

"If there are indications that a child's emotional status is such that it may result in serious acting out or other type of mental or emotional deterioration, JDC will attach the 'E' suffix. Further, if there are indications that a child is experiencing personality disorders which can deteriorate and become more fixed even with apparent good institutional adjustment being maintained (some passive-aggressive, some sociopathic, and some hysterical personalities), JDC will attach the 'E' suffix. Children whose acting out tendencies may be detected in the attitude and degree of fearfulness arising from more serious psychiatric illness (schizophrenia, paranoid ideation, personality disorders), but where there has been no previous objective evidence, may fall into this category."5

The "E" suffix, like the "R," requires a psychiatric re-evaluation before release from OYC. Also like the "R," the "E" may not be removed, and remains a part of the boy's record as "inactive." It is possible, however, for an "E" to be placed on AWL status for up to two days with special permission, a privilege which "R" boys do not have. This appears to be the only official difference in terms of treatment or handling.

In terms of the official nature and designation of "E"
as an abstract category, it may also be said that for the "E" suffix there appears to be a specific designation and officially, if not actually, a clear set of criteria for placement into this category. Thus, it seems that the "E" category is also relatively well defined within the official structures of the OYC.

The Functional Equivalence of "R" and "E"

As indicated, the effects of the "R" and "E" labels in the Ohio Youth Commission are almost the same. Although the description and criteria for placement for these two categories are different, the processes for attaching the label and inactivating the label are identical. The only official discussion in the "R" and "E" Directive covering how these youths shall be treated relates to their release from the institution or inactivation of the label. There is nothing mentioned about how they should be handled, what sort of treatment they may need, or how to go about changing their behavior.

Further, it appears that many boys who are currently designated as "E" would have been designated "R" before 1970, as might be expected. However, even after this date, there seems to be "no way to differentiate whether a kid gets an 'R' or an 'E' by virtue of his commitment behavior."5

It may therefore be surmised that in so far as "R" and
and "E" represent categories within the Ohio Youth Commission, they are functional equivalents. The organizational response to the categories does not differentiate between them. Therefore, categorization as "R" or categorization as "E" serves the same function for both the organization and the youths involved.

The Relation of "R" and "E" to Other Labels

There are only two other suffixes which are attached to a boy's number by the Youth Commission. When a youth is committed directly to some specific OYC institution by certain courts in the state having the power to do so, a "D" is placed after his number. Otherwise, the only item which will appear with his I.D. number is another one digit number reflecting the number of previous commitments within the Youth Commission. Neither of these other items compare to "R" or "E" in terms of being officially placed labels.

Further, the head of psychiatry for the Ohio Youth Commission has stressed that "R" and "E" are not diagnostic categories or labels. They do not, in themselves, diagnose or identify any specific type of mental condition or psychopathology. They are categories which have meaning only within the Youth Commission, and do not even necessarily relate to categories of mental disorders used on the outside. This fact, combined with the absence of clear differentiation of these categories from the normal students in terms of
handling suggests that the place of these categories is not well defined relative to other categories in use at OYC.

**Functions of "R" and "E"**

The official Ohio Youth Commission rationale for the implementation and use of the "R" and "E" categories corresponds to those reasons implied in the previous passages. It was felt that there were a sufficient number of youths under OYC control who were potentially dangerous enough to themselves or to the community to warrant special attention within the Commission.

It must be noted, however, that the use of "R" and "E" is not without challenge within the OYC at the current time. The deputy directors of the commission are seriously considering dropping both the "R" and the "E" categories. It is felt that "R" and "E" have regressed to the point where any youth with an emotional problem of any sort gets an "R" or "E." They have merely become "labels which are hung on the kid and then forgotten." There is now a feeling that the use of specific labels weakens their nature as categoric identifications which might help in the rehabilitation of the youth. As one staff member put it, "I'd like to see the ideas behind their use carried without the labels." Thus, while the official rationale for the use of "R" and "E" designations seems sound, the staff now challenges the use
of the categories in practice.

There would appear to be, however, other reasons beyond
the official rationale for the inception and use of "R"
and "E." One unstated reason which appears quite logical,
theoretically consistent, and indeed probable, is that
these categories exist to "get the Youth Commission off the
hook."9 The Commission is in the business of changing
people, of taking bad boys from the community and returning
them to the community as good boys. The released youth rep­
resent the end products of the Commission. The community is
willing to accept some OYC failure, but it will not tolerate
too much failure.

The community may react against failure in terms of
absolute numbers. If too many boys are returned and stay
"bad," the community will react negatively. However, public
intolerance may also be in terms of the severity of vio­
lative behavior by boys released from OYC. The community
will tolerate a small percentage of boys released who steal
cars, but if a boy is released and proceeds to rape and kill
two girls, "all hell breaks loose," as one staff member put
it.

However, it is apparent from past experience that such
similarly distressing occurrences cannot be wholly prevented
regardless of OYC treatment. Thus, it becomes necessary for
the commission to "cover itself" in the face of such acts on
the part of releasees. It may be suggested that "R" and "E" exist to provide such a cover.

Garfinkel and others have observed that one of the primary features of a deviant category for an individual is that it removes him from the "normal" considerations that affect other members of the group. He is seen to stand outside the values, norms, indeed the very confines, of the group. Taking the youths within the OYC, then, those boys who are labeled "R" or "E" are placed "beyond the pale." Any actions "R" or "E" boys may perform, even after release, can no longer be evaluated in terms of, or related to, the actions of the "normal" youth released from OYC.

In practice such removal means that if an "R" or "E" youth is released and commits a very serious crime the personnel of the Youth Commission can manage the tremendous community uproar which follows such an occurrence. The boy after all, had been identified as dangerous, and the Commission had done what it could. The youth can not be used by the community as a representative of the "normal" product of the Commission because he had already been set aside and officially identified as being other than normal.

Labeling: The Implementation of Categories

The process by which "R" and "E" categories are placed on specific youths is referred to as the labeling process. It must be kept in mind that the process of labeling is
something quite apart from the categories or labels themselves and from the boys who are so labeled.

Howard Becker observes that for any rule to become operative in a social structure "the specific rule has... to be applied in particular instances to particular people. It must receive its final embodiment in particular acts of enforcement."\(^{11}\) The same may be said for any category or label. Before it becomes "real" it must receive its embodiment through a particular act of labeling. This process -- the designation of particular boys as being within the "R" and "E" categories -- serves to realize and continually reaffirm these abstract categories.

As such, it is necessary to determine whether this process itself has any effect on the social and behavioral adjustment of the boys. To investigate this notion, the actual process by which boys are labeled within the Ohio Youth Commission, and the effects of the process, must be determined and described. Such a task involves not only investigation of the formal process itself, but investigation of the more subtle effects for all concerned.

**The Authority to Label Within OYC**

The final authority for attachment of the "R" or "E" label within the Ohio Youth Commission lies within the Juvenile Diagnostic Center, namely, with the Supervisor of
the Center. In reality, however, almost any staff member within the Commission who comes into contact with a boy has the power to attach these designations. Two factors account for this. First, the "R" and "E" labels can be applied at any time during a boy's stay in OYC. Second, JDC rarely rejects a recommendation for an "R" or "E" made by a staff member.

The designations, then, may be attached during initial intake at the Juvenile Diagnostic Center if the intake staff feel the boy warrants the label, or they may be attached after the boy has been assigned to one of the dozen specific institutions in the OYC system. The official method for labeling is the same in either case.

Once a staff member has suggested that either an "R" or "E" label be applied to a boy, that boy is then interviewed by a psychiatrist (unless, of course, the original suggestion comes from the psychiatrist.) The psychiatric personnel at JDC then review the report by the psychiatrist who interviewed the boy. Thus, they are the final authority in determining whether the suffix will be assigned.

If the recommended suffix is approved by the personnel of the Diagnostic Center, "JDC shall, in turn, notify the Classification and Assignment Section, the recommending institution, and the appropriate Bureau of Juvenile Placement Regional Office of the change in the child's status."
The "change in the child's status" is noted in the youth's file, on his file folder, and the "R" or "E" is permanently placed after his ID number.

**Labeling and Rehabilitation: The Lack of a Relationship**

To determine whether this labeling serves as an aid in altering the boy's behavior it is necessary to ask two questions. First, what is done with the boys so labeled in terms of specific or different rehabilitation programs? Second, what are the effects, both negative and positive, for the labeling staff and the labeled boy as a result of the labeling process?

The first point which must be considered is whether there are any special care and treatment modalities offered to "R" and "E" boys in contrast to the other populations at OYC. The answer seems to be negative. The Directive on "R" and "E" states that:

"JDC shall have the responsibility for recommending treatment planning for all 'R' and 'E' suffix cases. Classification and Assignment Section shall have the responsibility for considering all recommendations made by JDC and designating the facility which can best implement the treatment plan in each case." 13

Thus, very general outlines are established for "R" and "E" status relative to normal boys. It is suggested that "R" and "E" boys deserve and may require some type of special placement and treatment, and that the decision re-
garding this shall be made by a Bureau within the OYC. However, very little else is said, and no specific program is outlined. It appears that particular treatment programs are left to the discretion of the psychiatric and other treatment staff at each institution.

It is important to question, then, whether the "R" and "E" labeling has any rehabilitative function at all. The chief psychiatrist at the Youth Commission believes that it does. He feels that "most boys are helped to overcome their "R" or "E" through rehabilitation, so that when psychiatry reviews them, they very usually remove the label." This review consists of the short interview in which the psychiatrist looks for "an understanding of his behavior by the boy, an understanding of his behavior by the boy, and understanding of right and wrong, guilt, and an ability to relate to people."  

The telling fact, however, is that the pre-release interview is quite often the only contact the psychiatrist will have with a boy who has been labeled "R" or "E." The function of this interview is not to rehabilitate, but to evaluate whether any rehabilitation has occurred. Any rehabilitation which occurs must, therefore, occur in the other aspects of the correctional setting.

In point of fact, there are no special programs for the "R" and "E" youth. One administrative staff member flatly
states, "Nothing at all special happens to the "R's" and "E's." This is confirmed by another staff member's observation that, "in terms of particular treatment, the "R's" and "E's" are handled just like any other boy." At Fairfield, for example, there is no program for "R" or "E." The one practice which might be considered as having treatment potential was the tendency for these youth to be assigned to one particular cottage. However, two things overshadow even this as treatment. First, not all "R" or "E" boys at Fairfield are assigned to this cottage. Second, the staff of this cottage is not trained in psychiatry or in offering specialized treatment. The major effect of this assignment is that the cottage has become known as the "crazy house."

In short, the conclusion must be drawn that no special treatment is given to the "R" and "E" boys. Yet if one accepts the OYC psychiatrist's statement and Miller's finding's on outcome of release for "R" and "E" boys, the standard treatment which these boys receive is effective enough to change their behavior as much or more than that of other boys. Therefore, it may be said that the "R" and "E" boys seem to react well to the processes for behavioral change or rehabilitation which do exist within Fairfield and OYC, but that these processes have no relationship to the fact that the boys have been labeled as "R" or "E."
As has been repeatedly stated, a large part of the day-to-day operation of any member of a bureaucracy involves protection of his position. To the particular OYC staff members, then, labeling serves as confirmation of their individual expertise. As staff members, they are expected to act within the confines and rules of the Youth Commission. One of the normative expectations which goes with the role relates to the identification of troublesome boys to be given an "R" or "E" label. A staff member who observes a hostile or aggressive boy and does not recommend an "R" or "E" label for the boy creates two problems. First, he suggests that he is not performing his duties in the manner prescribed by the administrative personnel at OYC. As such, he poses an implicit threat to these persons. Second, he poses a threat to OYC in the form of releasing a dangerous boy into the community without the proper "cover" for the Commission.

It is evident that not only is the staff member supposed to identify hostile and aggressive boys eligible for "R" and "E" designations, but he is supposed to identify a proper number or quota of such boys. The administrative personnel have on more than one occasion re-affirmed the belief that they have a certain "quota" which they personally feel represents the percentage of boys within OYC.
who should be "R" or "E." If the number of boys actually identified as "R" or "E" falls below or above this quota, tension is created for these persons.

Two specific examples can be cited. In a discussion with an administrative staff member within the Youth Commission, it became apparent that he was dissatisfied with the current use of "R" and "E" designations. Further discussion revealed that it was his evaluation that no more than 1 or 2 per cent of all boys should have these labels, and that these should consist only of the assaultive boys. The fact that too many boys with too many different types of problems received these designations made the use of the designations dysfunctional in his estimation.

The second example relates to the instigation of the "E" label. When the "E" designation was put into use, superintendents in each institution were directed to send the names of boys who fit this designation to the proper central office administrator. Approximately 13 names were forwarded. These names were returned to the offices from which they came with the notation that it was not felt that this was a sufficient number. Each reporting unit was instructed to re-do its list, and "attempt to come up with more names."

In addition to the "position" pressures, there are other pressures placed on staff members as a direct result
of problems that labeling a boy may create for the boy. Those effects, and the concomitant pressures they produce, are probably as important for staff members as they are for boys.

As stated, once the "R" or "E" is attached, the youth must undergo a psychiatric evaluation before he may leave the jurisdiction of the Youth Commission. However, there is a more important effect which follows from this requirement, an effect which relates to the entire process of attaching the "R" and "E" labels.

If the "R" or "E" is attached at induction, then the youth is aware of the extra conditions this will involve. However, if the label is attached after the youth is placed in an institution, the extra attention given to the boy, the scheduling and procedure for interview, etc., amount to an extra six to twelve months that the boy must stay within the institution. In short, labeling a boy "R" or "E," or even attempting to label him, amounts to sentencing the youth to six to twelve months more in OYC. This fact is undoubtedly the most severe penalty for the youth which follows from the labeling process.

However, the extension of time in the institution produces a dilemma for the staff doing the labeling. The staff member suggesting an "R" or "E" designation for any given boy must now consider not only the possible rehabilitative
effects for the boy and the protective effects for the institution, but the negative effects which follow from the extra time involved in the labeling.

As one staff member who has been involved in the "R" and "E" labeling situation as both a lower level staff member and an administrator states; "If you bring the kid to attention, it means another six to twelve months, because that's what it takes. You can keep it (the youth's time) short and send him back to the community with strong recommendations for community services. You usually let it go unless the kid shows bizarre behavior we can't cover up. Actually, the recommendation to label or to release depends on where the kid's going, which community and the kind of community services they have."²⁰

The decision for staff members, then, must take into account not only the specific guidelines set forth for "R" and "E" designations, but all the implicit meanings and consequences the "R" and "E" labels carry. From the statements of staff members it appears that quite often the "R" and "E" labels are not suggested for boys as an aid to the boy's correction.

Other effects which follow from being labeled "R" or "E" are relative to the perceptions of "R" and "E" held by the participants in the correctional setting. These effects are covered in Chapter V.
**Summary**

In order to determine the organizational context and rehabilitative functioning of "R" and "E" as categories and the labeling process within the Ohio Youth Commission, a number of questions were raised in this chapter. The conclusions which followed from the examination of these questions are summarized below.

First, "R" and "E" are set up, ideally, as categories to aid in rehabilitation of youths so classified. Although "R" and "E" exist as well defined and differentiated categories in OYC, the official program for treatment of such boys is vague and very undefined. More time is devoted to identifying boys as "R" or "E" than is given to their management and treatment.

Second, "R" and "E" are not diagnostic categories although they relate to psychiatric conditions. They do not identify any specific psychiatric or mental condition, and therefore the treatment for boys who are "R's" and "E's" may vary widely. Further, these categories are not clearly related to other categories within the Youth Commission.

Third, many of the personnel in the Youth Commission responsible for treatment and handling do not feel that the "R" and "E" categories are any aid in the rehabilitation of boys so identified. They feel that the use of these categories as such may do more harm than good in many cases.
Fourth, although the official reasons for the implementation and use of the "R" and "E" categories are set forth, there are other, more plausible, reasons for the use of these categories. The alternative explanation of these categories, which seems to fit the facts better than the official reasoning, suggests that "R" and "E" were never actually intended to be, and do not function as, aids to rehabilitation.

Fifth, the effects of the labeling process for both the institution and the individual are unrelated to behavioral change. The labeling process does not aid "R" or "E" boys as such. Instead, it supports the staff and administration in the maintenance of system boundaries.

The major conclusion which may be drawn from this analysis is that the "R" and "E" categories are primarily vehicles for the identification of certain boys, and the separation of these boys from the normal population in terms of organizational statuses. This is, however, not the formally stated function of these designations. The context within which the phenomena exist appears to be one of confusion or contradiction, with a set of expectations and values existing in the official structures which do not correspond to the working reality.
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CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIAL, CRIMINAL HISTORY, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ATTRIBUTES OF "R" AND "E" BOYS

The "working reality" for the "R" and "E" designations are those meanings which "R" and "E" come to have for all persons who are involved on a day-to-day basis with "R" and "E" boys. To determine what this reality of "R" and "E" is for these persons involved in the daily personal interactions within the correctional institution it is necessary to examine the characteristics of "R" and "E" boys, for it is through these boys that the attitudes comprising this reality develop.

It is the aim of this chapter to determine whether the "R" and "E" suffixes designate or define a consistently identifiable type of boy. To turn the question around, is there a particular pattern of social background, criminal history, behavioral, and psychological attributes that characterize the boys who are identified as "R" or "E"?

Thus, there are four specific questions to be asked:

1. What common patterns exist for "R" and "E" boys in terms of their social backgrounds?
2. What common patterns exist for "R" and "E" boys in terms of their careers in delinquent activities?

3. What common patterns exist for "R" and "E" boys in terms of their behavioral patterns during their stay in the Youth Commission?

4. What common patterns exist for "R" and "E" boys in terms of their psychological makeup?

Social Background Factors

Historically, a number of social and psychological factors have been hypothesized as defining characteristics of delinquent boys. Hostility, aggressiveness, and emotional disturbance have been related, as have race, morphology, and the home situation of youth. Therefore, it appears relevant to consider these factors in relation to the "R" and "E" designations.

Race

It has been suggested that in the general population, race is correlated with a social or psychological propensity for aggressive behavior. However, it appears that in so far as "R" and "E" designate aggressive boys there is no correlation at all in this sample. When compared to the population at the Fairfield School for Boys and the general population of the Ohio Youth Commission, the racial balance
in the "R" and "E" groupings is almost identical, as the data in Table 1 indicate.

Table 1: Racial Composition of "R" and "E" Boys at Fairfield, Total Population of Fairfield, and Total Population of Ohio Youth Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Racial Composition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Non-White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;R&quot; and &quot;E&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>458</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.Y.C.*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The OYC population includes girls in OYC.

It appears that the racial distribution of the "R" and "E" boys is nearly identical to the entire institutional population and that blacks constitute about half of both the FSB and the "R" and "E" groups.

Boy's Physical Condition

Some researchers and theorists have suggested that a boy's physical condition may correlate with aggressiveness or emotional problems. It has been suggested that physical disfigurement, body type of somatotype, and condition of physical health all tend to produce, or relate to, negative
social behavior on the part of the boy.\textsuperscript{3}

Investigation of the "R" and "E" boys' files revealed no support for any physical impairments or related problems. According to the recorded data these boys are physically quite normal.

First, since no accurate measures of body type were available, the height and weight of each boy were compared to the desirable weights for each height.\textsuperscript{4} Of the 22 boys, two were between 10 and 20 pounds underweight, one was under 10 pounds overweight, and two were between 10 and 25 pounds overweight. The remaining seventeen were all within the recommended range of height-weight ratio. They were, in other words, normal.

Only three of the boys had any medical problems noted on their intake records. One had a hernia and one had a positive reaction to a tuberculin skin test. The other case had the underdeveloped genitalia, large breasts, and other symptoms of the chromosomal condition diagnosed as Klein-felter's Syndrome. This is unusual, of course, and surely related to the boy's special problem status. However, in the general "R" and "E" group there was an absence of other serious genetic or physical problems.

Finally, the boys' records do not reveal any serious physical stigma. Generally, they appear to be similar to
the normal population of boys, a finding which was supported by conversations with staff members who handle both "R" and "E" and non-"R" and "E" groups. In sum, "R" and "E" boys as a group are not physically or maturationally distinct from the normal boys at Fairfield.

Parental Status

In examining the status of the "R" and "E" boys' parental situation the first significant item appears. Seventeen of the twenty-two boys came from homes where the parents were divorced, separated just before the death of one spouse.

Thus only five, or 22.9 per cent of the boys were in an intact natural family unit at the time of incarceration. In Miller's study of TICO releases, 30.9 per cent had lived in intact family units at the time of incarceration, although only 26 per cent returned to intact units on release.5

Table 2 (following page) presents the comparison between the "R" and "E" boys and the general release population in terms of whom they were living with prior to incarceration.
Table 2: Person(s) Lived With Prior to Incarceration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person(s)</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; &quot;E&quot; Boys</th>
<th>Fairfield Releases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Parent</td>
<td>5 22.9</td>
<td>89 35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Natural and One Step Parent</td>
<td>7 31.7</td>
<td>54 21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father or Step Father</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>11 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother or Step Mother</td>
<td>10 45.4</td>
<td>94 38.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining with whom the "R" and "E" boys lived prior to incarceration, then, it was found that ten of the boys lived with only one parent, invariably the mother or foster mother. The remaining twelve youth lived with their natural parents or with one natural parent and a step-parent. However, if race is considered, 80 percent of the non-whites but only 20 percent of the whites came from based households.

It thus appears that almost all "R" and "E" boys came from broken homes. Further, if non-white, they had been living with their mother prior to incarceration, whereas if white they most likely were living with one natural parent and one step-parent or, in some few cases, with both natural parents.
Family Conditions

The general status of the family and the quality of home life is a much more intangible thing to determine than the marital status of the parents. The main facts about the home and the family were gained from social workers' investigations at the time of incarceration or reports given to the staff by the boys themselves. Although these are sometimes sketchy and sometimes contradictory, it was generally possible to derive some idea of the general home and family situation from the boys' files.

A clear cut pattern evolved from this investigation, with 18 of the 22 boys fitting the pattern. The first item in this configuration is an effectual father. If he is not totally absent from the home, he is unconcerned and uninvolved with the boy or the family.

It is the second item which fills out the family pattern of "R" and "E" boys. In all 18 cases there appeared to be an ineffectual mother. In seven of the 18 cases the mother is also absent, or unconcerned and uninvolved. In the remaining eleven cases, the reports on the mother invariably note that although she is concerned with her son, she is unable to provide him with the proper discipline and emotional stability. These mothers were described as "smothering, emotionally ineffective, with no strength,
Dealing with the four exceptions, one fit the pattern in a slightly altered form. Both natural parents in this case were unconcerned, but the boy had lived with foster parents who do appear concerned.

The remaining three cases fit into a distinct but similar pattern. In all three, there was an extremely volatile family situation, with a strong tension or rivalry existing between the boy and one or more family members. In one case, there was strong sibling antagonism, in another dislike for an emotionally disturbed step-mother, and in the final case, dislike for the family generally. It appears that if the unconcerned father and unconcerned or weak mother pattern is not operative, then the strong antagonism pattern is. It is of interest to observe that these four exceptions are the only homes out of the twenty two which were rated as fair or suitable by the investigating social workers.

**Careers in Delinquency**

In discussing the delinquent careers of the "R" and "E" boys, three dimensions appear important. It is necessary to determine the nature and seriousness of the first offense, number and type of subsequent offenses, and the type of offense for which the boy was currently committed.
First Offense

There are three questions which are relevant to the concern with the first offense of the "R" and "E" boys. First, what was the nature of the first offense? Second, how serious was this offense? Third, at what age was it committed?

There appeared to be no specific pattern to the first officially known act. The specific acts ranged from incorrigibility, ungovernability, and truancy all the way to auto theft, burglary, and assault with a knife. The acts were so varied it was impossible to specify any one of them as being typical. There are 14 different acts appearing as first delinquent acts for the 22 boys.

Turning, then, to the second and third questions, an attempt was made to establish some pattern on the basis of the seriousness of the first delinquent act. At the same time, an attempt was also made to relate the seriousness of the act to the age of the boy at the time of commission. The ages were broken into 10 to 12 years old (roughly corresponding to the time the boys were still in grade school), 13 to 15 years old (when the boys were in junior high school), and 16 to 18 years old (when they were, or were supposed to be, in high school).

The small number of cases in each instance prevented statistical analysis, but it was evident that there was
little association between the seriousness of the act and the age of the boy at its commission. The number of boys committing serious, moderate, or slight first offenses, and the age at which each boy was likely to commit each type of act were all but identical. Although there was a slight tendency for the first offense to be serious (10 serious versus 6 moderate and 6 slight), this was not strong enough to suggest any definite pattern.

Subsequent Career in Deviance

In investigating the files for subsequent offenses committed by the "R" and "E" boys, a total of 107 recorded offenses were found. In addition, two of the boys accounted for at least 15 more offenses each, offenses which were listed in their files as "regular contact since 1967," and "over 15 referrals since 1960." As a result, it may be said that these 22 boys accounted for over 137 reported offenses, of which 107 are contained in their files and therefore codeable. It is these 107 which appear in the following discussion.

In an attempt to discover the general seriousness of the offenses committed by the "R" and "E" boys, each of the 107 offenses was coded as to seriousness. The results appear in Table 3.
Table 3: Number of Total Offenses by "R" and "E" Boys by Seriousness of Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seriousness</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from Table 3 indicate that the "R" and "E" boys committed more serious than moderate or slight offenses. However, it is possible that a few boys committing a number of serious offenses could produce a bias in favor of the more serious offenses. Therefore, Table 4 displays the combinations of offenses committed by the 22 youths.

Table 4: Offense Combinations Committed by "R" and "E" Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seriousness of Offenses by Each Boy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious &amp; Moderate &amp; Slight</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious &amp; Moderate or Slight</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate or Slight &amp; Moderate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two items appear significant from this table. First, almost 40 per cent of the boys have committed at least one offense of each degree of seriousness, which implies versatility of delinquency. Second, 19 of the 22 boys have committed at least one serious offense. It may thus be concluded that the "R" and "E" boys at some time in their careers in delinquency have committed a serious offense.

One last item needs to be mentioned before turning to an investigation of the offense for which the boys were committed to the Commission. General examination of the types of offenses committed reveals, as it did for the first offense, no particular pattern relating to type of offense. From kidnapping, the most serious offense present, the specific acts committed by these youth ranged through the entire spectrum of property, personal, sex, and drug offenses to such juvenile offenses as incorrigibility and truancy.

The nature of the offenses for which the "R" and "E" boys were committed was compared to the committal offenses for the Fairfield releases, and the results displayed in Table 5. As can be seen, it appears that the "R" and "E" boys seem overrepresented in the relatively minor offenses, or juvenile offenses.
TABLE 5: Offenses for which Committed to Fairfield by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; f</th>
<th>&quot;E&quot; %</th>
<th>Fairfield Releases</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; f</th>
<th>&quot;E&quot; %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Offenses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/Liquor violations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage/Trespass to property</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seriousness of Offense for Which Committed

One final phase was investigated in regard to the delinquent histories of the "R" and "E" boys. It has been shown that their careers are varied, with an emphasis on serious acts. What sort of offenses, then, comprised their last delinquent act, e.g. that for which they were committed?

The particular offense for which each boy was brought before the Ohio Youth Commission was listed in every case. In the four cases where a boy was returned to the OYC for (in effect) violation of parole, the original offense for
which he was committed, rather than the offense for which he was returned, was counted. Table 6 presents the committal offenses for the 22 "R" and "E" and for the other releases classified as to seriousness of offense.

Table 6: Offenses for Which Committed to Fairfield, by Seriousness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Seriousness</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; E&quot; Boys</th>
<th>Fairfield Releases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results display a definite trend, although the "R" and "E" boys are not that different from the general releases. Although the boys' first offense may have been at any age and of any degree of seriousness, the offense for which they were committed to the Commission was a serious one in three-fifths of all the cases.

Behavioral Trends in the Youth Commission

The boys' behavior or career patterns while wards of the Ohio Youth Commission proved difficult to ascertain. Some consistent sources of information were found, but often reports apart from these proved to be unreliable on cross
investigation. It was possible, however, to construct a general outline of the behavior patterns and eliminate much of the ambiguity and unreliability using a variety of sources.

Times in OYC

One bit of information available in every case related to the number of previous commitments to the Youth Commission. These data are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Number of Previous Commitments to the Ohio Youth Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Previous Commitments</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; &quot;E&quot; Boys</th>
<th>Fairfield Releases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears from Table 7 that significantly more "R" and "E" boys were recidivists in the Youth Commission. Only one boy, however, had two or more previous commitments. It does appear that recidivism is a more characteristic pattern for "R" and "E" boys.

OYC Reports - General Adjustment

The so called Short Study Cottage Report was also found
in every file (although in slightly different forms). This report is filled out by the group leader (Cottage Leader) for each boy during his first weeks at the Juvenile Diagnostic Center and deals with the general adjustment of the boy and his reactions to the persons with whom he interacts.

Four dimensions of behavior were analyzed from this report; friendliness, self-control, aggression, and general adjustment. It is felt that these four dimensions constitute a reliable picture of the boy's general attitudes and behavior at the Youth Commission, at least initially. (See Tables 8 through 11.)

According to the Cottage Report Forms, the "R" and "E" boys displayed a variety of aggressive states, but the majority were evaluated as not being unusually aggressive. Ironically, this is precisely the one dimension on which one would expect "R" and "E" boys to be most conspicuously identified as being troublesome.

On all three other dimensions, over 50 per cent of the "R" and "E" boys fell into the category reflecting the most positive evaluation. The boys were reported as friendly and able to get along well with peers and adults. Seventeen of the 22 displayed controlled behavior. Some were characterized as passive while some were more active, but all were rated as having control in their behavior. Eighteen of the 22 were at least generally comfortable and showed no
more than moderate anxiety, being evaluated in the first or second categories in Table 11.

In short, the "R" and "E" boys appear to be very positive or at least modestly adept in their interpersonal relations. Most were evaluated in positive terms on every dimension except aggression. Although many of them were evaluated as non-aggressive, there was no clear majority. The general conclusion to be tentatively drawn is that "R" and "E" boys were observed to be generally positive in their interpersonal relationships with peers and staff of the institution, but that their reported aggressive patterns were inconsistent with the overall consistently positive pattern. It is possible that, in spite of the positive behavior patterns reported, the "R" and "E" boys were capable of more aggression than the other boys.

Table 8: Staff Evaluation of Friendliness of "R" and "E" Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm &amp; Usually Friendly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly but Reserved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn or Unresponsive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Staff Evaluation of Self-Control of "R" and "E" Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncontrolled:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature - Compulsive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn or Passive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled: Normally Active - Self Assured</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Staff Evaluation of Aggression of "R" and "E" Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostile or Aggressive to Certain People</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive only when Provoked</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Aggressive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Staff Evaluation of General Adjustment of "R" and "E" Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally Happy: Little Anxiety</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally Comfortable: Moderate Anxiety</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet &amp; Withdrawn: Depressed or Resentful</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Psychological Dimensions

It is extremely difficult to deal in any concrete fashion with the psychological profiles of these cases. Not only do the forms of the reports for the "R" and "E" boys on this dimension differ, but the wording, phrasing, and concepts used by different persons making the reports also differ. It is, thus, impossible to know whether a "dysocial personality" to one psychologist or psychiatrist is different from the "anti-social personality" of another. Such a problem, of course, is not unique to the present study, or even to psychiatric classification.

Fortunately, however, this problem is not too serious in the instance of the "R" and "E" boys. This is such similarity in the diagnoses of all of these boys that even the differences in wording imply the same pattern in almost every boy.

Psychiatric Evaluation of "R" and "E"

It is possible, from the psychiatric reports, to identify one ideal type which describes every boy. This hypothetical youth manifests an unsocialized reaction to adolescence. He has passive-aggressive traits, and may be explosive and impulsive much of the time. He has shallow insights into his own personality and problems. He feels
rejected, is quite often insecure, and has feelings of inadequacy. In some instances, he may manifest feelings of paranoia, although there is generally little sign of neurosis or psychosis.

Of the 22 "R" and "E" boys, 21 fit this description with no more than two items in the psychological report which vary from the general pattern described. The one exceptional case in the 22 carries a diagnosis of a paranoid personality, with signs of severe disturbance and incipient psychosis. Incidentally, this boy was designated as an "R," not an "E."

The "R" and "E" boys, as indicated from the data on social background, almost invariably lacked a suitable male role model. When they reach adolescence, their reaction to the problems of this age take on a highly unsocial, dysocial, or anti-social nature (the words used most often to describe them). Their feelings of insecurity and of inadequacy seem to be manifested in two patterns which follow from this reaction.

Some develop behavior patterns which appear sociopathic, many of them being experts at manipulation, with the corresponding inability to conform to behavioral norms for any period of time. Although they may appear controlled for a period, their impulsivity or lack of control eventually breaks through in some aggressive action.
On the other hand, other "R" and "E" boys may withdraw and appear lethargic and passive a great deal of the time. The hostility and aggressiveness which still underlies their reaction will sometimes break through here, too, in sporadic episodes of violence.

There is apparently little actual mental deterioration in the "R" and "E" boys. The psychiatrist's reports in the boys' case folders attest to this fact.

Given these syndromes it is possible to explain why these boys do better after release than do the normal boys. If the psychological dimensions which appear to be present in the "R" and "E" boys represent simply a negative reaction to the problems of adolescence, it may be that they tend to grow out of these problems as they grow out of adolescence. In other words, if their hostility and aggressiveness represent a response to a specific problematic age rather than some underlying pathology, their aggressiveness may disappear or take a more approved social form once this age is past. Such a hypothesis appears to be most consistent with both the diagnoses and research findings.

Intelligence

One further item relating to the psychological makeup of the boys should be discussed. It was possible to determine the scores of 21 of the boys on the Wechsler Adult
Intelligence Scale. The range of scores for "R" and "E" boys on the WAIS was 68 to 113, or from borderline mentally retarded to bright normal. The mean score was 90.1 and the median 90. These scores are not very different from those of the general FSB population as shown in Table 12. Most important, although most of the boys do fall below 100, eight of them are within two points of or above this score. Further, fully two-thirds of the boys have an I.Q. of 85 or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence Group</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; &quot;E&quot; Boys f</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; &quot;E&quot; Boys %</th>
<th>Fairfield Releases f</th>
<th>Fairfield Releases %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defective (30-69)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline (70-79)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Average (80-89)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (90-109)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Average (110 + 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be concluded that although there is a typical personality trait pattern for those selected and labeled as "R" and "E" boys, this pattern does not include intelligence as one of its items.
Summary

Investigation of the social background factors of the "R" and "E" boys produced no special patterns. Thus, race did not appear to be a significant factor, nor did general body type, medical condition, or presence of physical stigma.

Discernable patterns, however, did appear in the social histories. The "R" and "E" youth came from homes where the parents were separated or divorced. When race is considered, a pattern appears in which the non-white youth lived with his mother prior to incarceration, whereas the white youth lived with his parents or one natural and one step parent.

A definite pattern was found in the family conditions of the "R" and "E" boys. Black or white, they were found to have come from homes with both an ineffectual or absent father and an ineffectual mother who was unable to offer them the proper disciplines and emotional stability. The only cases which did not fit this pattern were found to have come from extremely volatile homes, with strong sibling rivalry or tension between the boy and at least one other family member.

Most items regarding the careers in deviance of the "R" and "E" boys displayed few definite patterns. It was found that although the criminal histories of the youth were
diversified in most cases, almost all of them had committed at least one serious offense. Further, most of them had committed a serious act which led to their being committed to the Youth Commission. Finally, the "R" and "E" boys' recidivism rate was higher than that of the non-"R" and "E" boys.

In dealing with behavior in the Youth Commission, the "R" and "E" boys were generally evaluated by the staff as being friendly, self-controlled, and generally adjusted to their confinement and situation. However, on a fourth dimension, aggressiveness, there was no such discernible positive pattern.

Finally, the psychiatric and psychological reports on these boys indicated a clear pattern regarding their overall psychological makeup. As noted earlier,

"The 'R' and 'E' boy manifests an unsocialized reaction to adolescence. He has passive - aggressive traits, and may be explosive and impulsive much of the time. He has shallow insights into his own personality and problems. He feels rejected, and is quite often insecure with feelings of inadequacy. In some instances, he may manifest feelings of paranoia, although there is generally little sign of neurosis or psychosis."
FOOTNOTES (Chapter IV)


2 Mosier, "Delinquents' Perceptions," p. 45.


5 Miller, "TICO Releases," p. 42.

6 Generally, while the boy was in the Juvenile Diagnostic Center a social worker appointed by the Center made a personal visit to the boy's home and prepared a report on the general conditions and family status.

7 These quotes are taken from the social workers' reports (see note 6) on the parental situation of various "R" and "E" boys in the sample.

8 See Mosier, "Delinquents' Perceptions," p. 45.
CHAPTER V

PERCEPTIONS OF "R" AND "E"

Perceptions of "R" and "E" are the keys to understanding these designations. Since individuals act in terms of their perceptions of objects, it is these perceptions which must be evaluated to understand the final meaning of any phenomenon. This chapter deals with the perceptions of "R" and "E" held by the various groups who relate to these boys on a day-to-day basis. To present a complete picture, five different perceptions were investigated. The perceptions were:

1. The non-"R" and "E" boys' perceptions of "R" and "E" boys (i.e. the 275 consecutive Fairfield releases not classified as "R" or "E").

2. The "R" and "E" boys' perceptions of themselves and other "R" and "E" boys.

3. The "R" and "E" boys' and the non-"R" and "E" boys' perceptions of the staff members' attitudes toward "R" and "E" boys.

4. The "R" and "E" boys' and the non-"R" and "E" boys' attitudes toward "R" and "E" as categories.

5. The staff members' perceptions of "R" and "E" boys.
Perceptions of "R" and "E" Boys

Ten items on the boys' schedule related to "R" and "E" as boys. For each item there were five response categories, with a response of "1" indicating strong agreement, and "5" indicating strong disagreement. The items and means, and the significance tests and probability level for the means of the two groups on each item, are presented in Table 13.

Non-"R" and "E" Boys' Perceptions: Single Item Analysis

Items one through five (Table 13) all related to perceptions of "R" boys. The means of these items suggested some indecision on the part of the 275 non-"R" and "E" Fairfield releases toward the "R" boys. They appeared unsure about whether the "R" boys have worse previous police records than others, whether they are more dangerous than other students, and whether they are less friendly. They were also undecided about whether other students think that the "R" students are weird.

However, the 275 generally agreed they do not treat an "R" student as different from any other student. It should be noted that those items where these boys display a general indecisiveness all relate to background or behavioral attributes of the "R" boys. It appears that they were uncertain about these attributes.
Table 13: Comparison of Mean Scores of 275 Fairfield Releases and 25 "R" and "E" Boys on Perceptions of "R" and "E" Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; &quot;E&quot; Fairfield Releases</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students who have &quot;R&quot; after their numbers generally have worse police records than other students.</td>
<td>2.84 3.11</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students who have &quot;R&quot; after their numbers are more dangerous than most other students.</td>
<td>3.16 3.35</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. &quot;R&quot; students are less friendly than other students.</td>
<td>3.24 3.44</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I usually don't treat an &quot;R&quot; student any different from any other student.</td>
<td>1.52 1.78</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most students here think that the &quot;R&quot; students are weird.</td>
<td>2.80 3.23</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students who have &quot;E&quot; after their numbers generally have worse police records than other students.</td>
<td>3.20 3.43</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Students who have &quot;E&quot; after their numbers are more dangerous than most other students.</td>
<td>3.16 3.36</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. &quot;E&quot; students are less friendly than other students.</td>
<td>3.36 3.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I usually don't treat an &quot;E&quot; student any different from any other student.</td>
<td>1.52 1.75</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most students here think that the &quot;E&quot; students are weird.</td>
<td>2.44 2.97</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This same uncertainty appeared on the first three items relating to the "E" boys, items six through eight. The 275 non-"R" and "E" students were undecided about whether "E" boys have worse previous police records, whether they are more dangerous, and whether they are less friendly. On these three items, as on all the background and behavioral items for the "R" boys, there was a slight tendency toward disagreement with the item as stated. On item 10, although the boys still appeared undecided about whether students think the "E" boys are weird, there was an inclination to agree with the statement.

However, only in regard to their own actions were these boys willing to make any firm decision, strongly agreeing with the statement that they treat an "E" student like any other student. The pattern for "E" appeared to be the same as for "R" for the non-"R" and "E" boys. However, only by analyzing each "R" item with its complementary "E" item could this be determined in fact.

Non-"R" and "E" Boys' Perceptions: Paired Item Comparison

Each "R" item was compared with the complementary item for "E" and a 't' test performed on the means to determine if there was any significant difference in the perceptions of these two suffixes held by the non-"R" and "E" boys. Two general findings emerged from this analysis.
On the first four pairings there appeared no significant difference in the means. The highest 't' value for any of the pairings was a 1.13. It appeared that the other boys did not distinguish between the "R" boys and the "E" boys in terms of their previous police records, their being more dangerous, or less friendly, or in the non-"R" and "E" boys treatment of "R" and "E."

However, in comparing items five and ten, which dealt with the students' views of the "R" boys or "E" boys as "weird," the 't' score was significant at the .05 level. This indicated that these students do tend to see a difference between these two types of boys in this respect, the tendency being to see the "E" boys as weird more so than the "R" boys.

The most probable explanation for this finding is that the boys are aware of the official description of the "E" as emotionally disturbed rather than as hostile or aggressive. If so, it implies that the official description of these types has some effect upon the perceptions of the boys so identified. The full importance of this possibility, and its relation to other perceptions, must await further analysis.

"R" & "E" Boys' Perceptions: Single Item Analysis

Insofar as the self-image of the "R" and "E" boys is
presented in their responses to those items concerning "R" boys and "E" boys, it must be concluded that these youth have an ambivalent image of themselves. Their responses on 70 per cent of the items fell in the "undecided" range; 2.5 to 3.5

The "R" and "E" boys, taken as a group, tended to be undecided on all of the background or behavioral attributes of the "R" boys. They were also undecided about the attributes of the "E" boys with one notable exception. The "R" and "E" boys tended to feel that the students view the "E" students as weird.

As was the case with the non-"R" and "E" boys, then "R" and "E" students were definite concerning their own behavior. Identical mean scores indicated that they did not treat the "R" students as different from other students, or the "E" students as different from other students, either.

"R" & "E" Boys' Perceptions: Paired Item Comparison

Comparing each "R" item with the complementary "E" item for the "R" and "E" sample and testing the difference in means with the 't' test indicated no significant difference for any pairing. The conclusion which must be drawn is that the "R" and "E" boys as a group do not distinguish between "R" boys and "E" boys on any of the dimensions covered in these items.
The major conclusion to be drawn from the single item analysis and the paired item comparison for this group is that the "R" and "E" boys have an ambivalent self image in terms of these categories. Further, this self image does not differentiate between the two designations, one of which they bear. To understand the full impact of this conclusion, it is necessary to compare this image to the image of "R" and "E" held by the other boys.

Comparison of the "R" & "E" and Non-"R" & "E" Perceptions

To this point, it has been observed that the general pattern of responses on items one through ten for the "R" and "E" and for the non-"R" and "E" groups appears similar. It was important, however, to discover whether there was any significant difference between these two perceptions. Two dimensions were investigated in this comparison. The direction of the mean of one group from the mean of the other was examined, and 't' scores were obtained to determine if there was any significant difference in the two means.

The 't' tests revealed no significant differences between the means on any of the items at the .05 level. The perceptions of the "R" and "E" boys and the perceptions of the other releases were fundamentally the same. Only on item ten did the 't' score of 1.84 approach statistical
significance. On this item, the "R" and "E" boys were more likely than the non-"R" and "E" boys to feel that the students at Fairfield thought that the "E" students are weird.

The directionality of the means, however, did appear significant. On all ten items, the mean for the 275 Fairfield non-"R" and "E" releases was higher than the mean for the "R" and "E" boys. Since all of the items were phrased negatively (...have a worse police record, are less friendly, etc.) and since a higher score indicates disagreement, this means that the 275 releases had a more positive evaluation of the "R" and "E" boys than the "R" and "E" boys had of themselves.

This finding implies that identifying these youth as "R" or "E" does have some effect upon their self-perception. Although the differences between means were not significant, and although it is impossible to state that this lower self image did not exist prior to this identification, the consistency of this directional difference is difficult to overlook. The labeled youth were invariably in greater agreement with negative statements about themselves than were the other students.

Boys' Perceptions of Staff Attitudes Toward "R" & "E"

Two items concerned the boys' perceptions of staff
members' attitudes toward "R" and "E." These items, means, and statistical tests for the groups are contained in Table 14.

Table 14: Comparison of Mean Scores of 275 Fairfield Releases and 25 "R" & "E" Boys on Perceptions of Staff Attitudes toward "R" & "E"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; Fairfield &quot;E&quot; Releases</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. The staff treats the students who have the &quot;R's&quot; just like everyone else.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.77 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The staff treats the students who have the &quot;E&quot; just like everyone else.</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.20 N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first observation relating to these items was that both groups agree with both statements. Both the non-"R" and "E" and the "R" and "E" boys regard the staff's treatment of "R" and "E" boys as comparable to their treatment of other boys.

The mean for item eleven was compared to the mean on item twelve within each sample to determine if either group discerned differential staff attitudes toward "R" as compared to "E." The 't' scores for both comparisons were not statistically significant at the .05 level. Both groups agreed that there was no significant difference in the staff's treatment of the "R" boys compared to their treat-
ment of the "E" boys.

Finally, the means of the two groups were compared for each item in terms of directionality and significance of difference to determine how the non-"R" and "E" boys' perceptions of staff attitudes compared to the "R" and "E" boys' perceptions. No differences were found on either item. The non-"R" and "E" boys were more likely to agree that the staff treated "R" boys just like everyone else, but the "R" and "E" boys were more likely to agree that the staff treated "E" boys like everyone else. Most important, the 't' scores were not significant in either comparison.

Boys' Perceptions of "R" & "E" as Categories

Items one through twelve all dealt with the "R" and "E" boys as boys at Fairfield. Items 13 through 18, however, relate to the "R" and "E" Suffixes as abstract categories used by the Ohio Youth Commission. These items, means, and significance tests are displayed in Table 15.

Item Analysis

Dealing with each item separately for the non-"R" and "E" sample, it was apparent that there was a negative view of the "R" and "E" suffixes as categories. Although there was indecision about the "R" and "E" boys as such and the feel-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; &quot;E&quot;</th>
<th>Fairfield Releases</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. In some ways it's a good thing to have an &quot;R&quot; after your number.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. In some ways it's a good thing to have an &quot;E&quot; after your number.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In some ways it's a bad thing to have an &quot;R&quot; after your number.</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In some ways it's a bad thing to have an &quot;E&quot; after your number.</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would much rather have an &quot;R&quot; after my number than an &quot;E.&quot;</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I would much rather have an &quot;E&quot; after my number than an &quot;R.&quot;</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ing that these students were receiving fair treatment from both the staff and other boys, the boys still saw definite disadvantages in the labels.

Thus, there was general disagreement with the contention that it was good in some ways to have either an "R" or an "E" suffix. Conversely, there was definite agreement that it was undesirable to have either an "R" or an "E." Compared to the usual "undecided" responses on the first ten items, the magnitude of agreement and disagreement on items 13 through 16 was even more pronounced.

Examination of items 17 and 18 for the 275 non-"R" and "E" releases suggested, again, that no distinction was made between the "R" and "E" designations. These boys saw little distinction between the two, and the means indicated that the boys were undecided about which one is preferable (or non-preferable).

The "R" and "E" boys, on the other hand, were not as confirmed in their opinions. There was little apparent disagreement with the statement that it is a good thing to have an "E" after your number, and only moderate disagreement with the statement that it is a good thing to have an "R" after your number.

Whether "R" or "E" was worse as a stigma, the "R" and "E" subjects were agreed that there are negative effects attached to the "R" or "E" categories. It would appear, as
expected, that the boys who have one of these labels are more cognizant of the negative aspects of these suffixes than are the unstigmatized.

The "R" and "E" group also displayed general indecisiveness about the preferability of the "R" or "E." There was a slight tendency to prefer the "R" designation to the "E," as shown by the lower mean score on item 17. This preference may also be a reflection, however, of the earlier finding that non-"R" and "E" boys were more likely to agree that the students viewed the "E" boys as weird more than the "R" boys. It is very likely that, for the "R" and "E" boys at least, there is a distinct preference for being viewed as "tough" over being viewed as "weird."

**Paired Item Comparison**

The comparison of paired "R" and "E" items revealed no significant difference between the mean on items 15 and 16 in the non-"R" and "E" group. There was no difference in their negative evaluation of either "R" or "E" categories.

However, comparison of items 13 and 14 produced a 't' score of 2.36, which is significant at the .05 level. The non-"R" and "E" boys were more likely to disagree that it is a good thing to have an "R" after your number than they are to disagree that it is a good thing to have an "E." In short, these boys saw more negative consequences from the
"R" label than from the "E."

This seems ironic in light of the fact that these same boys viewed the "E" boys as more weird than the "R," and that the "R" and "E" group clearly prefers the "R" label to the "E." It also does not seem to fit with the fact that the non-"R" and "E" group lumped the "R" and "E" labels together. There is an explanation for these incongruities, however.

As stated, these boys are relating to these labels in their day-to-day activities on two distinct levels. Within the administrative structures, where "R" and "E" are simply categorizations, the "R" boy who is hostile and aggressive is seen as a more serious problem from an administrative viewpoint because his aggressive tendencies and impulsivity are always a potential threat to the institution. Naturally, the negative effects of this perceived threat for the boys who are "R" are considerable.

However, on a personal level the preference of the non-"R" and "E" boys in terms of their interactions with other boys is for being considered "tough" rather than being considered "weird." In the status structure of the boys, aggressiveness is preferable, whereas in the administrative structure, "emotional disturbance" is preferable.

These boys, then, are trapped between the two structures. The demands or values of one are in opposition to the demands
of the other. Their preference for one label or the other reflects this conflict. Although they would rather have the "R" for interactional purposes and the "E" for administrative interaction, when forced to integrate the two structures and choose one suffix or the other, the non-"R" and "E" boys displayed considerable indecision.

Analysis of paired item comparisons for the "R" and "E" group did not reflect this indecision or difference, however. The 't' scores for both comparisons were far from significant at even the .05 level. The "R" and "E" group draws no distinction between the two labels. Investigation of the directionality of the differences suggested, however, that they, too, were more likely to see the positive consequences of the "E" compared to the "R."

Non-"R" and "E" and "R" and "E" Group Comparisons

On items 13 through 16 the mean scores of the 275 non-"R" and "E" releasees was closer to neutral than the mean scores of the "R" and "E" group. Thus, the "R" and "E" boys were more likely to see the positive effects of having an "R" or an "E" and less likely to see the negative, or at least, to affirm that being so labeled has serious negative consequences.

Although the 't' tests did not demonstrate statistically significant differences between the normal and the "R" and
"E" groups on these items, they did tend to strengthen the argument of directionality. For the first three items the 't' score was relatively large, over 1.36 in each case, although not significant at .05.

All of this supports the contention that the boys who have the "R" and "E" tags are more likely to have developed a more positive picture of these designations as categories. In all, they do not appear as troubled by these categories as are the boys who are not labeled.

Finally, there was no significant difference between the non-"R" and "E" and the "R" and "E" boys relating to their preference for either label: neither of the 't' scores on these items approached significance. However, the directionality of the items appeared to support the findings that both groups tend to prefer the "R" category over the "E." This preference is very slight, but indicates that when pushed to choose one suffix or the other for themselves, they preferred the "R," as one would expect.

Two final items should be discussed before moving to the staff members' assessments of the boys. The means for both groups on items 19 and 20 appear in Table 16.
Table 16: Comparison of Mean Scores of 275 Fairfield Releases and 25 "R" & "E" Boys on Perceptions of Parents' Attitudes Toward "R" & "E"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Scores &quot;R&quot; &amp; &quot;E&quot;</th>
<th>Fairfield Releases &quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Most parents would be upset if their kid had an &quot;R&quot; after his number.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.57 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Most parents would be upset if their kid had an &quot;E&quot; after his number.</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.11 N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Single item analysis shows that both populations feel that most parents would, indeed, be upset if their son had an "R" or an "E" after his number. However, beyond that, few concrete indications emerge. In the non-"R" and "E" group, the directionality implies that the boys feel parents would be more upset if their child had an "R" after his number. However, in the "R" and "E" group the boys feel that the parents would be more upset if their son had an "E." Although the difference between the means in the "R" and "E" group is more pronounced, neither of the 't' scores testing the difference within each group was significant at the .05 level.

Staff Member Assessments of "R" and "E" Boys

One final area of perception was investigated. To tap
the staff members' perceptions of "R" and "E," and of "R" and "E" compared to others, 18 items were selected from the Staff Members' Assessment Form. The first 15 of these items related to behavioral and attitudinal patterns of the boys. The sixteenth item asked for a prognosis of each boy's chances for success (non-recidivism) after release, and the final items requested evaluation of the aptness or correctness of the categorization of each boy as "R," as "E," or as "normal."

**Behavioral and Attitudinal Items**

Three significant findings emerged from the analysis of the staff members' perceptions on the 15 behavior and attitude items.

First, there were no items on which there was any significant tendency on the part of the staff to mark boys as very good or very bad. The item means were amazingly neutral. Each item on this assessment form had ten response categories, from "0" or "9," with a higher score indicating a more favorable assessment. Therefore, any mean between 4 and 5 represented a neutral response, neither positive nor negative.

On the assessment of the "R" and "E" boys, a total of 11 of the 15 means fell within this neutral range, leaving four which reflected some favorable or unfavorable evaluation.
In the assessment of the normal (e.g. non-'R' and 'E') boys, 10 items fell within the neutral range. Of the five items reflecting favorable or unfavorable evaluation, four were the same items as for the 'R' and 'E' boys. The five items and the means for each appear in Table 17.

Table 17: Staff Members’ Evaluation of 25 'R' & 'E' and 275 Non-'R' & 'E' Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; Fairfield &quot;E&quot; Releases &quot;t&quot; p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. He plays the inmate game</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, always; 9, never</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. His attitudes have changed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, for worse; 9, for better</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The other boys picked on him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, very much; 9, very little</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. He defines himself as a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, bad person; 9, good person</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. He thinks like a hood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, always; 9, never</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of the table reveals that the staff tended to perceive both the normal and the 'R' and 'E' boys as playing the inmate game. Staff felt that the other boys did not pick on these boys, and the boys in both groups defined themselves as good persons, and had attitudes which had changed for the better. They also tended to feel that the
Two things must be mentioned relative to these findings, however. First, the 't' scores for these groups were not significant at the .05 level. Second, although these findings relate to findings about "R" and "E" boys, there is no distinction between them and the other releases. Although all of the above findings are true for "R" and "E," they are no less true for the "normals."

The second finding emerging from the analysis of the fifteen behavioral and attitudinal items was that no pattern evolved which would suggest that the staff tended to rate the "R" and "E" boys better or worse than the "normal" on any consistent basis.

On ten items the "R" and "E" boys were rated slightly poorer than the normal boys and on the other five slightly better. Four of these items are found in Table 17; items 2, 3, 4, and 5. The only other more positive assessment was that the "R" and "E" boys felt the impact of Fairfield was greater than did the other boys.

There is no apparent logical connection between these five items, nor is there any way to distinguish them from the other items on which the "R" and "E" boys were evaluated lower in terms of behavioral questions or attitudes toward the institution questions.

The third, and most important, finding was that none of
the differences between the means for the "R" and "E" boys and the means for the "normal" boys were significant at the .05 level. On all fifteen items there appeared no significant difference between the staff members' assessment of one group of boys compared to the other group. In terms of their perceptions of behavioral and attitudinal characteristics the staff members failed to distinguish any differences between "R" and "E" and "normal" (or non-"R" and "E") boys. The full significance of this finding becomes apparent upon examination of the staff responses to items 17 and 18 on the Staff Member Assessment Form. Before turning to these items, however, it is necessary to discuss item sixteen.

**Staff Prognosis of Outcome after Release**

Item 16 on the Staff Member Assessment Form read as follows:

"What do you think will be this boy's eventual outcome?"

1: headed for more serious trouble
2: will barely get along within the law
3: will make a pretty good adjustment
4: will become a solid citizen

The mean for the non-"R" and "E" boys for this item was 1.99, and the mean for the "R" and "E" boys was 2.16.
The difference between these means was tested and found not to be statistically significant.

The staff members apparently felt that boys from both categories would be able to barely get along within the law. Still, their assessment of the chances for the "R" and "E" boys was slightly better than their assessment of the chances of the "normal" boys. This assessment, although not statistically significant, does confirm the surprising findings of Miller's post release study which showed that the "R" and "E," do, in fact, do better.

Staff Members' Assessment of Correspondence of Characteristics to Categorization

The last two questions on the Staff Member Assessment Form asked the staff member to compare the classification of each boy as "normal," "R," or "E," with the characteristics of that boy. Each item had ten response categories from "0," indicating very true; to "9," indicating very false. These items, means, and 't' scores for the two groups appear in Table 18.
Table 18: Comparison of Staff Members' Assessment of Correspondence of Characteristics to Classification for "R" & "E" and "Normal" Boys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>&quot;R&quot; &amp; Fairfield Releases</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Regardless of this boy's actual status, he seems to have all the characteristics of an &quot;R.&quot;</td>
<td>4.20 6.48 3.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Regardless of this boy's actual status, he seems to have all the characteristics of an &quot;E.&quot;</td>
<td>5.04 6.42 2.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be recalled at this point that previous findings indicated that the staff could not, or did not, distinguish between the characteristics of the "normal" boys and those of the "R" and "E" boys on the behavioral and attitudinal items. Yet analysis of these last two items indicated that the staff was very sure that the "normal" boys did not have the characteristics of "R" or "E" boys.

Most important, 't' tests on the means for these items revealed that the difference between the staff members' evaluation of "R" and "E" and "normal" boys on item seventeen was significant at the .01 level, and on item 18 at the .05 level. Not only were they both significant, but they were the only set of "R" and "E" items which were.

The question this raises is both simple and direct,
"When it has been established that there is no difference in the behavioral and attitudinal characteristics of two groups, how can one then be certain that the boys are properly in one group or another?"

The answer is both simple and complex; simple in that although the staff member insists that there is no difference between "normal," R," and "E" boys, he is, nevertheless, able to make distinctions between these groups on the basis of some set of implicit criteria. The answer is complex in that once again it suggests that the phenomenon operative in producing this result is the same interplay of personal interaction and official policy which was also found in the boys' perceptions of these designations.

In terms of day-to-day interactional relationships between the staff and the "R" and "E" boys, the staff appears unable or unwilling to distinguish the behavior of attitudes of these boys from that of the other boys. However, the staff must, for the purposes of the maintenance of the official system boundaries and support of their own position, be able to make some distinction between the "R" and "E" and "normal" students. This necessity of reconciling organizational needs with interpersonal relationship experiences pervades the study of "R" and "E." This duality, the incongruity between behavior and official classification, poses
the same problems for staff as for the boys themselves.

A general summary of the major findings to this point, and the ramifications and conclusions to be drawn from these findings, are contained in the final chapter.
FOOTNOTES (Chapter V)

1Miller, "TICO Releases," pp. 119-120.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the significance of the "R" and "E" classifications in use within the Ohio Youth Commission. This examination has included investigation of the origin of the "R" and "E" designations, the nature of "R" and "E" as official labels, and the process in which these labels are attached to specific boys. In addition, criminal career, background, and psychological attributes of the boys labeled "R" and "E" have been examined. Finally, the perceptions of the "R" and "E" suffixes by the labeled, the non-"R" and "E" boys, and the staff members involved with the boys have been examined and analyzed.

A number of research strategies were employed to generate the data for this study. First, the official directives on "R" and "E" designations from the Ohio Youth Commission were analyzed to show why these designations were introduced and what organizational goals they are designed to serve. In addition, a number of interviews were conducted with staff personnel at various levels to determine
the process for attachment of these designations to specific boys, and to relate this process and the actual use of "R" and "E" suffixes to the officially stated policies of the Youth Commission.

In order to study the "R" and "E" boys, and their characteristics and perceptions, 300 consecutive releasees from the Fairfield School for Boys, the largest of the institutions under the control of the Youth Commission, were tested at the point immediately preceding their return to the community. This group contained 25 boys labeled "R" or "E."

This test involved a questionnaire which was administered to each of the 300 boys in the sample. This questionnaire contained six scales of institutional impact replicating an earlier study by Eynon, Allen, and Reckless, and later studies by Miller and by Mosier within the Youth Commission. There were also additional scales. One of these new scales contained twenty items relating to perceptions of the "R" and "E" labels at a number of levels.

The staff member who knew each boy best was also asked to complete an assessment form. This form measured staff perceptions of the behavioral and attitudinal characteristics of the boy, staff prognosis of outcome after release, and the correspondence of the boy's categorization as "R," "E," or "normal," with the boy's characteristics and behavior.
The twenty items from the Boys' Schedule and the items from the Staff Member Assessment Form were used to determine the perceptions held by these individuals of the "R" and "R" suffixes. Individual item analyses, paired comparisons relating the items concerning "R" to the items concerning "E," and a comparison of scores of the normal boys to scores for the "R" and "E" boys, were calculated on all the items.

Finally, it was possible to locate in the Youth Commission file data for 22 of these boys. These data were used to determine the commonalities in the background attributes of the boys.

"R" & "E" as Categories and the Labeling Process

Five major findings derive from the investigation of "R" and "E" as categories. First, while the official directives on the "R" and "E" suffixes are clear and distinct, the official directives for treatment of these boys are vague and undefined.

Second, although both "R" and "E" theoretically relate to psychiatric conditions, they are not diagnostic categories. Instead, they are administrative classifications for boys who are similar largely in terms of being problems for the Youth Commission.

Third, many staff members in the Commission do not feel
that the "R" and "E" categories aid in handling the boys so identified. They seriously challenge the use of these labels.

Fourth, some OYC personnel suggest that the actual reason for the use of these categories is very different from the stated reasons for their existence. They suggest that the actual function of these labels is as a "cover" for the Commission in case boys released to the community commit violent crimes. The "R" and "E" labels "protect" the Commission against allegations of being "too soft" or negligent in returning dangerous or sick delinquents home.

Fifth, the effects of the labeling process for both the institution and the individual youth are unrelated to rehabilitation or behavioral change in those so labeled.

Social, Criminal History, and Psychological Attributes of the "R" and "E" Boys

The "R" and "E" boys, more so than the others, were found to come from broken homes where the parents are separated or divorced. The black "R" and "E" boys were found to have lived with their mother prior to incarceration, the white boys with their parents or one natural parent and one step-parent. The families of orientation were characterized by an ineffectual or absent father and an ineffectual mother, or by a volatile home situation with
strong tensions between the boy and one or more family members.

No pattern was discovered for the boys as to nature, seriousness, or age at commission of their first recorded delinquent act, although their subsequent careers were found to be highly diversified with at least one serious offense on their records. The recidivism rate for the "R" and "E" boys was also found to be higher than the recidivism rate for the non-"R" and "E" boys. In addition, most of the "R" and "E" boys had committed a serious crime which eventually led to their being committed to the Ohio Youth Commission. While within the Youth Commission, the "R" and "E" boys were evaluated by the staff as being friendly, self-controlled, and generally well adjusted to their confinement and to institutional life.

A definite pattern was evident regarding the psychological characteristics of the "R" and "E" subjects. They were found to manifest an unsocialized reaction to adolescence, with passive-aggressive traits. They had shallow insights into their personality problems, and often felt rejected and insecure and had feelings of inadequacy. They might be explosive and impulsive on occasion, but there was little sign of neurosis or psychosis. Such was the profile which emerged from the psychological reports contained in the file folders.
Perceptions of "R" and "E"

Analysis of the items from the Boys' Schedule indicated that neither the non-"R" and "E" boys nor the "R" and "E" boys could or would distinguish between the "R" category and the "E" category. For both groups of boys, there was a general indecisiveness in their perceptions of behavioral and attitudinal characteristics of "R" and "R" boys. Although the non-"R" and "E" boys tended to see the "E" boys as "weird" more so than the "R" boys, both groups were undecided about whether the "R" and "E" boys had worse previous police records than other boys, were more dangerous than other boys, or were less friendly than other boys.

Both groups -- the "normal" and the "R" and "E" boys -- thought that staff treatment of "R" or "E" boys was much the same as their treatment of other boys. In addition, both groups felt that they personally treated "R" or "E" boys like they treated other boys.

Concerning "R" and "E" as classifications rather than the boys so labeled, the "R" and "E" group was less extreme in their opinion as to the consequence of the labels than was the non-"R" and "E" group. The "R" and "E" boys tended to view the negative consequences more positively, or at least with greater resignation than the other boys. However, only one such item was statistically significant
at .05. The non-"R" and "E" boys were significantly more likely to feel that there was no positive value at all in having an "R" after your number -- a not unwise or imperceptive conclusion.

In evaluating the staff members' perceptions of "R" and "E" from the Staff Member Assessment Form, it was found that no item relating to behavioral or attitudinal characteristics of the "R" and "E" boys as compared to "normal" boys was significant. Suprisingly, the staff members were a little more optimistic about the "R" and "E" boys' chances for success after release. However, when asked to relate the characteristics of the boy to his actual status as "normal," "R," or "E," significant differences did appear. The staff members were much more likely to perceive an "R" or an "E" boy as exhibiting or potentially exhibiting the acting-out symptoms or mental disturbances defining the "R" or "E" category than to see the "normal" boy as having these same characteristics.

Conclusions

A number of general conclusions can be drawn from these findings. Thus, the "R" and "E" suffixes must be viewed as operating on two levels: in the administrative structure, and in the daily interpersonal operational matrix, and these two levels have different values, norms, and demands
pertaining to "R" and "E." The successful integration, or the attempt at integration, of these two levels is the prime concern and reality for those involved in day-to-day interaction with "R" and "E" designees.

Everyone -- "R" or "E" boys, other students, lower level staff, professionals, administrative personnel -- tends to perceive these labels from a different and often contradictory perspective. It is, therefore, surprising that so much consensus across groups was found in their views of the "R" and "E" boys and of the special problems associated with these labels.

The boys and the staff who interact with each other on a day-to-day basis are aware of the existence and nature of these categories in the Commission and the importance of these labels to that system. At the same time, they have retained both the remnants of their presenting culture, to use Goffman's phrasing, and are bound by the "inmate culture" of the institution in relating to other boys, whether "R," "E," or "normal." The results are a conflicting set of necessities, and, as a response to this a compromise set of values and attitudes which allows for the overt acceptance of the policies of the administration with regard to the need for and meaning of the "R" and "E" labels.

For the boys, this compromise produces some ambivalence toward "R" and "E" boys, and a contradictory view of "R" and
"E" categories in terms of preference. On the one hand the "R" students are viewed as extremely tough, a preferential status among lower class delinquents. On the other, the "R" suffix has numerous drawbacks such as delayed release from Fairfield, sometimes by as much as six months to a year.

This confusion, however is most pronounced for the staff. For the staff member, the "R" or "E" boy is basically the same as the non-"R" and "E" boy in terms of his characteristics, and if staff assessments are valid, he is generally treated in the same manner. Yet staff personnel have no trouble at all in distinguishing the "R" and "E" students from the others as they themselves indicated in their responses.

A second major conclusion is that the "R" and "E" categories exist in a structural limbo, unrelated to other categories in use in the Youth Commission and unrelated to other categories in use in related social service fields. These designations do not exist within the structures of the OYC to set apart boys to aid in their treatment or to distinguish certain boys for special programs or rehabilitation measures as Fairfield. Instead, they are used to protect the Commission from boys whose actions might cause the Commission future problems.

The labeling process is related to this need for
identification, and not to treatment. The process and the individuals involved in the process are guided, therefore, by two necessities. First, there is the demand placed upon staff to establish, maintain, and identify system boundaries within the organization. The limits of actions must be clearly set out, and those who go beyond these limits of predictability and control must be officially and formally identified.

Second, the labeler is guided by the necessity to support his own position within the organization. When presented with categories into which a certain percentage of boys are expected to fall, he must insure that this quota is met if only to certify that he is doing his job. It is these realities that account for the inception and present use of "R" and "E" within the Commission.

The third major conclusion is that the "R" and "E" boys are the "victums" of poor socialization. This is not to imply poverty, racial discrimination, or the like, but simply to state that even within their general low socio-economic background, these boys come from homes where some strong figure or role model was, and is, absent. These youth are not "sick" in a psychiatric sense as such, but rather seem to be confused about their personal identities and about the meaning of conforming behavior.

In Reckless' terms they lack inner-containment no less
than outer-containment. They seem rudderless and unable to steer themselves away from trouble. It seems likely that their failure to internalize acceptable social norms relates to their emotionally impoverished socialization and the lack of both a father and a mother figure as an acceptable role model.

This tentative conclusion is drawn from four findings. First, "R" and "E" boys are not very different from normal Fairfield boys on most socioeconomic and related attributes. Second, however, they do come almost universally from homes with absent or ineffectual fathers and mothers. Third, the psychiatric reports invariably testify as to their "un-socialized" reaction to the state of adolescence. Fourth, Miller, in a recent follow-up study, found that the "R" boys do tend to do better on release than the "normal" boys, i.e. their recidivism rates are lower.

Their problem, then, is a problem of adolescence, of having a degree of freedom to act when they reach this age which they are unprepared to handle. Since the "R" problem seems to be internal control, "R" students can be expected to improve as they mature and as they are forced to learn to adjust to a controlled social situation such as Fairfield.

In view of these conclusions it is strongly suggested that the Ohio Youth Commission create a new set of classifications which, on some theoretical and nosological
principles, relate to each other, to their stated function, and to the specific treatment modalities to be employed.
APPENDIX A: OHIO YOUTH COMMISSION OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

A-1: DESIGNATION OF "R" SUFFIX; 1968
A-2: DIRECTIVE ON "R" & "E" SUFFIXES; 1970
A-3: CRITERIA & PROGRAM STATEMENT FOR FAIRFIELD SCHOOL FOR BOYS
A-4: OHIO YOUTH COMMISSION FAIRFIELD SCHOOL FOR BOYS TABLE OF ORGANIZATION
III. IMPLEMENTATION

A. **Designation of R-Suffix**

1. Children who may be considered as dangerous or potentially dangerous to the community or to themselves shall be held at the Juvenile Diagnostic Center until a thorough diagnostic work-up has been completed.

   (a) If there are indications that the youth actually does present a threat to the community or to himself, the Juvenile Diagnostic Center will attach the R-suffix.

   (b) In the "Recommendations" at the end of the Juvenile Diagnostic Center report, the last paragraph shall be "SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS." A statement must be included calling attention to the nature of the problem and recommending a review by a psychiatrist before community placement.

   (c) Juvenile Diagnostic Center shall make entry on the Daily Report which will indicate the adding of the R-suffix to the youth's original number.

2. Youths in OYC facilities and on placement who have not previously received the R-suffix but are developing behavior which poses a threat to themselves or to others should be considered for R-suffix.

(a) Institutional and aftercare staff will be responsible for bringing these youths to the attention of Classification and Assignment by writing a transmittal letter stating the request and providing supporting information. OYC Form 35-3 shall submitted in these cases.

(b) Classification and Assignment reviews the request and determines whether to have the youth returned to JDC for evaluation.

3. Procedure for affixing the R-suffix

(a) The facility having custody of the youth shall make an entry as a memorandum at the bottom of the Daily Report indicating the adding of the "R" to the youth's original number: (Child's name and county of commitment) changed from (original number) to original number + R). All facilities having records of the youth, shall upon receipt of such notification of change, make the necessary correction on all official documents.

B. Review of R-Suffix cases

1. For those youths in a Youth Commission residential unit, requests will be made in writing to the Clinical Director of the Juvenile Diagnostic Center for an appointment for psychiatric review. At the time of the request, the adjustment report (OYC Form 16-7) along with the entire case record will be sent to the Juvenile Diagnostic Center. The purpose of the adjustment report (OYC Form 16-7) is to provide the psychiatric staff with pertinent information regarding an R-suffix case.

The Juvenile Diagnostic Center will advise the residential unit, in writing, as to the appointment time. It will be the responsibility of the residential unit to have the youth present at the designated time and place.
2. The psychiatric re-evaluation (3 copies) will be sent to the Central Office, Classification and Assignment Section. Disposition will be made by Classification and Assignment in a written statement accompanying the psychiatric reevaluation which is forwarded to the appropriate OYC residential unit and regional office.

3. No youth with an R-suffix shall be placed on AWL status from any institution or camp without prior written approval from Classification and Assignment Section, the Psychiatric Division of Juvenile Diagnostic Center, or a Psychiatrist previously approved by the Director of the Commission or Deputy Director for Correctional Services of the Youth Commission.

C. The following criteria are hereby established for the selection of those youths who need the R-suffix.

1. These youths generally fall into a category of individuals who are potentially dangerous to themselves or others due to covert or overt hostility, aggressiveness, or delusional or paranoid ideation, impaired judgment or absence of concern for others.

2. These attitudes most frequently are seen in youth where there is a history of fire-setting, physical or sexual assault or suicidal or homicidal trends.

3. In cases of more serious psychiatric illness, as schizophrenia, paranoid ideation or personality disorders where there has been no previous objective evidence, but the potential may still be detected in the attitude and the degree of fearfulness. Impulsivity and lack of judgment and/or self-control under stress may exist even in face of an apparent adequate institutional adjustment.
I. NATURE AND PURPOSE

In the total population of the Youth Commission, a small number of children appear to be a threat to the community or to themselves. The purpose of this directive is to establish a system of identification of these children as well as a method of insuring re-evaluation by a psychiatrist prior to their return to the community.

II. RESPONSIBILITY

A. The Juvenile Diagnostic Center (JDC) shall have the responsibility for identifying those children whose problems of emotional and behavioral adjustment warrant the designation of either an "R" or "E" suffix. Responsibility for making the decision to place any child in the "R" and "E" suffix categories shall rest with the Superintendent of JDC.

B. Superintendents of all Ohio Youth Commission facilities and Regional Directors of the Bureau of Juvenile Placement shall have the responsibility of alerting the Administrator, Classification and Assignment Section (CAS), of the presence of those children in their populations who were not identified by JDC as requiring the "R" or "E" suffix, but who developed serious emotional or behavioral problems later.
C. JDC shall have the responsibility for recommending treatment planning for all "R" and "E" suffix cases. CAS shall have the responsibility for considering all recommendations made by JDC and Designating the facility which can best implement the treatment plan in each case.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

A. Designation of "R" and "E" Suffixes

1. Children who may be considered as dangerous or potentially dangerous to the community or to themselves shall be held at JDC until a thorough diagnostic evaluation has been completed, including a psychiatric examination.

(a) If there are indications that a child actually does present a threat to the community or to himself, based upon demonstrated assaultive or attempted suicidal behavior, JDC will attach the "R" suffix. Children who are dangerous to themselves or others due to covert or overt hostility, aggressiveness, delusional or paranoid ideation, impaired judgment or absence of concern for others, may fall in this category. These characteristics are most frequently seen in children with a history of fire setting, physical or sexual assault, or suicidal attempts.

(b) If there are indications that a child's emotional status is such that it may result in serious acting out or other type of mental or emotional deterioration, JDC will attach the "E" suffix. Further, if there are indications that a child is experiencing personality disorders which can deteriorate and become more fixed even with apparent good institutional adjustment being maintained (some passive-aggressive, some sociopathic, and some hysterical personalities), JDC will attach the "E" suffix. Children whose acting out tendencies may be detected in the attitude
and degree of fearfulness arising from more serious psychiatric illness (schizophrenia, paranoid ideation, personality disorders), but where there has been no previous objective evidence, may fall in this category.

(c) In the "recommendations" at the end of the JDC Report, the last paragraph shall be "SPECIAL RECOMMENDATIONS." A statement must be included calling attention to the reason for assignment of the "R" or "E" suffix and recommending review by a psychiatrist before community placement.

(d) In each instance of assignment of an "R" or "E" suffix, JDC shall make an entry on the Daily Report which will indicate the adding of the suffix to the child's original OYC number.

2. Children in OYC families who have not previously received an "R" or "E" suffix, but who are developing behavior which poses a threat to themselves or to others, should be considered for assignment of the appropriate suffix.

(a) For those children in a Youth Commission residential unit having approved psychiatric services, the psychiatric evaluation may be arranged at the convenience of the institutional staff. Following the evaluation, an original and two (2) copies of the psychiatric report shall be sent to JDC for the determination of whether or not the recommended suffix will be assigned. If the recommended suffix is approved by JDC, JDC shall, in turn, notify CAS, the recommending institution, and the appropriate BJP Regional Office of the change in the child's status. If the recommended suffix is not approved, JDC will advise CAS. Cas may then make arrangements for the child's transfer to JDC for further evaluation.
(b) For those children in a Youth Commission residential unit not having approved psychiatric services, a request for an appointment for psychiatric review should be made, in writing, to the Clinical Director, JDC. At the time of the request, the Adjustment Report (OYC Form 16-7) along with the entire case record shall be sent to JDC with a copy of the Adjustment Report to the Administrator, CAS. JDC will advise the requesting facility, in writing, of the appointment date and time. It will be the responsibility of the residential unit to have the child present for psychiatric review at the designated time and place. In each instance of assignment of an "R" or "E" suffix, JDC shall notify CAS, the recommending institution, and the appropriate BJP Regional Office of the change in the child's status.

3. Procedure for Affixing "R" and "E" Suffixes

The facility having custody of the child shall make an entry as a memorandum at the bottom of the Daily Report indicating the adding of the "R" or "E" suffix to the child's original number. (i.e., give child's name and county of commitment, followed by the statement "Changed from (original number) to (original number + suffix)." All operating units having records of the child shall, upon receipt of such notification of change, make the necessary correction on all official documents.

B. Clearances for Community Activities or Placement

1. For off campus trips under the supervision of staff or parents, clearances may be granted by the Superintendent for children with either an "R" or "E" suffix, based upon observed adjustment and known reliability of supervising adults.

2. Clearances for AWL visits up to two (2) days duration may be granted by the Superintendent for children with the "E" suffix. Any AWL visit over two (2) days must have prior written approval from CAS or a psychiatrist previously approved by the Director or Deputy Director for Correctional Services, OYC.
3. No child with an "R" suffix shall be placed on AWL status from any institution or camp without prior written approval from CAS or a psychiatrist approved by the Director or Deputy Director for Correctional Services, OYC.

4. No child with either an "R" or "E" suffix shall be released to community placement without a psychiatric review and clearance by the psychiatric division of JDC or a psychiatrist approved by the Director or Deputy Director for Correctional Services, OYC.

5. Once a psychiatrist is approved by the Director for Correctional Services, (Ref: B-2, 3, and 4 above) such approval shall continue in force, and subsequent approval in each case to be reviewed by such psychiatrist shall not be required.

6. The provisions of this section shall be implemented in addition to, and not in lieu of, the provisions of OYC Directive Chapter E-8, Title: Absent With Leave Visits.

C. Procedure for Obtaining Psychiatric Review for Community Placement

1. For those children in a Youth Commission residential unit having approved psychiatric services, the psychiatric review may be arranged at the convenience of the institutional staff. Following the review, the psychiatric report and a copy of the Adjustment Report (OYC Form 16-7) shall be forwarded to the Administrator, CAS.

2. For those children in a Youth Commission residential unit not having approved psychiatric services, requests for an appointment for psychiatric review shall be made, in writing, to the Clinical Director, JDC. At the time of the request, the Adjustment Report (OYC Form 16-7) along with the entire case record shall be sent to JDC, with a copy of the Adjustment Report to the Administrator, CAS. JDC will advise the residential unit, in writing, of the
appointment date and time. It will be the responsibility of the residential unit to have the child present for psychiatric review at the designated time and place.

3. The psychiatric re-evaluation (3 copies) will be forwarded to CAS. Disposition will be made by CAS in a written statement which shall then be forwarded to the appropriate institution and regional office with the psychiatric report.

4. The provisions of this section shall be implemented in addition to, and not in lieu of, the provisions of OYC Directive Chapter E-1, Title Alert Lists and Placement Procedures.

D. Recommitments and Returnees

1. BJP staff shall bring to the attention of CAS a child's previous "R" or "E" status, when arrangements are being made for the reinstitutionalization of such child. BJP shall make a recommendation concerning the re-instituting of the child's previous suffix, and such recommendation shall be incorporated in the written Return Report. CAS will determine whether or not the suffix should be immediately re-instituted, or whether the child should be returned to JDC for further evaluation.

2. The provisions of this section shall be implemented in addition to the provisions of OYC Directive Chapter E-13, Title: Institutional Return of Children From Placement.

DANIEL W. JOHNSON, DIRECTOR
OHIO YOUTH COMMISSION
I. Criteria

1. Must be an adjudicated male delinquent by an Ohio County Juvenile Court as a permanent commitment.

2. Must be 15 years of age or older and no older than 18. The only boys under 15 to be admitted are those receiving Commission approval following referral from C&A.

II. Philosophy

Fairfield School for Boys, as an OYC facility and operating within OYC Directives, has been established to educate, retrain, and rehabilitate the 15-18 year old adjudicated male youth to prepare him for a successful return to community life.

III. Function

It is the function of FSB to help youth assume the responsibilities that they will face when returning to the community by guiding and developing a positive attitude toward authority, constructive value systems, and by giving them opportunities to improve their self images and self esteem through successful experiences.

IV. Programming

A. Educational Program

There exists a fully certified academic school at FSB, staffed with 84 full-time teachers and 19 teacher aides, housed in three buildings (totaling 48 classrooms and three libraries). A regular curriculum for grades 7-12 is in operation, as well as four special remedial classes having achievement
levels from grade one to grade six. Three libraries and four remedial reading Communication Skills Improvement laboratories are also in operation. The school has a complete guidance program that specializes in testing, educational and vocational counseling. There are approximately 700 boys involved in the academic school.

The vocational program at FSB has 15 certified trade and industrial vocational areas, these are: auto body, auto repair, sheet metal, masonry, carpentry, barbering, electronics, household wiring, shoe repair, drycleaning, machine shop, welding, drafting, electricity and small appliance repair.

There are four primary production areas for boys to receive on the job training. These are food service, farm, supplies and services and maintenance. Maintenance training would include lawn care, painting, minor electrical repairs, home-workshop, carpentry, and other general maintenance. Supplies and service areas would include laundry and tailoring. There are approximately 200 boys in this program.

B. Therapeutic Program

Individual and group counseling are provided primarily through the Social Service Staff. Social workers are responsible for establishing group therapy programs in their individual cottages. These reality-oriented groups meet from three to five times each week. A full-time psychiatrist is employed and has as a major responsibility the establishment of individual and group psychotherapy programs. The social workers maintain offices in the cottage and meet at least weekly with cottage staff to discuss problem youth, methods of handling children, and progress of individual boys. It is also the social workers responsibility to prepare all written reports on the boys. Major treatment decisions are made by the committee representing various disciplines in the institution. A second committee composed of representatives of the educational and social service areas make the major disciplinary decisions.

C. Religious Program

The religious department is staffed by two full-
time Protestant Chaplains and one part-time Roman Catholic Chaplain. In addition to the regular worship services, special programs such as musical presentations, films, and a "teen challenge" series are offered. The Religious Education Department also operates a choral program. In addition, Bible classes, catechism classes, and group counseling programs are offered. The staff also cooperates with OYC's Community Services Contact Program, which is geared at helping the youth return to the community.

D. Recreational Program

The Recreational Program functions primarily through the Group Life Department. Boys may participate in organized team games, track, swimming, gym games, arts & crafts, etc. Off campus activities include fishing, baseball games, tours to scenic spots, concerts, etc.

E. Health & Supportive Services

Complete medical and dental services are made available to the boys by the hospital staff. The boys who need continuing medical attention are placed in the twelve bed campus hospital.

V. A. Youth Most Likely to Succeed at FSB

It has been found that the youth who benefits most from the FSB program is between 15 and 18 years of age, possesses at least near average intelligence, and is free from serious physical and emotional problems.

B. Youth Least Likely to Succeed at FSB

Youth who are mentally retarded, physically handicapped, extremely sophisticated delinquent, or extremely emotionally handicapped, are least likely to benefit from the FSB program.
APPENDIX B: BACKGROUND DATA FORMS

B-1: ADMISSIONS SUMMARY FACE SHEET

B-2: OFFENSE RATINGS AS SERIOUS, MODERATE OR SLIGHT LISTING
ADMISSION SUMMARY

True Name __________________________ Serial No. ______________________

Date Enrolled ___________ County ___________ Cottage ___________ 

Offense __________________________ Committal ______________________

Previous Institutions and Dates ________________________________

Age on Admission ___________ Birth Date ___________ Birthplace ___________

Race ______ Religious Faith ___________ Local Church ___________

Parents Marital Status ________________________________

Father Address Occupation

Step-Father Address Occupation

Mother Address Occupation

Step-Mother Address Occupation

Boy Lived With ___________ Relationship ___________

Address ___________ No. Bros ___________ No Sisters ___________

Height _______ Weight _______ Hair (Sallow, Ruddy, Light, Dark, etc.)

Identifications: __________________________ Complexion ___________

(Marks, tatoos, scars, deformities, etc.) __________________________

Glasses __________________________

Medical Findings ______________________

Last School Attended ___________ From _______ To _______

Principal __________________________ Address ______________________

Correspondent __________________________ Relationship ______________________

Telephone No. ___________ Address ______________________

Guidance Counselor ___________ Field Counselor ___________

Remarks:
The materials in this section have been adapted from a previous study by Reckless and Dintiz. The original classification by these authors is listed and then followed by other offenses and descriptions of offenses unique to this study and classified by this author.

SERIOUS OFFENSES: Police contacts rated as serious by the Reckless Classification. This rating includes any offense normally considered a Felony or Part I crime.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reckless Classification</th>
<th>Other Offenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated assault</td>
<td>Molesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed robbery</td>
<td>Murder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>Purse snatching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault and battery</td>
<td>Receiving and concealing stolen property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault with a deadly weapon</td>
<td>Theft from the mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto theft</td>
<td>Unarmed robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking and entering</td>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>Sodomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape from custody</td>
<td>Embezzlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felonious assault</td>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery, fraud</td>
<td>Grand larceny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit and run</td>
<td>Housebreaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influencing a minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walter C. Reckless and Dimon Dimitz, Youth Development Project, An Experimental Program for Prevention of Delinquency in Vulnerable Seventh Grade Boys of the Inner City, Columbus, Ohio, May 31, 1971 (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1970), pp. 85-992.
Specific offense description in TICO sample also classified as serious.

- Attempted rape
- Attempted assault
- Molesting younger sisters
- Oral sodomy
- Assault with knife
- Driving stolen car
- High speed auto chase
- Assault police officer
- Chase man with knife
- Assault on teacher
- Striking school teacher
- Theft from person
- Cutting episode

Injury to person
Unlawful entering and stealing
Physical assault on girl
Assaultive behavior
Bastardy
Chase boys with loaded shotgun
Sexual & assaultous behavior
Boat theft
Unlawful entry
Helped girl get gun—she committed suicide

Threaten neighbors, throw knife at father (incorrigible)

MODERATE OFFENSES: Police contacts rated as moderate by Reckless Classification. This rating includes any offense which does not clearly fit in to the Serious or Slight offense category.

**Reckless Classification**

- Attempted arson
- Obscene literature
- Glue sniffing
- Gasoline
- Shoplifting
- Resisting arrest
- Illicit sex with consent
Specific offense descriptions in TICO sample also classified as moderate.

- Attempted Arson
- Auto tampering
- Theft
- Stealing
- Bicycle theft
- Auto larceny
- Riding in stolen car
- Borrowing car without permission
- Abduction for immoral purposes
- Drunkenness, strike police
- Rock throwing episode
- Harboring 2 - 14 year old girls (runaway)

SLIGHT OFFENSES: Police contacts rated as slight by Reckless Classification. These offenses are usually considered as minor misdemeanors or Part 2 crimes.

- Curfew violation
- Disorderly conduct
- Fighting
- Improper language
- Intoxication
- Pointing firearms
- Obstructing justice
- Throwing missiles
- Swimming in an unguarded area
- Trespassing
- Truancy from school
- Gambling
- Indecent exposure
- Failure to appear in court
- Shooting pool

- Soliciting for prostitute
- Shoplifting
- Attempted suicide
- Auto trespass
- Auto looting
- Sniffing trespass
- Extortion
- Extortion from children
- Homosexuality
- Sex offense w/young girl
- Sex w/sister, with 11 year old
- Borrow motorbike without permission

- Discharging firearms in city limits, BB gun
- False fire alarm, false report
- Incorrigibility
- Possession of fireworks
- Meanacing threats
- Possession of fireworks
- Suspicious person
- Truancy from home
- Violating probation
- Delinquency
- Riding double on a bicycle
- Misrepresentation of minor status
- Unlawful assembly
Specific offense description in TICO sample also classified as slight.

Parole violation
Sex offense
Exhibitionism
Window peeping
Immorality
Gave incorrect age for driver's license

Threat to kill mother
Threat to kill teacher
Minor sex offense
Overt sex behavior
Note requesting sex
APPENDIX C: BOYS' SCHEDULE

C-1: FULL SCHEDULE: "THE WAY I LOOK AT THINGS:

C-2: ITEMS FROM PERCEPTIONS OF "R" & "E" SCALE
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The best way to make it here is to be a slick.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I'm tougher than most of the other students.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>At the present time, I think of myself as someone who got a raw deal.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Staff members here often pick on certain students.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Now that I am leaving this institution, I feel ready to make a fresh start.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I have not gained much respect for myself as a person during my stay here.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The best way to make it here is to act tough.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If a student hassles me, I can take it.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Do the other students make it hard or easy to follow the rules here?</td>
<td>Very hard</td>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is make friends with adults.</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. I get a better break from the staff than do most of the other students.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

12. This institution seems to be a place where a student waits around for others to tell him what to do.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

13. This is a rotten place to be.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

14. Now that I am leaving here, I see myself as a person who has been a private at a military school.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

15. Did any of the other students pick on you while you were here?
   Most of the time  Some of the time  Very little of the time  None of the time

16. My friends here have helped me to feel better about myself.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

17. Most of what I have learned here I learned from other students.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

18. Most of the other students here treat me pretty bad.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

19. At the present time I think of myself as someone who will straighten out.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree

20. I like being here more than most of the other students.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  Strongly disagree
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. If I keep out of trouble on the outside, it will be because of what I have learned here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 22. Most of the staff tried real hard to help me. |   |   |   |   |
| Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

| 23. I've got worse problems now than I had when I cam here. |   |   |   |   |
| Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

| 24. I think I am a better person because I have been here. |   |   |   |   |
| Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

| 25. The staff helped me gain confidence in myself. |   |   |   |   |
| Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

| Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

| 27. I don't like the way most of the staff treats me. |   |   |   |   |
| Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

| 28. Did some adult take an interest in you and help you while you were here? |   |   |   |   |
| Helped me a lot | Helped me some | Helped me a little | Didn't help me |

| 29. I got as much help here as I wanted to get. |   |   |   |   |
| Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

| 30. Students who have E's after their numbers generally have worse police records than the other students. |   |   |   |   |
| Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree |

| 31. Have you ever broken rules here? |   |   |   |   |
| Quite a few | A few | One or two | None |

| 32. Have you ever been "punched out"? |   |   |   |   |
| Lots of times | Several times | Once or twice | Never |
33. Now that I am leaving here, I see myself as a person who has paid his debt to society.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

34. Students who have Es after their numbers are more dangerous than most other students.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

35. I expect people on the outside to treat me unfairly just because I've done time here.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

36. At the present time, I think of myself as someone who can't be pushed around.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

37. The staff treats the students who have Rs after their numbers just like anyone else.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

38. Now that I am leaving here, I feel hopeful for the future.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

39. In some ways it's a good thing to have an R after your number.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

40. Now that I am leaving here, I feel untroubled.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

41. In some ways, it's a bad thing to have a R after your number.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

42. At the present time, I think of myself as someone who has made a mistake.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree
43. Did the other students ever accuse you of "getting up on your pounds" because you wouldn't "mess up" with them?
   Most of Some of Very little None of
   the time the time of the time the time

44. I usually don't treat an R student any different from any other student.
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree disagree

45. Would you agree to stay here an extra month?
   Sure Sure
   would Maybe Don't Know Probably not wouldn't

46. This institution seems to be a place where a person can easily lose his temper.
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree disagree

47. R students are less friendly than other students.
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree disagree

48. At the present time, I think of myself as someone who wishes he hadn't done it.
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree disagree

49. This institution seems to be a place where a person will never get a break.
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree disagree

50. Did you like the officers with whom you came in contact here?
   Most of Some of One or two None of them them of them of them

51. The counselors here care about students as people.
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree disagree

52. Did watching your step help you while you were here?
   Helped me Helped me Helped me Didn't help me
   a lot Some a little
53. Most students here think that the E students are weird.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

54. Now that I am leaving here, I see myself as a person who has been a patient in a hospital.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

55. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to talk about yourself to some adult.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

56. Did the officers here really try to help?  
   Most of the time Some of the time Very little None of the time

57. The best way to make it here is not to rat.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

58. If a person can get along here, he can get along on the outside.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

59. I learned more bad things during my time here than I would have in the same time outside.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

60. I like myself better now than when I first came here.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

61. Most parents would be upset if their kid had an E after his number.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

62. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to run errands for the officers.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

63. Most students here think that the R students are weird.  
   Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
64. I am able to control my temper better than before I came here.  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree

65. I would much rather have an "E" after my number than an "R".  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree

66. If a friend of mine got into trouble, I would want him to be sent here.  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree

67. If I felt I were going to get into real trouble, I would ask to be sent back here before it happened.  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree

68. While here, the average student learns how to get along better with other people.  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree

69. It really helps a person to be here.  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree

70. The average student gets a chance to improve himself here.  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree

71. E students are less friendly than other students.  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree

72. Now that I am leaving here, I feel friendly.  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree

73. When a student gets sick here, none of the other students bother themselves about him.  
   Most of the time | Some of the time | Very little of the time | None of the time

74. Now that I am leaving here, I see myself as a delinquent.  
   Strongly agree | Agree | Undecided | Disagree | Strongly disagree
75. I usually don't treat an E student any different from any other student. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

76. Now that I am leaving here, I see myself as a person who has been a pupil at a boarding school. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

77. Students who have Rs after their numbers are more dangerous than most other students. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

78. While he's here, the average student finds out why he got into trouble. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

79. I got a bum rap by being sent here. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

80. In some ways, it's a bad thing to have an E after your number. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

81. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to play it straight. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

82. Students who have Rs after their numbers generally have worse police records than the other students. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

83. The food here is clean. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

84. How would you describe the program at this institution? 
Very good Good 50/50 Poor Very Poor

85. In some ways it's a good thing to have an E after your number. 
Strongly agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree
86. My stay here has helped me.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

87. If you were the superintendent here, would you make nay changes in the way this place is run?
   Quite a few  A few  One or two  None

88. The best way to make it here is to outsmart the cottage leader.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

89. This institution seems to be a place where a person must obey a lot of phony rules.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

90. The staff treats the students that have the Es just like anyone else.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

91. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to try to figure yourself out.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

92. Most parents would be upset if their kid had an R after his number.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

93. Being sent here was a good deal for me.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

94. Now that I am leaving here, I see myself as a criminal.
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree

95. Did other students try to put the "nut" on you here?
   Most of the time  Some of the time  Very little  None of the time

96. I would much rather have an "R" after my number than an "E".
   Strongly agree  Agree  Undecided  Disagree  disagree
SECTION "B"

Put an X in the column which best indicates how helpful each person has been while you've been here.

1. SOCIAL WORKER
2. PSYCHOLOGIST
3. CHAPLAIN
4. RECREATION LEADER
5. COTTAGE SUPERVISOR
6. YOUTH LEADER
7. SPECIAL TEACHER
8. REGULAR TEACHER
9. VOCATIONAL TEACHER
10. WORK OFFICER
11. SECURITY
12. DOCTOR
13. NURSE
14. FATHER OR STEPFATHER
15. MOTHER OR STEPMOTHER
16. BROTHERS AND SISTERS
17. OTHER RELATIVES
18. PSYCHIATRIST
19. GUIDANCE COUNSELOR
20. CLOSEST FRIEND HERE

a. very helpful
b. better-than average help
c. average help
d. helped me a little
e. not at all helpful
1. Students who have "E's" after their numbers generally have worse police records than other students. (30)

2. Students who have "E's" after their numbers are more dangerous than most other students. (34)

3. "E" students are less friendly than other students. (71)

4. I usually don't treat an "E" student any different from any other student. (75)

5. Most students here think that the "E" students are weird. (53)

6. Students who have "R's" after their numbers generally have worse police records than other students. (82)

7. Students who have "R's" after their numbers are more dangerous than most other students. (77)

8. "R" students are less friendly than other students. (47)

9. I usually don't treat an "R" student any different from any other student. (44)

10. Most students here think that the "R" students are weird. (63)

11. The staff treats the students who have "E's" just like anyone else. (90)

12. The staff treats the students who have "R's" after their numbers just like anyone else. (37)

13. In some ways it's a good thing to have an "E" after your number. (85)

14. In some ways it's a good thing to have an "R" after your number. (39)

15. In some ways it's a bad thing to have an "E" after your number. (80)

16. In some ways, it's a bad thing to have an "R" after your number. (41)

17. I would much rather have an "E" after my number than an "R." (65)
18. I would much rather have an "R" after my number than an "E." (96)

19. Most parents would be upset if their kid had an "E" after his number. (61)

20. Most parents would be upset if their kid had an "R" after his number. (92)
APPENDIX D: STAFF MEMBER ASSESSMENT FORM
STAFF MEMBER ASSESSMENT

Name of boy released:_________________________________________

OYC No: ___________________ Cottage

ASSESSMENT

DIRECTIONS: Circle the number corresponding to the amount of the characteristic exhibited by the boy.

1. He is honest in his relations with others:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Never  Always

2. His interpersonal approach to others is:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Very Poor  Very Good

3. He is at ease with himself:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Never  Always

4. He identifies with the staff:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Never  Always

5. He thinks like a hood:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Always  Never

6. He plays the inmate game:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Always  Never

7. He rejects the institution:
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Very Much  Very Little
8. His attitudes seems to have changed for the:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Worse Better

9. The other boys influenced him:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Much Very Much

10. The other boys picked on him:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
A Lot Little

11. He thinks the institution has been to him:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Harmful Very Helpful

12. He feels that what happened to him here was:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Bad Very Good

13. His self concept is:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Poor Very Good

14. He feels that being sent to the institution was:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very Bad Very Good

15. He defines himself as a:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Bad Person Good Person
16. What do you think will be this boy's eventual outcome? (check one and explain.)

____ 1. Headed for more serious trouble
____ 2. Will barely get along within the law
____ 3. Will make a pretty good adjustment
____ 4. Will become a solid citizen

Why? ____________________________________________

17. What do you think will be the biggest problem for this boy when he gets home?

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

18. Regardless of this boy's actual status, he seems to have all of the characteristics of an "R".

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very True
False

19. Regardless of this boy's actual status, he seems to have all of the characteristics of an "E".

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very True
False

Signed: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________