This dissertation has been 63-2536
microfilmed exactly as received

MYLONAS, Anastassios Demosthenes, 1925-
PRISONERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD LAW AND
LEGAL INSTITUTIONS.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1962
Sociology, public welfare

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

PRISONERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD LAW AND LEGAL INSTITUTIONS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Anastassios Demosthenes Mylonas, LL.B., M.A.

The Ohio State University
1962

Approved by

Walter C. Reckless

Adviser

Department of Sociology and
Anthropology

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"One hand washes the other and both wash the face" goes the expressive Greek proverb. This study was made possible by the combined efforts of many.

The writer feels greatly indebted to Dr. Walter C. Reckless for his generous and constant guidance throughout the study and for his counsel and direction during my graduate career in sociology. His kind support, his unusual patience, and his special interest in this study are highly appreciated.

I am also grateful to Dr. Raymond F. Sletto for his helpful suggestions and advice in constructing the schedule of the study. The writer is further indebted to him and also to Dr. Simon Dinitz for their careful and critical reading of the manuscript.

I wish to express my great obligation to Dr. Robert P. Bullock for his advice during all phases of the study and his generous assistance in the analysis of the data.

My thanks are given to Mr. Judson R. Landis and Mr. Patrick T. Cleaver for their assistance in the machine tabulation of the data.

Grateful acknowledgment is due Warden Ernest L. Maxwell and the officials of the Ohio Penitentiary for their cooperation and assistance in the conduct of this research. Appreciation is due Mr. Erwin A. Wendler and "Bob," a prisoner upon whom the writer so often depended.

Particular gratitude is felt toward the three hundred inmates at the Ohio Penitentiary; without their participation and kind cooperation this study would never have taken place.

Finally, I wish to thank Mrs. Laura P. Cleaver for the task she undertook in typing the manuscript.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
II. THE METHOD	17
III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE	25
IV. THE FINDINGS	38
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	72
APPENDIXES	
I. TABLES	78
II. QUALITY OF SCALES	92
III. SCHEDULES	96
IV. LAW SCALE ITEM ANALYSIS	118
BIBLIOGRAPHY	128
AUTOBIOGRAPHY	132

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Type of Admission of 300 Male Property Offenders Admitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962	19
2. Type of Offense of 300 Male Property Offenders Admitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962	28
3. Race and Type of Offense of 300 Male Property Offenders . .	29
4. Background Characteristics Found in the Study Population and All Admissions to the Ohio Penitentiary during 1961 .	33
5. Reliability Coefficients of Scales, Using Split-Half Technique	34
6. Mean Socialization Scores of Offenders and Non-Offenders .	35
7. Intercorrelations between Scores on the Four Inventories, Using Pearsonian Correlations (N = 300)	37
8. Intercorrelations between Scores on the Four Inventories, Using Pearsonian Correlation (N = 300)	40
9. Section A: Mean Law Scale Scores by Subgroups of 300 Male Property Offenders	42
Section B: Mean Law Scale Scores by Extreme Subgroups . .	44
10. Background Characteristics and Race of Male Property Offenders	46
11. Intercorrelations between Age and Scores on the Four Inventories, Using Pearsonian Correlation	50
12. Intercorrelations between Criminal Record and Scores on the Four Inventories, Using Pearsonian Correlation	51
13. Section A: Mean Socialization Scale Scores by Subgroups of 300 Male Property Offenders	51
Section B: Mean Socialization Scale Scores by Extreme Groups	53

TABLES Continued

Table	Page
14. Section A: Mean Morale Scale Scores by Subgroups of 300 Male Property Offenders	59
Section B: Mean Morale Scale Scores by Extreme Subgroups	61
15. Section A: Mean Interpersonal Competence Items Scores by Subgroups of 300 Male Property Offenders	63
Section B: Mean Interpersonal Competence Items Scores by Extreme Groups	65
16. Race of 300 Male Property Offenders	79
17. Age of 300 Male Property Offenders	79
18. Residential Area (in Which They "Grew Up as a Boy") of 300 Male Property Offenders	80
19. Religious Preferences of 300 Male Property Offenders	80
20. Grade-Level Attained through Formal Education of 300 Male Property Offenders	81
21. Scores on the Ohio Penal Classification Test of 300 Male Property Offenders	81
22. Marital Status of 300 Male Property Offenders	82
23. Type of Occupation at Time of Offense of 300 Male Property Offenders	82
24. Number of Arrests under 18 Years of Age of 300 Male Property Offenders	83
25. Number of Arrests after 17 Years of Age of 300 Male Property Offenders	83
26. Total Number of Arrests of 300 Male Property Offenders	84
27. Number of Felonies for Which Commitment Had Been Made to A Prison for 300 Male Property Offenders	84
28. Number of Times Previously Incarcerated of 300 Male Property Offenders	85
29. Length of Time Spent in Juvenile Correctional Institution by 300 Male Property Offenders	85

TABLES Continued

Table	Page
30. Length of Time Spent in Jail and/or Workhouse by 300 Male Property Offenders	86
31. Length of Time Spent in State or Federal Reformatories by 300 Male Property Offenders	86
32. Length of Time Spent in State or Federal Penitentiary by 300 Male Property Offenders	87
33. Total Amount of Time Spent in Correctional Institutions by 300 Male Property Offenders	87
34. Number of Times of Parole Violation by 300 Male Property Offenders	88
35. Socialization Scale Scores of 300 Male Property Offenders .	88
36. Morale Scale Scores of 300 Male Property Offenders	89
37. Interpersonal Competence Items Scores of 300 Male Property Offenders	90
38. Law Scale Scores of 300 Male Property Offenders	91
39. Cross-Validating Data for the Socialization Scale of the California Psychological Inventory	93
40. Reliability Coefficients of Socialization Scale, Morale Scale, Interpersonal Competence Items and Law Scale, Using Split-Half Technique	95

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

One aspect of the socio-cultural context which has special bearing upon the incidence of juvenile delinquency and adult crime is the system of norms by which behavior is regulated. The mores, constituting the basic and general rules of society, are set forth to protect the peace, order and solidarity of the group. According to Durkheim, "the link of social solidarity to which repressive law corresponds is the one whose break constitutes a crime."¹

The social institutions of the society, namely, family, religion, and education as well as the neighborhood, condition the child during his early life to the norms and strengthen the norms through persistent and formal reinforcement. In a primitive, relatively stable and uncomplicated society the group may impose its will on its members by ostracism and other measures of primary group constraint; therefore, "the law emerges as a specialized means of control."²

The importance of the law as a means of control has been emphasized by many theorists from the time of Plato and Aristotle but none have

¹Emile Durkheim, Division of Labor in Society, trans. George Simpson (New York: Macmillan Co., 1933), p. 70.

²Paul Tappan, Crime, Justice and Correction (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960), p. 178.

studied the attitudes of criminal or non-criminal groups toward law and legal institutions. The supremacy of law is accepted by Aristotle as a mark of good state and not as an unfortunate necessity. According to his thesis, the law is "reason unaffected by desire; in any good state the law must be ultimate sovereign and not any person whatsoever."³

Plato in his Laws writes, "Without laws men differ not at all from the most savage beasts."⁴

The law is a means of molding and controlling men--one means by which the controlling power in a community bends individuals and institutions to its will. It consists of rules and regulations prescribed by the governing authority and requires obedience from the governed.⁵

Simple compliance with the rules of the society, however, is not sufficient to establish that the individual accepts and defines them as legitimate. As Max Weber has suggested, "A person attributes legitimacy to a system of rules and corresponding models of behavior when he accepts them as binding on his conduct."⁶ In other words, legitimacy of norms contains an essential subjective element, since it depends on the existence of a group member's readiness to obey a particular set of rules whether or not he consciously recognizes this attitude.

³George H. Sabine, A History of Political Theory (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1937), pp. 93-95.

⁴Ibid., p. 69.

⁵Frank Parsons, Legal Doctrines and Social Progress (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1911), p. 17.

⁶Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 124-32.

According to R. A. Cloward and L. E. Ohlin, people attribute legitimacy to a system of norms for a variety of reasons--perhaps because of respect for the traditional place they have occupied in the life of the group; because of the fact that the rules facilitate certain emotional satisfactions; because of a belief in their ultimate relation to some moral, aesthetic, or other type of standard, and so on.⁷ Furthermore, Cloward and Ohlin state that in technical usage the concept of legitimacy has implied an element of "rightness" or moral validity. However, a distinction should be made between the legitimacy of social norms and their moral validity. Sorokin's distinction between "law norms" and "moral norms" is appropriate. Sorokin has suggested that "any norm that is only imperative and not attributive, that only recommends a certain conduct but does not ascribe a right to demand it to any subject of right" is a "moral norm" and is a very different thing from "law norms." The essential characteristic of the "law norm" is that it establishes a definite two-sided, imperative attributive relationship between two parties through an indication of what one party is entitled to demand from the other and what the other party is obliged to do to meet this demand.⁸

The distinction between what Sorokin calls "law norms" and "moral norms" enables one to understand the case of a criminal who regards fraud as legitimate under the rules of conduct he follows and yet at the same time morally wrong. It has been suggested by some

⁷R. A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, Delinquency and Opportunity (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960), pp. 16-17.

⁸P. A. Sorokin, Society, Culture and Personality: Their Structure and Dynamics (New York: Harper and Bros., 1947), pp. 71-85.

criminologists and sociologists that "delinquents and criminals have withdrawn their attribution of legitimacy of certain of the norms maintained by law-abiding groups of the larger society and have given it instead to new patterns of conduct which are defined as illegitimate by the official agencies of that society."⁹

This view has been echoed by Gresham M. Sykes and David Matza.¹⁰ However, instead of withdrawal of the delinquent's attribution of legitimacy to certain norms of the society, they identify the process as "techniques of neutralization." In their article, "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values," they state:

Many delinquents, we argued are essentially in agreement with the larger society, at least with regard to the evaluation of delinquent behavior as "wrong." Rather than standing in opposition to conventional ideas of good conduct, the delinquent is likely to adhere to the dominant norms in belief but render them ineffective in practice by holding various attitudes and perceptions which serve to neutralize the norms as checks on behavior. "Techniques of neutralization," such as the denial of responsibility or the definition of injury as rightful revenge, free the individual from a large measure of social control.¹¹

According to Merton, the normative means to desired goals in our society are blocked to some groups, namely, certain lower-class persons and racial and religious minorities. Since some goals are highly valued, non-normative behavior is employed to achieve them. As Merton puts it, "a cardinal American virtue, 'ambition,' promotes a cardinal

⁹R. A. Cloward and Lloyd E. Ohlin, op. cit., p. 19.

¹⁰Gresham M. Sykes and David Matza, "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency," American Sociological Review, XXII (December, 1957), 664-670.

¹¹Gresham M. Sykes and David Matza, "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values," American Sociological Review, XXV, 5 (October, 1961), 712-713.

American vice, 'deviant behavior.'¹² This sometimes involves unlawful behavior and consequently the possibility of entanglement with the law. Therefore, if normless behavior is thought by the offenders to have been "necessary" or at least "justified" on the basis of efficiency, then their attitudes toward law and legal institutions of society are likely to be unfavorable.

American criminologists and sociologists generally admit that, although comparative statistics are not available, the United States has a very large amount of adult crime and juvenile delinquency, perhaps the highest volume of crime and delinquency of any advanced country in the world. There are many explanations and conditions which contribute to the high delinquency and adult crime rate in the United States. According to Reckless, the two following conditions are considered as the main ones:

A. People in the United States do not have the respect for law that people have in other countries, for example, England, Holland, Germany, Sweden, etc. The law-abiding tradition is not strong. On the contrary, America has a sort of lawless tradition --at least a fairly strong subculture of lawlessness, which came with the settlement of a new country and the pushing out to new frontiers. Many persons in the United States oversubscribe to the philosophy of taking chances with laws and regulations and getting by with infractions. An all too large number of persons like to see a violator wiggle out of the clutches of the law. A large sector of the American public is on the side of the defendant and against the police, prosecutor, and courts.

B. In line with a strong tradition of lawlessness is another almost equally strong tradition, namely that of the "fix." Everything can be fixed if the right people can be reached. This means everything from parking tickets to serious crimes, from special privileges to throwing contracts. Many Americans are not content to take their turn, to take what regulations or policies call for.

¹²Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 146-147.

They find a way to get the matter "fixed" in their favor. The use of the "fix" is notorious in organized, professional, and white-collar crime in the United States.¹³

If, as most of the American criminologists and sociologists would agree, a lawless tradition permeates American society and withdrawal of attribution of legitimacy to certain norms is widespread, then one would reasonably expect an unfavorable attitude of the offender toward law in general and legal institutions, i.e., courts, judges, prosecutors, jury, lawyers and police.

For many years it has been understood that adult offenders have anti-social grudges and hostile attitudes toward society. Many of these unfavorable attitudes develop early in life; some develop later as a result of experience with police, courts, and prisons. However, no studies have been made of the attitudes of adult prisoners toward law and legal institutions. Reckless claims that one of the important factors in the failure of parolees is an anti-social attitude developed as a result of their experiences in correctional institutions.

As a result of strong discipline and severe authoritarian handling, many offenders develop antisocial grudges toward society and its authorities. Hostility so engendered leads to further aggression as a sort of revenge on society. Police, court, jail, and prison experiences frequently create bitterness and a desire to get even rather than a receptive attitude for reorganizing one's life.¹⁴

Several studies have attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of institutionalization based on the success or failure of the released

¹³Walter C. Reckless, The Crime Problem (3rd ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961), p. 1.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 163.

prisoner in the community.¹⁵ All these studies, however, have introduced factors of post-institutional influence which make invalid the true significance of the study of institutional experience. The outcome of parole in these studies is predicted from background factors, most of them situational ones. None of the considered factors covers attitudes toward law and legal institutions.

When one reviews the research done on prisoner populations, he finds many attempts to assess various attributes of prisoners but very few attempts test their attitudes toward law and legal institutions. One of the first studies of a prisoner population was that made two generations ago by Goring in England.¹⁶ But here the attempt was to assess the constitution, mentality and social background characteristics of 3,000 English convicts as a sort of research antidote to Lombroso's observations and theories about prisoners. "Weak-mindedness" is the main mental factor which Goring found important in the etiology of crime. Soon after World War I, because of the Alpha test, it became possible to compare prisoner populations with draft-army populations on

¹⁵See, for example, Ernest W. Burgess, "Factors Determining Success or Failure on Parole," in Andrew A. Bruce, et al., The Working of the Indeterminate-Sentence Law and the Parole System in Illinois (Springfield, Illinois, 1928), pp. 205-249; Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck, After-Conduct of Discharged Offenders (London: Macmillan and Co., 1945), Criminal Careers in Retrospect (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1943), Five-Hundred Criminal Careers (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1930); Ferris F. Laune, Predicting Criminality (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1936); Michael Hakeem, Forecasting Parole Outcome by Parole Officers and Laymen (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1950); George B. Vold, Prediction Methods and Parole (Hanover, New Hampshire: The Sociological Press, 1931).

¹⁶Charles Goring, The English Convict (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1913).

intelligence tests. Murchison administered the Army Alpha test in several state prisons and reformatories of the United States. The prisoners were found to concentrate in the levels of intelligence above average more than did the men of the white draft army and consequently made a superior showing in intelligence grading. Moreover, he discovered that the intelligence rating of habitual offenders was slightly superior in general to that of first offenders. Thus, the author concludes that "if it is true, as some have claimed, that feeble-mindedness is an important factor in recidivism, it is equally true that high intelligence is just as important a factor."¹⁷

Zeleny, reworking the data from the better administered, comparable psychometric studies, concluded that "it has not been found to be true that feeble-mindedness is an important cause of crime."¹⁸ Sutherland's most important finding on a re-examination of the results of 350 studies of intelligence of American offenders was that "feeble-mindedness has not been demonstrated to be a generally important cause of delinquency." His re-examination of the criminal intelligence studies also made it clear that there is no significant relation between level of intelligence and recidivism.¹⁹ Moreover, researchers who have made detailed case studies of offenders in order to determine the actual operation of

¹⁷Carl Murchison, Criminal Intelligence (Worcester, Massachusetts: Clark University Press, 1926), pp. 37-95.

¹⁸Leslie D. Zeleny, "Feeble-mindedness and Criminal Conduct," American Journal of Sociology, XXXVIII (January, 1933), p. 574.

¹⁹Edwin H. Sutherland, "Mental Deficiency and Crime," in Kimball Young (ed.), Social Attitudes (New York: 1931).

causative factors do not believe that feeble-mindedness is a prevalent causative factor.²⁰

Still later, after psychologists had developed many different kinds of personality trait inventories, prisoners were compared with civilian or non-criminal populations. Perhaps the most important review of these studies is the one by Schuessler and Cressey,²¹ students of Sutherland. They examined 113 research projects in which personality tests were used to investigate the differences between criminal and non-criminal groups. The authors state that "the doubtful validity of many of the obtained differences, as well as the lack of consistency in the combined results, makes it impossible to conclude from these data that criminality and personality elements are associated." In other words, they discovered that personality traits are distributed in the criminal population about the same way as in the non-criminal population.

The prevailing opinion of sociologists and criminologists in the United States, in contrast to that held by the majority of such persons in Europe, is that personality traits and early life history do not play an important role in the etiology of crime and delinquency. For example, Sutherland, whom American sociologists have followed most widely, in his theory of "differential association," emphasizes the point that

²⁰Augusta F. Bronner, "The Contribution of Science to a Program for Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency," The Child, the Clinic and the Court (New York: 1925).

²¹Karl F. Schuessler and Donald R. Cressey, "Personality Characteristics of Criminals," American Journal of Sociology, IV (March, 1950), 476-484.

human behavior could only be predicted through a knowledge of the duration, frequency, priority, and intensity of contacts which a subject has had with other persons.²²

Recently, a series of studies has been made under Professor Walter C. Reckless in which the researchers have attempted to uncover the self-perceptions and self-concepts of prisoners as well as the effect that institutional experience has on the inmate. Edward J. Galway, for example, in his study of the effectiveness of a reformatory program concludes:

The quantity and quality of institutional adjustment and response to the program can be partially determined by constellations of personality characteristics and case-record factors and that, with further study, "treatment types" may be established.²³

David E. Bright, in his attempt to discover what influences, if any, have affected the personalities of inmates during incarceration, found that

The longer the time served in prison, the more adverse will be the attitudes of the inmates, and that better prison programs and facilities lead to better attitudes.²⁴

A recent study by John P. Clark of male prisoners at the Ohio Penitentiary revealed that

Adult prisoners' attitudes toward the acceptance or rejection of blame for their offenses are part of their general blame orientation

²²Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology (4th ed.; New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1947), pp. 6-9.

²³Edward J. Galway, "A Measurement of the Effectiveness of a Reformatory Program" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1948), p. 89.

²⁴David E. Bright, "A Study of Institutional Impact upon Adult Male Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1951), p. 84.

toward incidents where the assignment of blame is likely to occur and that blame orientation is part of a complex of attitudes.²⁵

The main findings of Howard E. Fradkin in his study on "Criminal Background and Self-Concept as Prognostic Factors in the Lives of Prisoners" are expressed as follows:

There appears to be a definite relationship between the social background of property offenders and their self-conceptions; and the prior correctional experience of a group of property offenders appears to be associated with many of their self-concepts; the longer the correctional experience, the more negative is the conception of self, of the institution and of the possibility of future adjustment.²⁶

Kay, in her study, "Differential Self-Perceptions of Female Offenders," claims that self-concepts are related to age, total arrests, length of incarceration and age of onset of illegal behavior.²⁷

It is obvious that, although many studies have been made on the self-perceptions of adult offenders, none of them has studied their attitudes toward law and legal institutions. Certainly a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions is an indication of conformity and good adjustment of the individual to society. The nearest approach to a study of prisoners' attitudes toward law and legal institutions is the one made by Watt and Maher of a group of Indiana State Prison inmates toward law and justice and toward home and parents. The

²⁵John P. Clark, "Blame Acceptance among Ohio Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1960), p. 70.

²⁶Howard E. Fradkin, "Criminal Background and Self-Concept as Prognostic Factors in the Lives of Prisoners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, The Ohio State University, 1958), p. 78.

²⁷Barbara Ann Kay, "Differential Self-Perceptions of Female Offenders" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, The Ohio State University, 1961), p. 46.

authors concluded that "investigation of 74 adult male criminals serving prison sentences lends no support to the hypothesis that the attitudes of these subjects toward public law and morality is a function of their acceptance or rejection of parental figures."²⁸ An instrument to measure the attitudes toward legal authorities by juveniles was constructed by Ames W. Chapman and administered to 160 boys, ranging in age from 13 to 16 years and in grades from the seventh to the eleventh. The author found no statistically significant difference between the attitudes of delinquent and non-delinquent boys.²⁹

It is the purpose of the present study, therefore, to pick out one aspect of the problem of the offender's relation to law and to focus upon one group of offenders. The selected aspect of this research is the attitude toward law and legal institutions in terms of favorable or unfavorable attitude which is tantamount to acceptance or rejection of the dominant legal norms of the society. The study specifically concerns itself with the attitudes toward law and legal institutions of newly admitted male offenders to a maximum security prison. The focus is, therefore, upon the most extreme segment of norm violating members of society.

It is not possible in this study to compare prisoner and non-prisoner groups properly matched; consequently, the hypotheses must be set in terms of expected differences among prisoners in a maximum

²⁸Norman Watt and B. A. Maher, "Prisoners' Attitudes toward Home and the Judicial System," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, IL, 4 (November-December, 1958), 330.

²⁹Ames W. Chapman, "Attitudes toward Legal Authorities by Juveniles," Psychological Abstracts, XXXI (1957), 36-73.

security prison like the Ohio Penitentiary. In general, the hypotheses have to do with differentially favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions according to various social categories. However, it is obvious that favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions should be related to or associated with other assessments such as favorable and unfavorable socialization, high or low morale and favorable or unfavorable self-image of interpersonal competence.³⁰ According to Reckless, Dinitz and Kay, "concept of self and others contains the impact of life on the person as he has internalized his experience; in other words, it consists of the residue of attitudes and meanings accumulated through the interaction of a certain organism or constitution in interpersonal relations."³¹

Hypotheses of the Study

The first hypothesis of this study is designed to reveal the significance of the variable--attitude toward law and legal institutions--when related to socialization, morale and self-image of interpersonal competence.

I. The offenders' attitudes toward law and legal institutions will be found to be related in expected directions to their socialization, morale and self-image of interpersonal competence.

It has been suggested that good or poor adjustment to society as well as favorable or unfavorable social attitudes may be related to

³⁰Edward Rothstein, "An Analysis of Status Images as Perception Variables between Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Boys (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, January, 1961), p. 102.

³¹Walter C. Reckless, Simon Dinitz and Barbara Kay, "The Self-Component in Potential Delinquency and Potential Non-Delinquency," American Sociological Review, XXII, 5 (1957), 566-570.

certain background social characteristics of individuals according to race, age, religion, marital status, education, occupation, and so on. Rundquist and Sletto in their study, "Personality in the Depression," suggest that the "magnitude of general maladjustment was greater among men from the lower occupational strata, among older men, and among men with the least education."³² Recently Reckless et al. have made a series of studies which attempted to compare the "self-concept" of sixth-grade "good" boys with that of sixth-grade boys who were "headed for trouble with the law"; both groups came from high delinquency areas. These studies suggest that self-concepts may be related to certain factors present in the backgrounds of delinquent or criminal groups.³³ It is, therefore, hypothesized that:

II. There is a significant difference in the mean scores of a scale which purports to measure attitudes toward law and legal institutions of various subgroups of the study population, namely, those based on personal background characteristics and amount of criminal history.

In view of Hypothesis II, the following nine sub-hypotheses suggest themselves:

a. The Negro offenders have more unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions than the white offenders, because of their "special culture pattern" which in turn has a direct effect upon crime and exposure to arrest.

³²Edward A. Rundquist and Raymond F. Sletto, Personality in the Depression (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1936), p. 369.

³³Walter C. Reckless, Simon Dinitz and Ellen Murray, "Self-Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency," American Sociological Review, XXI (December, 1956), 744-746; "Teacher Nominations and Evaluations of 'Good' Boys in High Delinquency Areas," The Elementary School Journal (January, 1957), pp. 221-223; "The Self-Component in Potential Delinquency and Potential Non-Delinquency," American Sociological Review, XXII (October, 1957), 566-570.

b. The older the offender, the more likely he is to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions, because he will be more mature, i.e., more accepting of the norms and mores of the society.

c. Those prisoners with a childhood of rural or small town background are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions than the prisoners from big cities and industrial centers, because of the probable lack of sophistication in crime and indoctrination into the "culture" of the lower-class urban offender.

d. Those offenders who are closely identified to some religion are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions, since the religious denominations and sects of the lower classes are usually of the traditional fundamentalist variety which emphasizes the individual's respect for the law.

e. The more educated prisoners are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions, because of their greater knowledge and adherence to middle-class norms and their greater access to middle-class rewards.

f. The more intelligent prisoners are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions than the less intelligent prisoners, because of their understanding of their social situation and their psychic attributes.

g. The single prisoners are more likely to have an unfavorable attitude toward law and legal institutions, because of their unstable life, probable feelings of socio-psychological isolation from other persons and the lack of feelings of belonging and responsibility.

h. Those prisoners who have an established career or field of occupation are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions than prisoners who are unskilled or semi-skilled workers, because many of the "rationalizations" for behavior will not be so available to the former as to the latter.

i. Prisoners who have a long history of criminal involvement (arrests, institutionalization, etc.) are more likely to have unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions than prisoners with less history of criminal involvement, because long exposure to the "criminal element" engenders hostility and hatred toward society and its officials.

A secondary interest in this study will be to see whether or not variations in the mean scores on the three other self measures used in the study, namely socialization (SO scale), morale scale and interpersonal competence items, follow the sub-group trends of the mean

scores on the law scale. Consequently, after the findings under each of the nine sub-hypotheses of Hypothesis II will come a discussion of the findings relative to the three other self measures.

CHAPTER II

THE METHOD

The data for the testing of the hypotheses formulated in Chapter I were secured from three hundred property offenders admitted consecutively from November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962, to the Ohio Penitentiary, a maximum security institution located in Columbus, Ohio. Property offenders alone were included in the sample since they represent the largest single category of offenders and they are regarded as the group in which criminal careers are concentrated.

The Ohio Penitentiary, the third largest penal institution in the United States, receives all newly admitted adult male offenders except those sentenced directly to the State Reformatory at Mansfield, Ohio. At the time of this study, the average daily population numbered approximately 4,500 men; the average monthly rate of admissions ranged from 200 to 240 men including parole violators.

Research Procedure

Data for this study were collected from two sources: the responses of each inmate to a standard schedule and the information from individual case records kept on each inmate in the files of the institution. The schedule was administered on a weekly basis to groups of from 12 to 45 newly admitted prisoners, usually on Wednesday from 9:15 a.m. to

11:30 a.m. The room was located in the Social Services Building which otherwise was used for the institutional orientation program sessions, the AA sessions and the Classification Committee. Sufficient space was available so that communication among inmates was minimal. Illiterate inmates were excluded from this study.

In order to standardize the testing procedure, the writer read each item of the schedule to each group, answering questions of interpretation when necessary. This procedure seemed to be very effective throughout administration of the test. In general, the groups appeared to be cooperative, relaxed and seriously interested in the project. Although they were asked not to sign their name or number to protect their anonymity, a number of them offered to do so and did. Only five men refused to take the test (they were later identified as Negroes with a long record of institutionalization). Slow readers were assisted in the completion of the schedule in special sessions. In order to insure a more relaxed atmosphere, no prison official was present at the time of the administration of the schedules to the prisoners.

Each of the test groups was composed of one week's admission to the institution; however, during the month of December only part of the week's admissions were available. Because of the Christmas holidays a conflict with the other institutional departments and services such as Psychological Services, Orientation Program, Hospital, and so on was unavoidable. Also, during that month the standardized daily schedule of the prisoners' lives, i.e., "bath day," "yard day," visiting hours, weekly shows, and so on was rather upset. Furthermore, there was a conflict with the days of routine admission interviews and the schedule

for the inmates to see the Christmas Show presented annually by the prisoners.

The inmates were tested during their third week of the orientation program at the prison. Each group was relatively isolated from other groups, thus minimizing the danger of passing information from one group to another about the schedule.

The total number of inmates to whom the schedule was administered was 330. However, thirty cases were discarded; they consisted of prisoners with education below the fifth grade and with inferior intelligence quotients and of those who left the schedule incomplete or marked most of the statements "undecided."

The case records of the inmates were searched for data and information not ordinarily available from the inmates themselves. A "data sheet" was constructed and used in order to standardize the collection of information on each prisoner from the case folders of the prison (see Appendix III).

TABLE 1. Type of admission of 300 male property offenders admitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

Category	Number	Percentage
New admissions	249	83.0
Parole violators	51	17.0
Total	300	100.0

The Schedule

The schedule consisted of 196 items designed to elicit data relevant to the testing of the formulated hypotheses (see Appendix III, Schedule A). Items were constructed after consultation with criminologists, sociologists, prison officials and a number of incarcerated adult male offenders. Twenty-eight of the original 196 items were then selected and a preliminary schedule constructed for use in interviewing newly admitted property offenders. Fifteen such offenders were interviewed. On the basis of this pretest it became apparent that differences in attitudes toward law and legal institutions rather than a uniform and stereotyped attitude existed among prisoners. The final schedule was prepared and administered to 330 inmates, 300 of whom were retained in the sample.

The main body of the schedule consisted of four parts together with a cover sheet explaining the purpose of the study and giving instructions for completing the schedule (see Appendix III). The first part, items 1 through 53, is the Socialization Scale (SO) taken from the California Psychological Inventory constructed by Gough. This scale is designed to measure the degree of "social maturity, probity, and rectitude" which the individual has attained.¹ The SO Scale has been tested repeatedly for reliability and validity. High scores indicate a veering

¹Harrison G. Gough and Donald Paterson, "The Identification and Measurement of Predispositional Factors in Crime and Delinquency," Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVI (June, 1952), 207-212. One item of the original scale (I have never been in trouble with the law) was omitted because of its obvious lack of discrimination. Resulting scores were corrected upward so that statistics might be comparable to other studies.

toward good socialization while low scores indicate the tendency toward deviancy, delinquency and poor socialization.

The second part of the schedule, items 54 through 75, is the Morale Scale constructed by Rundquist and Sletto. According to the authors, this scale "appears to be a valid measure of a very general trait akin to its name."² High scores indicate low morale.

The third part consisted of 110 statements, items 76 through 185, designed to measure the individual's attitude toward law and legal institutions. The first 49 items, 76 through 124, were designed to measure the offenders' attitudes toward law in general; items 125 through 143, to measure the offenders' attitudes toward judges, courts and juries; items 144 through 149, toward lawyers and prosecutors; and items 150 through 185, toward police. Twenty-two of these items were used by Rundquist and Sletto³ for the construction of their Law Scale (Appendix III, Schedule C), 16 items were taken from the Law Scale prepared by Daniel Katz⁴ (Appendix III, Schedule D), the remaining 72 were developed by the writer after an intensive search in studies and publications related to law and law enforcement agencies and after discussions with experts in the field of law.

Using the method of summated ratings developed by Likert,⁵ thirty items were finally selected to construct a Law Scale (Appendix III,

²Rundquist and Sletto, op. cit., p. 208

³Ibid., p. 25.

⁴Daniel Katz, Attitude Toward the Law, Scale No. 27, Forms A and B (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931).

⁵For a discussion of this, see Leonard W. Ferguson, Personality Measurement (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952), pp. 123-144.

Schedule E) for this study, to measure the offenders' attitudes toward law and legal institutions. The first ten items were designed to measure the offenders' attitudes toward law in general; items 11 through 17 to measure their attitudes toward judges, courts and jury; items 18 through 20, toward lawyers and prosecutors; and items 21 through 30, toward police. The critical ratio was used as the statistical test⁶ for item analysis. All thirty items selected had critical ratios of from 7.80 to 13.72 (see Appendix IV). Weights for item responses were assigned in such a manner that a high score indicates an unfavorable attitude.

The fourth part of the schedule, items 186 through 196, was designed to measure the offenders' self-images of interpersonal competence. The significance of the "social self" as a major variable in social interaction has been extensively developed and emphasized by a number of social psychologists and criminologists.⁶ These 11 items were taken from the "Self-Image of Interpersonal Competence Scale" constructed and used by Rothstein to measure "empirically the nature and degree to which boys in each grouping, both delinquent and non-delinquent, view themselves as possessing or not possessing those attributes and characteristics which will enable persons to engage effectively in social interaction with other people."⁷ Rothstein's "Self-Image of

⁶See, for example, William Healy and Augusta Bronner, New Lights on Delinquency and Its Treatment (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936); Fritz Redl and David Wineman, Children Who Hate (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951; Reckless, Dinitz and Kay, op. cit.; Reckless, Dinitz and Murray, op. cit.

⁷Rothstein, op. cit., p. 69.

Interpersonal Competence Scale" consisted of 60 items--10 items for each dimension (component) of the scale, i.e., health, intelligence, empathy, autonomy, judgment and creativity. The criterion used for the selection of the 11 items was their ability to differentiate highly between delinquent and non-delinquent boys. High scores indicate a favorable self-image of interpersonal competence. For a discussion of the validity and reliability of the four inventories used in this study--socialization scale, morale scale, interpersonal competence items and law scale--see Appendix II.

Following part four of the schedule are items designed to elicit background data. This section was placed last to avoid fear of possible identification of the inmate by the information requested. Only two offenders did express such a fear after completion of the background data sheet.

Case Record Data

Background data on race, grade level completed, intelligence test score, type of offense, length of sentence, number and length of previous incarcerations and official Federal Bureau of Investigation arrest record were taken from each inmate's records (see Appendix III, Schedule B).

The intelligence test used for adult offenders in Ohio is the Ohio Penal Classification Test (OPCT) constructed by Sell. A correlation of .79 has been found between this test and the Wechsler-Bellevue and a correlation of .73 with the Revised Beta on similar subjects. A test-retest revealed a reliability coefficient of .87. The median for this

test is 100.14, the mean 100 for the standardizing populations including prison groups, high school students and the membership of several adult social clubs.⁸

Statistical Analysis

The background data and scale scores were coded and punched on data processing cards. The data were then analyzed to discover the relationship between the prisoners' scores on the law scale and their personal background characteristics as well as their scores on the socialization, morale, and interpersonal competence inventories. An effort has been made to identify those variables which contribute most to the offender's favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions and also the relationship among these contributing variables. Critical ratios and correlation coefficients appeared to be the most appropriate statistical tests for this analysis.

⁸DeWitt E. Sell, Manual for the Ohio Penal Classification Test (Chicago: Psychiatric Affiliates, 1952), pp. 2-5.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Background Variables

Data regarding the personal and social characteristics of the three hundred male prisoners were taken from the schedule as well as from the offenders' case records at the institution (see Appendix III, Schedules A and B). A comparison between information given by the offenders and that taken from their case records revealed no significant discrepancy; however, the data gained from the official files on the offenders were considered more correct. Following are some summaries of these data.

1. Race. Whites comprised 66.7 per cent of the offenders in the sample while the remaining 33.3 per cent were Negroes (see Table 16, Appendix I). Considering that Negroes represented only 8.1 per cent of Ohio's population in 1960,¹ their over-representation in the Ohio Penitentiary is obvious. This finding was expected as many previous studies have also found a disproportionate number of Negroes in prison populations. Their lower class, their differential treatment by legal institutions and their "special culture pattern" may be the cause of their disposition toward criminal behavior.²

¹U. S., Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1960 (80th ed.; Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office).

²Reckless, op. cit., pp. 42-45.

2. Age. As indicated in Table 17 (Appendix I), the offenders were distributed throughout an age range of 21 to 70 years. The mean age was 34.8 years; the median, 33.95. The majority of offenders were 35 years of age or younger at the time of their incarceration; however, the median age of the group was higher by 4.05 years than the median age (29.9) given for larceny prisoners in statistics published by the United States Department of Justice in 1957.³

3. Intelligence. The findings of this study substantiate those of other researchers that criminal behavior and intelligence are not associated.⁴ As shown in Table 21 (Appendix I), 47.5 per cent of the offenders were classified in the normal intelligence range on the basis of their scores on the Ohio Penal Classification Test.⁵ More than 80 per cent of the inmates were either normal or brighter than normal on the basis of test score responses.

4. Education. The range of formal education was from five years in elementary school through four years beyond high school graduation. Almost 90 per cent of the offenders had either attended or graduated from high school, while 6.3 per cent had only elementary school education; 1.6 per cent had graduated from college (see Table 20, Appendix I).

5. Marital Status. The marital status of the study population was distributed as follows: 26.3 per cent of the offenders were single

³U. S., Department of Justice, Federal Prison, 1956 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957).

⁴Earlier studies are Murchison, op. cit.; Zeleny, op. cit.; Sutherland, op. cit.; Bronner, op. cit.; Schuessler and Cressey, op. cit.

⁵Sell, op. cit.

at the time of commitment to the penitentiary; 36.3 per cent were married at the time of their incarceration; 37.4 per cent were divorced, legally separated or widowers (see Table 22, Appendix I).

6. Religion. As indicated in Table 19 (Appendix I), almost 74 per cent of the offenders claimed affiliation with various Protestant denominations. Twenty-five and three-tenths per cent of the prisoners were classified as Roman Catholic, while the remaining one per cent claimed no or some other religious affiliation. Such a distribution of professed religious affiliation is in line with the fact that the state of Ohio is a Protestant state. On the other hand, the large percentage of Protestants in the study population is partly due to the prevailing practice at the institution which classifies those prisoners as Protestant who have no clearly defined religious affiliation.

7. Residential History. Forty-eight per cent of the study population were reared in cities of 50,000 or larger, while only 16.7 per cent grew up on farms (see Table 18, Appendix I). This finding is in agreement with the data gathered by other studies of Ohio Penitentiary prisoners⁶ and reported statistics.⁷

8. Occupation. While the case records of the offenders do not show specific occupation at time of arrest, the writer undertook the task of classifying these occupations according to the North-Hatt scale of jobs and occupations.⁸ As shown in Table 23 (Appendix I),

⁶See Fradkin, op. cit., p. 70; Clark, op. cit., p. 27.

⁷U. S., Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Report, XXIV, 2 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1953), 88.

⁸Cecil C. North and Paul K. Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," Opinion News (September, 1947), pp. 3-13.

51.7 per cent of the offenders were in the unskilled category; 39 per cent, skilled or semi-skilled; 6.7 per cent, white-collar workers; and only 1.6 per cent, professionals. One per cent of the prisoners stated they had never held any position.

Criminal Variables

Under this heading come those factors which refer to the nature and/or extent of the offenders' involvement in official crime.

1. Type of Offense. The data of Table 2 indicate that one-third of the three hundred male property offenders of the study population was sentenced to the Penitentiary for the crime of burglary. Forgery and other check offenses comprised more than 25 per cent of the sample. The offense committed least was auto theft. A possible explanation for this is that most auto thieves are youthful and consequently are sentenced to the Ohio State Reformatory.

TABLE 2. Type of offense of 300 male property offenders admitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

Offense	Number	Percentage
Auto theft	15	5.0
Burglary	104	34.6
Forgery and other check offenses	80	26.7
Grand larceny	37	12.3
Robbery	44	14.7
Other ^a	20	6.7
Total	300	100.0

^aThis category included receiving stolen property, defrauding an innkeeper, pick-pocket, obtaining property under false pretense, counterfeiting, embezzlement and one case of arson (his own home).

A comparison between the two racial groups of the study population revealed that only robbery, both armed and unarmed, was more frequently committed by Negroes than by white offenders. The distribution of offenses among the two groups is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Race and type of offense of 300 male property offenders.^a

Offense	White		Negro	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Auto theft	12	4.0	3	1.0
Burglary	66	22.0	38	12.7
Forgery and other check offenses	66	22.0	14	4.7
Grand larceny	22	7.3	15	5.0
Robbery	20	6.7	24	8.0
Other	16	5.3	4	1.3
Total	202	67.3	98	32.7

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

2. Arrest Record. As indicated in Table 24 (Appendix I), 56 per cent of the offenders claimed never to have been arrested while a juvenile, i.e., under the age of eighteen. Two recent studies of prisoners at the Ohio Penitentiary indicated that 51 and 55 per cent of the study population had no contact with police and court authorities, while one recent study of inmates at the Ohio Reformatory for Women found that 71 per cent of the study population had no official record as juvenile offenders.⁹ If these data are accurate, the theory that the majority

⁹These studies are Fradkin, op. cit., p. 21; Clark, op. cit., p. 31; and Kay, op. cit., p. 25.

of adult offenders have juvenile delinquency history does not hold true.

In relation to this, Reckless writes:

In general, assumption that delinquency is the precursor of adult crime overlooks the fact that adults who have had officially clear records as juveniles can and do get involved in fraud, swindle, theft, check forging, murder, gambling, desertion, alcoholism, drugs offenses, sex offenses, and so forth.¹⁰

Table 25 (Appendix I) indicates that 72 per cent of the three hundred adult male property offenders (the present study group) had been arrested three or more times after their seventeenth birthday, while Table 26 (Appendix I) shows that 79.3 per cent of the group had been arrested three times or more in their entire lives, according to fingerprint clearances with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The mean number of felonies for which commitment had been made to a prison for the study population was 2.47; the median, 2.67. As is shown in Table 27 (Appendix I), 28 per cent of the offenders had committed one felony; 33 per cent, two felonies; the remaining 39 per cent, more than three felonies.

3. Incarceration Record. It has been suggested that the actual length of time the offender has been exposed to the "criminal culture" or, as Sutherland put it, "the duration" of contact,¹¹ plays an important role in his internalization of some of the attitudes found among the criminal population. It is apparent that an offender's history of arrests is related to his prison record, in spite of statistics¹² which

¹⁰Reckless, op. cit., p. 365. ¹¹Sutherland, op. cit., pp. 3-9.

¹²Courtland C. Van Vechten, "Differential Criminal Case Mortality in Selected Jurisdictions," American Sociological Review, VII (1942), 833-839.

show a drop of 94.5 cases per 100 offenses between the time a crime is reported to the police and the time a conviction is received in court.¹³

One item of the schedule asked the number of times the offender had been incarcerated in a state or federal prison, while a second item asked the time the offender had spent in a juvenile institution, a jail or workhouse, state or federal reformatory or penitentiary. The mean number of times for the entire population was 2.29, although the present incarceration was the first for only 12 per cent of the group (Table 28, Appendix I). Whereas only 26 per cent of the offenders had served time in juvenile institutions and 55 per cent in jails or workhouses for periods of one month or longer, 47 per cent had spent time in state or federal reformatories and 46.4 per cent had spent time in federal or state penitentiaries, as shown in Tables 29 through 32 (Appendix I). When the contents of these tables are combined to form Table 33 (Appendix I), it can be seen that 88 per cent of the study population has spent time in some penal institution prior to their present incarceration. Almost half of the offenders (47.3 per cent) has served over three years while only seven per cent has served one to twelve months. It is clear, therefore, that this group of offenders has been exposed to the behavior pattern of those frequently in contact with law and legal institutions.

Parole Violators

As indicated in Table 34 (Appendix I), 83 per cent of the three hundred prisoners of the study population were admitted to the Ohio

¹³Reckless, op. cit., p. 27.

Penitentiary for the first time, while 17 per cent of the prisoners were returned to the Penitentiary as parole violators, having been there previously.

The writer found it impossible to compare his study population with the United States prison population or with the prison population of the state of Ohio. Neither the Federal Bureau of Prisons nor the Bureau of Statistics at the Ohio Department of Correction records statistics on prisoners by the background characteristics which were selected for this study. However, Table 4 constructed on the information given by the above Bureau of Statistics shows that the study population is fairly representative of the new admissions to the Ohio Penitentiary during 1961.

Attitudinal Variables

There are four major dependent variables incorporated in this study: socialization, morale, self-image of interpersonal competence and attitude toward law and legal institutions. The construction of a scale measuring attitude toward law and legal institutions was part of the main effort of this study. The reliability of the four inventories, including the law scale, as determined by the split-half technique is shown in Table 5.

1. Socialization. It has been suggested that lower-class values and norms are in conflict with the standards and laws of the middle-class society.¹⁴ Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the

¹⁴Albert K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang (Chicago: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1955), pp. 50-70.

TABLE 4. Background characteristics found in the study population and in all admissions to the Ohio Penitentiary during 1961.

Background Characteristics	Percentages	
	Study Population	New Admissions 1961
<u>RACE</u>		
White	66.7	64.0
Negro	33.3	36.0
<u>AGE</u>		
Median	33.9	31.8
<u>RELIGION</u>		
Protestant	73.7	80.0
Catholic	25.3	18.0
Other or none	1.0	2.0
<u>EDUCATION</u>		
1st - 4th grade	--	8.0
5th - 9th grade	49.3	56.0
10th - 16th grade	50.7	36.0
<u>I. Q. (OFCT)</u>		
Superior and bright normal	34.3	28.0
Normal and dull normal	65.7	52.0
Inferior and other	--	20.0
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>		
Single	26.3	28.0
Married	36.3	38.0
Separated, divorced, widower	37.4	34.0
<u>OCCUPATION</u>		
Professional	1.6	2.6
White-collar	6.7	4.6
Skilled	19.3	27.4
Semi-skilled	19.7	24.1
Unskilled	51.7	40.7
Unemployed	1.0	.6

TABLE 5. Reliability coefficients of scales, using split-half technique.^a

Scale	Coefficient
Socialization (Gough)	.80
Morale (Rundquist and Sletto)	.90
Self-image of interpersonal competence (Rothstein)	.63
Law	.94

^aReliability coefficients corrected for attenuation using Spearman-Brown prophecy formula.

offender's attitude toward law and legal institutions might be related to attitudes involved in the commonly accepted non-criminal values and norms. The Gough Socialization Scale was used in this study since it has repeatedly been shown to measure an individual's veering toward delinquency and criminal behavior. The range of scores for the entire study population was from 14 to 49; the mean was 27.94, the median 28.55 (Table 35, Appendix I). High scores indicate non-criminal attitudes. As indicated in Table 6, the sample of property offenders in this study did not differ significantly in terms of mean scores from other prison populations or non-delinquent groups.

2. Morale. Rundquist and Sletto found "a definite association between morale and attitude toward law and legal institutions." The coefficient between morale and law for the men in the controlled sample was .506; for the older men in the relief group, .572; for the high school boys, .126. "This is evidence," the authors concluded, "of the

necessity of maintaining the morale of unemployed men if favorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions are to be maintained."¹⁵

TABLE 6. Mean socialization scores of offenders and non-offenders.

Population	N	Mean
Present population	300	27.94
Ohio property offenders ^a	300	27.50
Ohio prisoners ^b	336	27.50
Ohio Reformatory for Women ^c	324	28.20
California prisoners ^d	117	27.76
Non-delinquents ^d	8,559	36.70

^aFradkin, op. cit., p. 37. ^bClark, op. cit., p. 36.

^cKay, op. cit., p. 36.

^dHarrison G. Gough, Manual of the California Psychological Inventory (Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1957), p. 25.

In view of the above findings, it is reasonable to think that the morale of offenders would be related to their attitudes toward law and legal institutions. The Morale Scale constructed by Rundquist and Sletto was used in this study. The range of scores for the study population was from 28 to 92 (see Table 36, Appendix I); the mean of 56.25 compares quite closely with the means of the various groups tested by the scale's creators.¹⁶ High scores indicate low morale.

¹⁵Rundquist and Sletto, op. cit., p. 149.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 199. Range of means was from 41.88 to 53.61

3. Self-Image of Interpersonal Competence. The range of scores for the entire study population on the interpersonal competence items was from one to eleven, the mean being 6.93 and the median 7.48 (see Table 37, Appendix I). High scores indicate favorable self-images of interpersonal competence of the offenders. A comparison of the findings of this study with those of Rothstein was not possible, since the two studies dealt with entirely different groups; moreover, the scale used to measure the offenders' self-images of interpersonal competence consisted of only eleven items of the sixty used by Rothstein.

4. Attitude toward Law and Legal Institutions. The thirty-item scale used to measure the offender's attitude toward law and legal institutions was constructed by the writer following the method described in Chapter II. The range of scores on this scale was from 39 to 138. The mean score was 96.69 and the median 97.57 (see Table 38, Appendix I). A low score indicates a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions. Since no similar studies with prison populations have been made, the writer has no way of comparing his findings.¹⁷

Intercorrelations between Scales

As indicated in Table 7, all correlations between the scores on the four inventories are moderately high and significant, except the correlation between the scores on the law scale and the scores on the eleven interpersonal competence items. The marked correlations were expected according to Hypothesis I. However, the low coefficient of correlation

¹⁷Ibid., p. 200. Range of means was from 46.06 to 52.09.

(-.13) between the scores on the law scale and the scores on the interpersonal competence items was not expected.

TABLE 7. Intercorrelations between scores on the four inventories, using Pearsonian correlations (N = 300).

Scale	1	2	3
1. Law			
2. Socialization (Gough)	-.40		
3. Morale (Rundquist and Sletto)	.55	.50	
4. Self-image of interpersonal competence (Rothstein)	-.13	.43	-.35

Note: The negative direction of certain of the correlations above is a function of the weighting of item responses.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS

This study focused mainly on the attitudes of prisoners toward law and legal institutions. The hypotheses formulated in Chapter I were concerned with the relation of such attitudes to other measures of the offenders' self-perceptions as well as with the variations in these attitudes and self-perceptions according to personal background characteristics.

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, a series of tests of significance were performed which seek to determine first of all whether any relationship exists between the offenders' attitudes toward law and legal institutions and their socialization, morale and self-image of interpersonal competence and secondly whether these four measures of self vary according to personal characteristics of the prisoners.

Hypothesis I. The offenders' attitudes toward law and legal institutions will be found to be related in expected directions to their socialization, morale and self-image of interpersonal competence.

According to Hypothesis I, high scores indicating unfavorable attitudes on the law scale will be associated with low scores on the socialization scale (unfavorable direction), with high scores on the morale scale (poor morale) and with low scores on the interpersonal competence

items (unfavorable self-image). Conversely, according to Hypothesis I, low scores on the law scale (designating favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions) will be associated with high scores on the socialization scale (favorable socialization), with low scores on the morale scale (high personal morale) and with high scores on the interpersonal competence items (favorable self-image of interpersonal competence).

The thirty items of the law scale are duplicated in Schedule E (Appendix III), the fifty-three items of the socialization scale are presented in Schedule A (Appendix III) along with the twenty-two items of the morale scale and the eleven items of interpersonal competence.

The intercorrelations between the scores on these four inventories are indicated in Table 8. The correlations are in the expected directions and all are significant. However, one correlation, that between law and interpersonal competence, which is significant and in the expected direction is too low to be accepted. All others are modest in degree, varying from .35 to .55. Were these correlations in the .70's or .80's, one might suspect that the four scales measure the same basic self-perceptions. It is to be preferred, of course, that these intercorrelations be in the .60's, since the scales would then explain a sizeable degree of the variability in the self-perceptions of the subjects in the sample. Intercorrelations from .35 to .55 are modest to the degree that only a small proportion of variability in the study population can be explained by any of the four inventories.

The four measures of self-perception overlap very little and tend to measure somewhat different components of self. Hypothesis I,

therefore, can only be partially and tentatively accepted. The findings under Hypothesis II indicate the extent to which variations in the scores on the four instruments follow the same pattern.

TABLE 8. Intercorrelations between scores on the four inventories, using Pearsonian correlation ($N = 300$).^a

Scale	1	2	3
1. Law			
2. Socialization (Gough)	-.40 ^b		
3. Morale (Rundquist and Sletto)	.55 ^b	-.50 ^b	
4. Interpersonal competence (Rothstein)	-.13 ^c	.43 ^b	-.35 ^b

^aRepetition of Table 7.

^bSignificant at .001 level of significance.

^cSignificant at .01 level of significance.

Hypothesis II. There is a significant difference in the mean scores of a scale which purports to measure attitudes toward law and legal institutions of various subgroups of the study population, namely, those based on personal background characteristics and amount of criminal history.

Since no studies have ever attempted to shed light on this proposition, there is no reason to believe that the personal and social background characteristics of the offenders are not related to their attitudes toward law and legal institutions. Recent studies of various self-attributes of prisoners have revealed significant relationships between the offenders' personal and socio-economic characteristics and measures of self-perception. Clark, for example, discovered that the self-perception which he designated as the prisoner's blame orientation (acceptance or rejection of blame for his last offense) was related to

intelligence, grade-level, steady employment at the time of the offense and number of arrests since 17 years of age.¹ Fradkin found that five out of sixteen self-concept items were significantly associated with the offenders' incarceration records.² Kay also found significant relationships between the self-perceptions of female offenders and their social background characteristics.³

The mean scores of the various subgroups of the three hundred prisoners of this study are given in Table 9 below along with the mean differences and critical ratios. As indicated in this table, seven out of fourteen subgroups according to background characteristics were found to be significantly different in their attitudes toward law and legal institutions. The mean score differences between five subgroups based on race, criminal record, time spent in a jail and/or workhouse, time spent in a reformatory, and time spent in penitentiaries were significant at the .01 level of significance; between two subgroups--those based on marital status and time spent in juvenile institutions--at the .05 level; between the first offenders and those who had committed two to three offenses, at the .001 level of significance. It is interesting to note that in only two out of eight subgroups based on personal characteristics were there significant mean score differences on the law scale, while five out of the six subgroups categorized by the amount of criminal history were significantly different in their mean scores.

¹Clark, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

²Fradkin, op. cit., pp. 48-49.

³Kay, op. cit., pp. 45-48.

The findings substantiate the claim that frequent and lengthy exposures to the "criminal" population of prisons foster an internalization of some of the attitudes commonly attributed to the "criminal culture." Actually, the six subgroups having to do with the amount or extensiveness of criminal record overlap a great deal with reference to determination of differential socialization.

TABLE 9. Section A: Mean law scale scores by subgroups of 300 male property offenders.^a

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R. ^b	P ^c
<u>RACE</u>					
1. White	200	94.50			
2. Negro	100	101.10	6.60	2.75	.01
<u>AGE</u>					
1. 21 - 30	106	99.13 (1-2)	2.50	.91	ns
2. 31 - 40	125	96.63 (1-3)	6.13	1.03	ns
3. 41 and over	69	93.00 (2-3)	3.59	1.22	ns
<u>RESIDENTIAL ORIGIN</u>					
1. On a farm or in the country	71	96.11 (1-2)	1.24	.32	ns
2. 2,500 - 50,000	56	94.87 (1-3)	1.40	.49	ns
3. 50,000 and over	173	97.51 (2-3)	2.64	.76	ns
<u>RELIGION</u>					
1. Protestant	221	95.92			
2. Catholic	76	98.25	2.33	.79	ns
<u>EDUCATION</u>					
1. 5th - 9th grade	148	98.26			
2. 10th - 16th grade	152	95.16	3.10	1.27	ns
<u>I. Q. (OPCT)</u>					
1. Superior and bright normal	103	97.34			
2. Normal and dull normal	197	96.35	.99	.39	ns

TABLE 9. Continued

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R.	P
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>					
1. Single	79	101.00 (1-2)	5.94	1.97	.05
2. Married	109	95.06 (1-3)	5.77	2.00	.05
3. Separated, divorced, widower	112	95.23 (2-3)	.17	.06	ns
<u>OCCUPATION</u>					
1. Professional, white-collar, skilled	83	96.22			
2. Semi-skilled, unskilled	214	96.71	.49	.18	ns
<u>CRIMINAL RECORD^d</u>					
1. First offenders	84	87.53 (1-2)	13.38	5.07	.001
2. 2 - 3 offenses	156	100.91 (1-3)	11.00	3.28	.01
3. 4 offenses and over	60	98.53 (2-3)	2.38	.83	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN JUVENILE INSTITUTION</u>					
1. None	222	95.34 (1-2)	3.26	.87	ns
2. 1 - 12 months	38	98.60 (1-3)	7.01	2.08	.05
3. 13 - 84 months	40	102.35 (2-3)	3.75	.81	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN JAIL AND/OR WORKHOUSE</u>					
1. None	135	92.17 (1-2)	7.53	3.09	.01
2. 1 - 12 months	142	99.70 (1-3)	12.44	2.89	.01
3. 13 - 72 months	23	104.61 (2-3)	4.91	1.15	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN REFORMATORY</u>					
1. None	159	93.63 (1-2)	7.59	2.82	.01
2. 12 - 24 months	86	101.22 (1-3)	4.82	1.48	ns
3. 25 months and over	55	98.45 (2-3)	2.77	.78	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN PENITENTIARIES</u>					
1. None	139	93.49 (1-2)	4.88	1.77	ns
2. 12 - 48 months	101	98.37 (1-3)	7.81	2.73	.01
3. 49 months and over	60	101.30 (2-3)	2.93	.93	ns
<u>PAROLE VIOLATIONS</u>					
1. None	249	95.95			
2. One and over	51	100.29	4.34	1.38	ns

TABLE 9. Continued; Section B: Mean law scale scores by extreme sub-groups.

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R.	P
<u>AGE^e</u>					
1. 21 - 30	106	99.13			
2. 31 and over	194	95.35	3.78	1.48	ns
<u>RESIDENTIAL ORIGIN</u>					
1. On a farm or in a city of 50,000	127	95.57			
2. In a city over 50,000	173	97.51	1.94	.78	ns
<u>I. Q. (OPCT)</u>					
1. Superior	40	100.04			
2. Dull normal	55	101.22	1.18	.27	ns
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>					
1. Single	79	101.00			
2. Married, separated, divorced, widower	221	95.14	5.86	2.24	.05
<u>OCCUPATION</u>					
1. Professional	5	97.60			
2. Unskilled	155	96.48	1.12	.25	ns
1. Professional and white- collar	25	97.60			
2. Skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled	172	96.71	.89	.18	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN JUVENILE INSTITUTIONS</u>					
1. None	222	95.34			
2. 1 - 84 months	78	100.52	5.18	1.93	ns

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

^bCritical ratio. ^cLevel of significance.

^dSee also correlation in Table 11.

^eSee also correlation in Table 10.

Hypothesis IIa. The Negro offenders have more unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions than the white offenders.

As indicated in Table 9 above, the mean score difference on the law scale between white and Negro subgroups was found to be significant at the .01 level. In other words, the Negro offenders' attitudes toward law and legal institutions are more unfavorable than those of the whites. The percentage distribution of the background characteristics in the study population as indicated in Table 10 below is fairly similar both for whites and Negroes with four exceptions: 18 per cent more Negroes grew up in cities of 50,000 or larger; 14 per cent more Negroes were affiliated with the Protestant faith; no Negro prisoners had education beyond high school; and the percentage of Negro offenders in the "dull normal" category of intelligence is 20.5 per cent higher than that of whites. However, these four background characteristics which seem to be unevenly distributed among the two groups apparently did not determine significant mean score differences in prisoners' attitudes toward law and legal institutions (see Table 9). Therefore, it may be safe to conclude that the Negro offenders' more unfavorable attitudes showing on the law scale may be attributed to a socialization resulting partly from their differential treatment by society. On the basis of the above findings, Hypothesis IIa is accepted.

On the other hand, one should note that the mean scores on the socialization scale, the morale scale and the interpersonal competence items are not significantly different for Negro and white prisoners (see Tables 13 - 15). Here we have an inconsistency, since all these measures show a slight degree of correlation in Table 8. Perhaps the

degree of correlation is not high enough between the scores on the law scale and the scores on the other instruments to predetermine a racial differential in three of the four self-perception measures if such a differential is established in one of the four. Moreover, the factor of racial discrimination in the legal process may be reflected in the Negro's attitude toward law and society which is not reflected in his self-perception gauged by the other three measures.

TABLE 10. Background characteristics and race of male property offenders.^a

Background Characteristics	White		Negro	
	Fre- quency	Per Cent	Fre- quency	Per Cent
<u>AGE</u>				
21 - 30 years	73	36.5	33	33.0
31 - 40 years	78	39.0	47	47.0
41 years and over	49	24.5	20	20.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>RESIDENTIAL ORIGIN</u>				
On a farm and in the country	56	28.0	17	17.0
2,500 - 10,000	42	21.0	14	14.0
50,000 and over	102	51.0	69	69.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>RELIGION</u>				
Protestant	138	69.0	83	83.0
Catholic	61	30.5	15	15.0
None	1	.5	2	2.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>EDUCATION</u>				
5th - 9th grade	99	49.5	49	49.0
10th - 12th grade	88	44.0	51	51.0
13th - 16th grade	13	6.5	0	0.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0

TABLE 10. Continued

Background Characteristics	White		Negro	
	Fre- quency	Per Cent	Fre- quency	Per Cent
<u>I. Q. (OPCT)</u>				
Superior and bright normal	83	41.5	20	20.0
Normal	94	47.0	48	48.0
Dull normal	23	11.5	32	32.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>				
Single	47	23.5	32	32.0
Married	71	35.5	38	38.0
Separated, divorced, widower	82	41.0	30	30.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>OCCUPATION</u>				
Professional, white-collar, skilled	63	31.5	20	20.0
Semi-skilled, unskilled	136	68.0	78	78.0
Unemployed	1	.5	2	2.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>CRIMINAL RECORD</u>				
First offenders	55	27.5	29	29.0
2 - 3 offenses	106	53.0	50	50.0
4 offenses and over	39	19.5	21	21.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>TIME SPENT IN A JUVENILE INSTITUTION</u>				
None	154	77.0	68	68.0
1 - 12 months	23	11.5	15	15.0
13 - 84 months	23	11.5	17	17.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>TIME SPENT IN JAIL AND/OR WORKHOUSE</u>				
None	98	49.0	37	37.0
1 - 12 months	88	44.0	54	54.0
13 - 72 months	14	7.0	9	9.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0

TABLE 10. Continued

Background Characteristics	White		Negro	
	Fre- quency	Per Cent	Fre- quency	Per Cent
<u>TIME SPENT IN REFORMATORIES</u>				
None	112	56.0	42	42.0
12 - 24 months	52	26.0	34	34.0
25 months and over	36	18.0	24	24.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>TIME SPENT IN PENITENTIARIES</u>				
None	90	45.0	49	49.0
12 - 48 months	65	32.5	36	36.0
49 months and over	45	22.5	15	15.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>TOTAL TIME SPENT IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS</u>				
None	26	13.0	10	10.0
1 - 6 months	20	10.0	12	12.0
7 - 12 months	2	1.0	2	2.0
13 - 24 months	67	33.5	35	35.0
25 - 72 months	53	26.5	31	31.0
73 months and over	32	16.0	10	10.0
Total	200	100.0	100	100.0
<u>PAROLE VIOLATIONS</u>				
None	140	80.4	73	81.1
One time or more	34	19.6	17	18.9
Total	174	100.0	90	100.0

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1962, to February 16, 1962.

Hypothesis IIb. The older the offender the more likely he is to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions.

The various behavior problems of a modern society are likely to show special age group differentials. In the United States, for example, the age group 20-24 contained in the prewar and postwar years the

highest number of reported arrests as well as the highest number of inmates admitted to prisons and reformatories from courts per unit of population.⁴ It has been suggested that involvement in delinquency and crime reaches its peak in late adolescence and young adulthood. Due to biological and sociological factors, older persons are more settled and stable. It is reasonable to hypothesize, therefore, that older offenders have a more favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions than the younger offenders.

To test this hypothesis, the study population was split into three age subgroups: 21-30 years of age, 31-40 and 41 years or older. A comparison of the mean scores on the law scale between the three groups revealed no significant differences (see Table 9, Section A); however, the mean score difference between the age groups 21-30 years old and 41 years or older appears to be of a very limited significance (mean difference 6.13 and critical ratio 1.93). A further testing of the hypothesis by dichotomizing the population into extreme groups of 21-30 years of age and 31 years or older again showed no significant difference in mean scores (see Table 9, Section B). Finally, using correlational analysis (see Table 11), age was not found to be significantly related to the offenders' attitudes toward law and legal institutions. In view of these findings, the second sub-hypothesis is rejected.

For comparison it is interesting to see that an age differential is apparent in socialization; an age differential although slight does stand out for the two subgroups of 21-30 years of age and 41 years or older. The mean score difference on the socialization scale of these

⁴Reckless, op. cit., p. 40.

two groups is significant at the .02 level (see Table 13, Section A). It is safe, therefore, to conclude that the older the offender the better his socialization. These findings are in agreement with those of previous studies of similar populations. Kay, for example, claims that "poor socialization is a more frequent attribute of the younger contingent of female offenders."⁵

Scores on the morale scale and the interpersonal competence items did not vary significantly by the age groups among the three hundred prisoners, as is seen in Table 11. Because of the statement by Rundquist and Sletto that "the morale scores of older men begin to deviate in the unfavorable direction,"⁶ the writer expected a significant difference in the mean scores on the morale scale between the two extreme age subgroups of prisoners; however, this was not apparent. A possible explanation is that the first weeks of incarceration affect the morale of all age groups equally (see Table 14, Section B). Likewise, mean score differences in age subgroups did not appear for interpersonal competence items (see Table 15, Section A).

TABLE 11. Intercorrelations between age and scores on the four inventories, using Pearsonian correlation.

Scale	Correlation Coefficient	Level of Significance
Socialization (Gough)	.179	.001
Morale (Rundquist and Sletto)	-.107	ns
Interpersonal competence (Rothstein)	.001	ns
Law	-.152	.005

⁵Kay, op. cit., p. 31.

⁶Rundquist and Sletto, op. cit., pp. 201-210.

TABLE 12. Intercorrelations between criminal record and scores on the four inventories, using Pearsonian correlation.

Scale	Correlation Coefficient	Level of Significance
Socialization (Gough)	-.183	.001
Morale (Rundquist and Sletto)	.122	.02
Interpersonal competence (Rothstein)	-.087	ns
Law	.146	.01

Note: None of the above correlations are of any importance. No more than three per cent of the variations in scale scores were a result of the criminal record.

TABLE 13. Section A: Mean socialization scale scores by subgroups of 300 male property offenders.^a

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R.	P
<u>RACE</u>					
1. White	200	27.80			
2. Negro	100	28.21	.41	.50	ns
<u>AGE</u>					
1. 21 - 30 years	106	26.89 (1-2)	1.04	1.21	ns
2. 31 - 40 years	125	27.93 (1-3)	2.67	2.44	.02
3. 41 years and over	69	29.56 (2-3)	1.63	1.57	ns
<u>RESIDENTIAL ORIGIN</u>					
1. On a farm and in the country	71	27.77 (1-2)	.43	.35	ns
2. 2,500 - 50,000	56	28.20 (1-3)	.14	.15	ns
3. 50,000 and over	173	27.91 (2-3)	.29	.27	ns
<u>RELIGION</u>					
1. Protestant	221	28.12			
2. Catholic	76	27.55	.56	.61	ns

TABLE 13. Continued

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R.	P
<u>EDUCATION</u>					
1. 5th - 9th grade	148	27.07			
2. 10th - 16th grade	152	28.78	1.71	2.22	.05
<u>I. Q. (OPCT)</u>					
1. Superior and bright normal	103	27.84	.14	.17	ns
2. Normal and dull normal	197	27.98			
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>					
1. Single	79	25.83 (1-2)	3.51	3.70	.001
2. Married	109	29.34 (1-3)	2.22	2.36	.02
3. Separated, divorced, widower	112	28.05 (2-3)	1.29	1.42	ns
<u>OCCUPATION</u>					
1. Professional, white-collar, skilled	83	28.51			
2. Semi-skilled, unskilled	214	27.64	.87	.88	ns
<u>CRIMINAL RECORD</u>					
1. First offenders	84	30.59 (1-2)	3.55	3.98	.001
2. 2 - 3 offenses	156	27.04 (1-3)	4.06	3.59	.001
3. 4 offenses and over	60	26.53 (2-3)	.49	.50	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN JUVENILE INSTITUTION</u>					
1. None	222	29.17 (1-2)	4.33	3.81	.001
2. 1 - 12 months	38	24.84 (1-3)	5.17	5.38	.001
3. 13 - 84 months	40	24.00 (2-3)	.84	.59	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN JAIL AND/OR WORKHOUSE</u>					
1. None	135	29.53 (1-2)	2.66	3.32	.001
2. 1 - 12 months	142	26.87 (1-3)	4.40	2.89	.01
3. 13 - 72 months	23	25.13 (2-3)	1.74	1.16	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN REFORMATORY</u>					
1. None	159	29.80 (1-2)	3.16	3.63	.001
2. 12 - 24 months	86	26.64 (1-3)	4.00	4.21	.001
3. 25 months and over	55	25.80 (2-3)	.84	.83	ns

TABLE 13. Continued

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R.	P
<u>TIME SPENT IN PENITENTIARIES</u>					
1. None	139	29.80 (1-2)	3.16	3.55	.001
2. 12 - 48 months	101	26.64 (1-3)	4.00	4.21	.001
3. 49 months and over	60	25.80 (2-3)	.84	.82	ns
<u>PAROLE VIOLATIONS</u>					
1. None	249	28.60			
2. One time or more	51	24.70	3.90	3.93	.001
 <u>Section B: Mean Socialization Scale Scores by Extreme Groups</u>					
<u>I. Q. (OPCT)</u>					
1. Superior	40	27.53			
2. Dull normal	55	27.17	.36	.25	ns
<u>OCCUPATION</u>					
1. Professional, white-collar	25	29.56			
2. Skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled	172	27.73	1.83	.93	ns
1. Professional	5	29.56			
2. Unskilled	155	27.64	1.92	.97	ns

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

Hypothesis IIc. Those prisoners with a childhood of rural or small town background are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions than the prisoners from big cities and industrial centers.

The study population was split into three groups: those reared on a farm or in the country, those reared in a town or city from 2,500 to 50,000 and those reared in a city over 50,000. As indicated in Table 9, Section A, the differences in the mean scores on the law scale by these

subgroups were found not to be significant. A further split of the sample into two groups--those who grew up on a farm or in a city up to 50,000 and those who grew up in a city over 50,000--gave no better results (see Table 9, Section B). The lack of a significant difference in the attitudes of these groups toward law and legal institutions may be due to the fact that some offenders who claim they grew up in rural areas might have lived for a number of years in urban areas where they "became sophisticated in criminal techniques, especially in regard to crimes against property."⁷ This reasoning is supported by Rundquist and Sletto's statement that "farmers' sons in urban environment score unfavorably on both the law and the morale scale."⁸ Regarding the sophistication of the rural offender in criminal techniques, Reckless writes:

If there is less sophistication in the commission of property offenses in rural areas, it would be due undoubtedly to an absence of a permeating criminal tradition or criminal culture. Again, if this is true, violators in rural areas would be much less apt to turn to property offenses as their outlet than violators in urban areas, who are confronted with much greater property opportunities and with a more permeating criminal sophistication.⁹

However, on the basis of the foregoing findings the third sub-hypothesis is rejected.

Regarding the other three measures, those of socialization, morale and self-image of interpersonal competence, again one should note that

⁷Marshall B. Clinard, "Rural Criminal Offenders," American Journal of Sociology, L, 1 (1944), 38-45.

⁸Rundquist and Sletto, op. cit., pp. 202-210.

⁹Reckless, op. cit., p. 66.

the mean scores on these scales are not significantly different for the rural-town-city subgroups (see Tables 13-15).

Hypothesis IIId. Those offenders who are closely identified with some religion are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions.

As indicated in Table 19 (Appendix I), almost 74 per cent of the offenders claimed affiliation with various Protestant denominations. Twenty-five and three-tenths per cent were classified as Roman Catholic, while only three prisoners claimed no or another religion. A comparison of the mean scores of these two religious groups on the law scale as well as on the three other measures, i.e., socialization, morale and self-image of interpersonal competence items, revealed no significant differences among them (see Tables 9, 13-15). The fourth sub-hypothesis, therefore, is rejected.

Although some early researchers found that Catholics are more prone to commit crimes than Protestants,¹⁰ recent studies have been unable to substantiate such a claim. The findings of this study also failed to discover any relationship between attitude toward law and professed religious affiliation.

Hypothesis IIe. The more educated prisoners are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions.

To test this hypothesis the study population was split into two groups: 5th-9th grade level attained in school and 10th-16th grade level. As indicated in Table 9, a comparison of the mean scores on the law scale by these subgroups failed to show any significant differences between them. This finding was not expected, since it has been

¹⁰Gustav Aschaffenburg, Crime and Its Repression, trans. Adalbert Albrecht (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1913).

suggested that education assists the adjustment of an individual to modern society. Rundquist and Sletto state that the "mean score in both scales, the law and the morale scale, for men with from 13 to 16 years of education is more favorable than for men with eighth-grade education or less."¹¹ Clark also found a significant relationship between the offenders' grade level and their blame orientation at the .01 level of confidence.¹² However, on the basis of the findings of this study, the fifth sub-hypothesis cannot be accepted.

On the other hand, the mean scores by subgroups based on grade completed in school are significantly different at the .05 level of significance for the socialization scale, at the .02 level for the morale scale and at the .02 level for the interpersonal competence items (see Tables 13-15). This inconsistency supports the view that the attitude toward law and legal institutions represents a separate self-component somewhat different from other measures of self-development and perhaps more specific to criminal experience.

Hypothesis II_f. The more intelligent prisoners are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions than the less intelligent prisoners.

Some researchers of prisoner samples found that "feeble-mindedness and high intelligence are equally important factors in criminal behavior."¹³ The findings of the present study are somewhat consistent with this contention.

¹¹Rundquist and Sletto, op. cit., p. 178.

¹²Clark, op. cit., pp. 49-50.

¹³Murchison, op. cit., pp. 37-95.

On the basis of their scores on the Ohio Penal Classification Test, the prisoners were split into two groups--those classified in the superior and bright normal intelligence range and those classified in the normal and dull normal intelligence range. As indicated in Table 9 (Section A), the mean scores on the law scale by these two subgroups are not significantly different. A further comparison of the extreme groups of the study population, those classified in the superior range of intelligence and those classified in the dull normal intelligence range, showed no significant difference in mean scores on the law scale (see Table 9, Section B). The sixth sub-hypothesis of the study is, therefore, rejected.

The mean scores of the above subgroups on the socialization, morale and self-image of interpersonal competence scales were found also not to be significantly different (see Tables 13-15, Section A). One may conclude, then, that attitudes toward law and other self-perceptions of prisoners do not vary with intelligence level.

Hypothesis IIg. The single prisoners are more likely to have an unfavorable attitude toward law and legal institutions.

In order to test this hypothesis, the study population was split into three subgroups: single, married, and separated, divorced or widowed. Table 9 (Section A) reveals a moderate difference in the mean scores on the law scale between the single and married subgroups as well as between the single and separated, divorced or widowed subgroups. This difference is significant at the .05 level. No significant difference was found in the mean scores on the law scale between the married and separated, divorced or widowed subgroups. The findings of this

study show, therefore, that the single offenders have a more unfavorable attitude toward law and legal institutions than the offenders who were married at the time of incarceration or who had previously been married. It may be concluded, then, that the marital status variable is moderately related to the attitude toward law and legal institution of the offender. Therefore, the above hypothesis is tentatively accepted.

Regarding the other three measures, socialization, morale and interpersonal competence items, the analysis revealed the following: There are differences in the mean scores on the socialization scale between the single and married subgroups as well as between the single and separated, divorced or widowed subgroups. These differences are significant at the .001 and .02 levels of confidence respectively (see Table 13, Section A). Similarly, as indicated in Table 14, Section A, the mean scores of these subgroups on the morale scale show differences significant at the .01 and .001 levels of confidence respectively. No difference in the mean scores on both scales (socialization and morale) was found between the married and separated, divorced or widowed subgroups. Finally, Table 15 (Section A) shows no difference in the mean scores on the interpersonal competence items between single and married subgroups or between the single and separated, divorced or widowed subgroups. However, a moderate difference significant at the .05 level of significance in the mean score on these items appears between the married and separated, divorced or widowed subgroups.

The above findings reveal that the marital status of the prisoners is associated in a fairly consistent manner with three components of self-development, i.e., attitude toward law, socialization and morale.

An explanation for the lack of difference in the mean scores on interpersonal competence items between marital status subgroups of prisoners is not immediately apparent.

The findings of the study at this point are somewhat in agreement with the findings of Rundquist and Sletto who state that the single, married and divorced persons do not differ strikingly on the morale and law scale.¹⁴

TABLE 14. Section A: Mean morale scale scores by subgroups of 300 male property offenders.^a

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R.	P
<u>RACE</u>					
1. White	200	55.65			
2. Negro	100	57.45	1.80	1.28	ns
<u>AGE</u>					
1. 21 - 30 years	106	57.33 (1-2)	1.35	.82	ns
2. 31 - 40 years	125	55.98 (1-3)	2.25	1.26	ns
3. 41 years and over	69	55.08 (2-3)	.90	.55	ns
<u>RESIDENTIAL ORIGIN</u>					
1. On a farm and in the country	71	55.77 (1-2)	2.59	1.21	ns
2. 2,500 - 50,000	56	58.36 (1-3)	.00	.00	--
3. 50,000 and over	173	55.77 (2-3)	2.59	1.37	ns
<u>RELIGION</u>					
1. Protestant	221	55.89			
2. Catholic	76	57.21	1.32	.77	ns
<u>EDUCATION</u>					
1. 5th - 9th grade	148	57.40			
2. 10th - 16th grade	152	53.04	4.36	2.35	.02

¹⁴Rundquist and Sletto, op. cit., p. 178.

TABLE 14. Continued

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R.	P
<u>I. Q. (OPCT)</u>					
1. Superior and bright normal	103	56.62			
2. Normal and dull normal	197	56.06	.56	.42	ns
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>					
1. Single	79	60.57 (1-2)	5.71	3.19	.01
2. Married	109	54.80 (1-3)	6.01	3.47	.001
3. Separated, divorced, widower	112	54.56 (2-3)	.30	.19	ns
<u>OCCUPATION</u>					
1. Professional, white-collar, skilled	83	54.70			
2. Semi-skilled, unskilled	214	56.85	2.15	1.34	ns
<u>CRIMINAL RECORD^b</u>					
1. First offenders	84	52.77 (1-2)	4.45	2.95	.01
2. 2 - 3 offenses	156	57.22 (1-3)	5.83	2.91	.01
3. 4 offenses and over	60	58.60 (2-3)	1.38	.72	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN JUVENILE INSTITUTION</u>					
1. None	222	54.85 (1-2)	2.28	1.00	ns
2. 1 - 12 months	38	57.13 (1-3)	8.35	3.81	.001
3. 13 - 84 months	40	63.20 (2-3)	6.07	2.97	.01
<u>TIME SPENT IN JAIL AND OR/WORKHOUSE</u>					
1. None	135	53.64 (1-2)	4.61	3.26	.01
2. 1 - 12 months	142	58.25 (1-3)	5.61	2.38	.02
3. 13 - 72 months	23	59.25 (2-3)	1.00	.42	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN REFORMATORY</u>					
1. None	159	54.33 (1-2)	5.03	3.01	.01
2. 12 - 24 months	86	59.36 (1-3)	2.61	1.45	ns
3. 25 months and over	55	56.94 (2-3)	2.42	1.14	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN PENITENTIARIES</u>					
1. None	139	55.64 (1-2)	.02	.01	ns
2. 12 - 48 months	101	55.62 (1-3)	3.09	1.83	ns
3. 49 months and over	60	58.73 (2-3)	3.11	1.65	ns

TABLE 14. Continued

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff. C.R.	P
<u>PAROLE VIOLATIONS</u>				
1. None	249	56.05		
2. One time and over	51	57.21	1.16 .77	ns
<u>Section B: Mean Morale Scale Scores by Extreme Subgroups</u>				
<u>AGE^c</u>				
1. 21 - 30 years	106	57.33		
2. 31 years and over	194	55.66	1.67 1.11	ns
<u>RESIDENTIAL ORIGIN</u>				
1. On a farm and in a city up to 50,000	127	55.77		
2. In a city over 50,000	173	56.40	.63 .43	ns
<u>I. Q. (OPCT)</u>				
1. Superior	40	57.90		
2. Dull normal	55	58.21	.31 .12	ns
<u>OCCUPATION</u>				
1. Professional	5	56.11		
2. Unskilled	155	57.42	1.32 .33	ns
1. Professional, white-collar	25	56.85		
2. Skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled	172	57.42	.57 .16	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN PENITENTIARIES</u>				
1. None	139	55.64		
2. 12 months or over	161	56.78	1.14 .80	ns

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

^bSee also correlation in Table 11.

^cSee also correlation in Table 11.

Hypothesis IIh. Those prisoners who have an established career or field of occupation are more likely to have a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions than prisoners who are unskilled or semi-skilled workers.

Criminologists and sociologists have suggested that unskilled workers of modern urban society are much more likely to be involved in crime, because they have fewer resources and less influence than members of the middle and upper classes.¹⁵ On the basis of this statement, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the unskilled or semi-skilled workers of the study population are more likely to have unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions than the offenders who are classified as professional, white-collar workers or skilled workers.

For the testing of this hypothesis, the study population was split into two groups--professional, white-collar, skilled and the semi-skilled and unskilled. Comparison of the mean scores on the law scale by these subgroups showed no significant difference. A further comparison of the mean scores of the extreme subgroups of professional and unskilled offenders revealed no significant difference (see Table 9). The hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.

As indicated in Tables 13 - 15, the mean scores of the above subgroups on the other three inventories, i.e., socialization, morale and interpersonal competence items, showed no significant difference. Obviously attitudes of prisoners toward law and other self-perceptions of prisoners are not associated with occupational level.

¹⁵For a discussion of this, see W. G. Bonger, Criminality and Economic Conditions, trans. Henry P. Horton (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1916), pp. 420-447; Reckless, op. cit., p. 34.

These findings were not expected, since unskilled workers in an urban society are usually the victims of unemployment and poverty. Moreover, Rundquist and Sletto found that occupational security of their study groups differentiated the showing of male subjects on the morale and law scale.¹⁶ A possible explanation for these unexpected findings may lie in the fact that practically all the prisoners in the sample had been employed at the time of their offense. Further research on the employment history of the prisoners is needed to confirm present findings.

TABLE 15. Section A: Mean interpersonal competence items scores by subgroups of 300 male property offenders.^a

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R.	P
<u>RACE</u>					
1. White	200	17.02			
2. Negro	100	16.77	.25	.92	ns
<u>AGE</u>					
1. 21 - 30 years	106	16.89 (1-2)	.00	.00	--
2. 31 - 40 years	125	16.89 (1-3)	.18	.43	ns
3. 41 years and over	69	17.07 (2-3)	.18	.49	ns
<u>RESIDENTIAL ORIGIN</u>					
1. On a farm and in the country	71	17.22 (1-2)	.49	1.22	ns
2. 2,500 - 50,000	56	16.73 (1-3)	.44	1.37	ns
3. 50,000 and over	173	16.88 (2-3)	.15	.43	ns
<u>RELIGION</u>					
1. Protestant	221	17.05			
2. Catholic	76	16.64	.41	1.28	ns

¹⁶Rundquist and Sletto, op. cit., pp. 202-210.

TABLE 15. Continued

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff.	C.R.	P
<u>EDUCATION</u>					
1. 5th - 9th grade	148	17.20			
2. 10th - 16th grade	152	16.67	.53	2.04	.02
<u>I. Q. (OPCT)</u>					
1. Superior and bright normal	103	16.97			
2. Normal and dull normal	197	16.92	.50	1.62	ns
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>					
1. Single	79	16.72 (1-2)	.65	1.86	ns
2. Married	109	17.43 (1-3)	.22	.63	ns
3. Separated, divorced, widower	112	16.56 (2-3)	.87	2.30	.05
<u>OCCUPATION</u>					
1. Professional, white-collar, skilled	83	17.23			
2. Semi-skilled, unskilled	214	16.80	.43	1.38	ns
<u>CRIMINAL RECORD</u>					
1. First offenders	84	17.17 (1-2)	.24	.80	ns
2. 2 - 3 offenses	156	16.93 (1-3)	.54	1.35	ns
3. 4 offenses and over	60	16.93 (2-3)	.30	.83	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN JUVENILE INSTITUTION</u>					
1. None	222	17.14 (1-2)	.27	.63	ns
2. 1 - 12 months	38	16.87 (1-3)	.29	.93	ns
3. 13 - 84 months	40	15.85 (2-3)	.02	.04	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN JAIL AND/OR WORKHOUSE</u>					
1. None	135	17.14 (1-2)	.27	.96	ns
2. 1 - 12 months	142	16.87 (1-3)	1.01	1.87	ns
3. 13 - 72 months	23	16.13 (2-3)	.74	1.34	ns
<u>TIME SPENT IN REFORMATORY</u>					
1. None	159	17.11 (1-2)	.30	.91	ns
2. 12 - 24 months	86	16.81 (1-3)	.48	1.37	ns
3. 25 months and over	55	16.63 (2-3)	.18	.44	ns

TABLE 15. Continued

Background Characteristics	N	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{X}$ Diff. C. R.	P
<u>TIME SPENT IN PENITENTIARIES</u>				
1. None	139	17.21 (1-2)	.55 1.72	ns
2. 12 - 48 months	101	16.66 (1-3)	.46 1.31	ns
3. 49 months and over	60	16.72 (2-3)	.09 .23	ns
<u>PAROLE VIOLATIONS</u>				
1. None	249	17.05		
2. One time and over	51	16.39	.66 1.88	ns

Section B: Mean Interpersonal Competence Items Scores by Extreme Groups

I. Q. (OPCT)

1. Superior	40	17.20		
2. Dull normal	55	16.36	.84 1.71	ns

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

Hypothesis IIIi. Prisoners who have a long history of criminal involvement (arrests, institutionalization, etc.) are more likely to have unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions than prisoners with less history of involvement.

A review of relevant literature strengthened the writer's belief that the amount of criminal history of the offenders, the number of offenses committed and time spent in correctional institutions, are related to their attitudes toward law and legal institutions. In other words, prisoners with a long history of criminal involvement are more likely to have less favorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions than first offenders or offenders with a small amount of incarceration.

To test this hypothesis the study population was split into three groups: first offenders, those who committed two to three felony offenses and those who committed four or more felony offenses. Using

history of incarceration, the following subgroups were formed: those who had spent time in a juvenile institution, those who had spent time in a jail and/or workhouse, those who had spent time in an adult reformatory and those who had spent time in penitentiaries. Two more sets of subgroups were formed on the basis of whether these offenders were new admissions to the Ohio Penitentiary or were parole violators.

The mean scores on the law scale by subgroups based on the number of felonies committed along with the mean differences and critical ratios are shown in Table 9 (Section A). A comparison of these mean scores revealed differences in these scores between the first offenders and those who had committed two to three offenses as well as the first offenders and those who had committed four offenses or more. These differences are significant at the .001 and .01 levels respectively. No significant difference was found in the mean scores on the law scale between the offenders who had committed two to three offenses and those who had committed four or more. It is interesting to note, however, that the mean score of the prisoners who had committed two to three offenses is higher than those who had committed four offenses or more. This may be due to the fact that these men are still refusing to accept their status and are projecting the blame for their criminal involvement onto officials of society.

For further testing of this hypothesis, correlational analysis was used. As indicated in Table 12, the scores on the law scale were only slightly but significantly related to the number of felonies committed.

Regarding the association of the offender's history of incarceration with attitude toward law and legal institutions, the analysis of

the scores on the law scale as shown in Table 9 revealed the following: The mean score on the law scale for the prisoners who had spent no time in juvenile institutions was not found to be significantly different from the mean score of those who had spent one to twelve months there but was found to be moderately different from the mean score of offenders who had spent thirteen months or more in such an institution. This difference is significant at the .05 level. Also, no significant difference was found between the mean scores on the law scale for the prisoners who had spent one to twelve months in a juvenile institution and those who had spent thirteen months or more. Finally, a comparison of the mean scores on the law scale by the extreme groups, those prisoners who had not spent any time in a juvenile institution and those who had spent time from one month and over, revealed no significant difference (see Table 9, Section B).

Secondly, differences were found between the mean scores on the law scale for prisoners who had not spent any time in a jail and/or workhouse and those who had spent one to twelve months and also between those who had spent no time in jail and those who had spent thirteen months or more there. These differences were found to be significant at the .01 level. Again, no significant difference was found in the mean scores on the law scale for the offenders who had spent one to twelve months in a jail and/or workhouse and those who had spent thirteen months or more (see Table 9).

Thirdly, a moderate difference was found between the mean scores on the law scale for prisoners who had not spent any time in a reformatory and those who had spent up to two years' time. This difference

was significant at the .01 level. However, here we have an unexpected situation--no significant difference was found between the scores on the law scale for prisoners who had not spent any time in a reformatory and those who had spent more than two years. Moreover, the mean score on the law scale for the offenders who had spent one to two years' time is higher than the mean score of those who had spent more than two years' time. This last finding may be attributed again to the fact that these young men are still refusing to accept their status and are projecting the blame for their criminal career onto official society. As expected, no significant difference was found between the scores on the law scale by the offenders who had not spent any time in a reformatory and those who had spent two years' time or more.

Fourthly, the mean score difference between the prisoners who had spent no previous time in penitentiaries and those who had spent one to two years were not significant, while a difference significant at the .01 level of significance was found in the mean scores for the prisoners who had not spent any time in penitentiaries and those who had served over four years. Again, no significant difference was found in the mean scores for prisoners who had spent one to four years' time in penitentiaries and the mean score of those who had spent four years or more.

Finally, the mean score difference for the non-parole violator prisoners and the prisoners returned to prison as parole violators was not found to be significant. This finding is accounted for by the fact that the majority of the non-parole violator prisoners had spent time in another penal institution or even at the Ohio Penitentiary but they were not considered parole violators.

In five out of the six subgroups of the study population based on the amount of criminal history, there were significant mean score differences on the law scale. The findings of this study substantiate Reckless' statement that "some adult offenders' hostile attitude toward society develop later in life as a result of experience with police, courts, and prisons." In view of the foregoing findings, the last hypothesis of this study is accepted.

In regard to the variation in the mean scores of socialization, morale and interpersonal competence of the prisoners according to amount of criminal history, the following findings are indicated in Tables 13-15: In all six subgroups of the study population when categorized by the amount of criminal history of the offenders there were significant mean score differences on the socialization scale. As indicated in Table 13 (Section A), these differences were found to be significant at the .001 and .01 levels. Using the correlational analysis, the criminal record variable--the number of felonies committed by the prisoner--was found to be only slightly related to the prisoner's socialization, although the correlation was found to be significant at the .001 level (see Table 12).

In four out of the above six subgroups, those based on the criminal record, time spent in juvenile institutions, time spent in a jail and/or workhouse, and time spent in a reformatory, there were significant mean score differences on the morale scale. These differences shown in Table 14 (Section A) were found to be significant at the .001, .01 and .02 levels of significance. The correlational analysis also showed a slight relationship between the criminal record, i.e., number of felonies

committed by the offenders, and their morale. This correlation was found significant at the .02 level (see Table 12).

Again, the mean score on the morale scale for the offenders who had spent one to two years in a reformatory was found to be higher than the mean score of those who had spent over two years' time. The explanation given for the mean score difference on the law scale by these two subgroups may also apply here. Another unexpected finding is that no significant differences were found in the mean scores on the morale scale by subgroups based on time spent in penitentiaries. Perhaps the morale of these prisoners had already been unfavorably influenced by their previous incarceration in correctional institutions other than penitentiaries.

Finally, as indicated in Table 15 (Section A), in none of the six subgroups based on the amount of criminal history was there any significant mean scores difference on the interpersonal competence items. Since in only two subgroups of the study population, those based on education and marital status, were there moderate mean score differences on the interpersonal competence items, it is safe to assume that these items do not comprise a proper instrument for the measurement of this self-component of adult prisoners. Such a claim is supported by the fact that correlational analysis also showed that the criminal record of the offenders, i.e., number of felonies committed, and the scores on interpersonal competence items is not significant (see Table 12).

In general, then, the attitude toward law and legal institutions of prisoners varies somewhat by racial, marital status and criminal

history subgroups and not by other personal characteristics. While there is a modest relationship between scores on the law scale and those on socialization, morale and interpersonal competence, the subgroup variation of scores on socialization and morale followed reasonably closely the subgroup variation on the law scale. The scores on the interpersonal competence items have practically no subgroup variation among the prisoners.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The main purpose of this study was to measure the attitudes of adult property offenders toward law and legal institutions. Criminologists and sociologists have tended to neglect this self-dimension of prisoners which is tantamount to acceptance or rejection of the dominant legal norms of society. Secondly, the study attempted to discover to what extent prisoners' attitudes toward law and legal institutions varied by personal background characteristics. The study tried also to determine whether prisoners' attitudes toward law and legal institutions are related to other self-measures such as socialization, morale and interpersonal competence. Finally, an effort was made to see to what extent socialization, morale and interpersonal competence varied by subgroups of prisoners based on personal background characteristics.

Summary of Research

Data used in this study were gathered from the case records and from the schedule responses of a group of three hundred male property offenders consecutively admitted to the Ohio Penitentiary between November 29, 1961, and February 16, 1962. For the measurement of the prisoner's socialization, morale and interpersonal competence, three inventories developed by Gough, Rundquist and Sletto, and Rothstein,

respectively, were used. The attitudes of the prisoners toward law and legal institutions was measured by a thirty-item scale constructed by the writer according to the scale value difference technique.

The relationship between the offenders' attitudes toward law and legal institutions, socialization, morale and interpersonal competence and background characteristics was determined mainly by significant mean score differences of the subgroups, partly by correlation between sets of scores and quantified personal variables. Interrelationships between the scores on the four inventories were established by linear correlation.

Major Findings

The property offenders included in the sample were found to have the following general characteristics: they were over-represented in number of Negroes; the majority of them were under 35 years of age and had a median age of 33.95; more than 80 per cent had normal or better intelligence; almost 90 per cent had attended or graduated from high school; more than two-thirds had previously been married, and of these, more than half were either divorced or separated at the time of incarceration; 74 per cent claimed affiliation with the Protestant faith; nearly 40 per cent reported being reared on a farm or in a small town; more than half were unskilled workers; one-third of the group was sentenced for the crime of burglary; although 56 per cent had no contacts with police or court authorities as juveniles, the majority of them had been arrested three or more times since adulthood; 12 per cent had

never been previously incarcerated, while more than one-third had been for two years and the others from three to fifteen years.

An examination of the mean scores on the law scale according to the various subgroups of prisoners revealed that significant differences appeared only in the subgroups based on race, marital status and criminal involvement (criminal record and time spent in correctional institutions). Further analysis showed that the offenders' socialization was significantly related to age, education, marital status and criminal involvement; their morale, to education, marital status and criminal involvement; interpersonal competence to educational level only.

Finally, the intercorrelations between the scores on the four inventories--the law scale, the socialization scale, the morale scale, and the interpersonal competence items--were found to be low but statistically significant, varying in expected directions from .35 to .55 (with one coefficient at .13).

Conclusions

Although the findings from an initial pilot project such as this study should not be considered conclusive, certain conclusions seem justified.

1. The attitudes of adult male property offenders toward law and legal institutions seem to be moderately associated in expected directions with their socialization and morale. The better socialized prisoner and the prisoner with high personal morale have more favorable attitudes.

2. The attitudes of these property offenders toward law and legal institutions are not related and do not vary with most of their personal background characteristics.

3. Attitudes of prisoners toward law and legal institutions vary according to racial subgroups. The Negro property offender's attitude is more unfavorable than that of the white offender. This finding is consistent with sociological conclusions that the Negro has a "special culture pattern" and that official society discriminates against him.

4. The prisoners' attitudes toward law and legal institutions vary with marital status. The single offenders have a more unfavorable attitude than the married, separated or divorced offenders.

5. Attitude toward law and legal institutions varies somewhat with the criminal record, i.e., the number of felonies committed. First offenders have less unfavorable attitudes than recidivists. However, the correlation of scores on the law scale with extent of felony record was found to be low but significant.

6. Prisoners' attitudes toward law and legal institutions vary somewhat with the length of time they had been exposed to correctional and penal institutions. The longer the correctional experience, the more unfavorable the attitude. This finding gives some support to Sutherland's contention that criminality is a function of duration of contact with offenders.¹

¹Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1947), pp. 3-9. In his "differential association" theory of criminal behavior, Sutherland points out the importance of the frequency, priority, duration and intensity of contacts with delinquents and criminals.

7. Attitudes toward law and legal institutions apparently represent a separate self-component among prisoners. It is only modestly correlated with direction of socialization and height of personal morale; it has hardly any connection with interpersonal competence. Subgroup mean scores on the law scale vary just about as modestly as subgroup mean scores on the socialization and the morale scales. With the exception of grade completed in school, interpersonal competence did not vary with prisoner subgroups.

This study, while yielding some definite conclusions, is exploratory. As noted in Chapter I, there have been attempts to assess various attributes of prisoners but practically no research has been done to measure their attitudes toward law and legal institutions; this would appear, then, to be the first effort in that direction.

Implications for Further Application

There is significant evidence to continue the exploration of attitudes toward law and legal institutions of male versus female offenders, juvenile versus adult offenders, probation versus committed cases, offenders against the person versus offenders against property, short sentence (jail and workhouse) versus long sentence (prison) cases, and so forth. There is a strong suspicion that attitudes toward law and legal institutions would vary by subgroups of civilian workers as compared with prisoner subgroups of similar occupational level.

Further exploration needs to be made as to whether there is any relationship between attitude toward law and personality traits. It is suspected that the thirty items comprising the law scale (attitudes

toward law and legal institutions) are highly correlated with some individual variables, since the scale value differences of these thirty items was very high, having critical ratios of 7.80 and 13.72. This study merely senses that there are personality traits and/or self-components behind the individual variability in attitudes toward law and legal institutions.

The social importance of the present study of prisoners will lie in identifying the particular groups of male offenders in a maximum security prison such as the Ohio Penitentiary that have more unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions and in discovering whether these groups of prisoners can be re-socialized in terms of better attitudes. If institutional treatment is able to retrain prisoners, then programs of retraining should be directed toward helping the prisoner internalize the values and legal norms of society.

Property offenders seem to be a good risk for experiment in adult social re-education. As Clark points out, "the common property offenders are willing to admit blame for their offenses more often than personal offenders." The fact that in spite of this they still continue their criminal activity "suggests that in their cultural setting such behaviors are interpreted as justifiable or accepted."² Group therapy if properly used might affect their values and attitudes.

²Clark, op. cit., pp. 71-72.

APPENDIX I

TABLES

TABLE 16. Race of 300 male property offenders.^a

Race	Frequency	Percentage
Total	300	100.0
White	200	66.7
Negro	100	33.3

TABLE 17. Age of 300 male property offenders.^a

Age	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
61 and over	1	.3	100.0
56 - 60	3	1.0	99.7
51 - 55	5	1.7	98.7
46 - 50	11	3.7	97.0
41 - 45	49	16.3	93.3
36 - 40	50	16.7	77.0
31 - 35	75	25.0	60.3
26 - 30	70	23.3	35.3
21 - 25	36	12.0	12.0

Mean = 34.80

Median = 33.95

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961,
to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 18. Residential area (in which they "grew up as a boy") of 300 male property offenders.^a

Residential Origin	Frequency	Percentage
Total	300	100.0
Farm	50	16.7
Rural non-farm	21	7.0
Village	22	7.3
Town	34	11.3
Small city	29	9.7
City	144	48.0

TABLE 19. Religious preferences of 300 male property offenders.^a

Religion	Frequency	Percentage
Total	300	100.0
Protestant	221	73.7
Catholic	76	25.3
Other or none	3	1.0

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 20. Grade-level attained through formal education of 300 male property offenders.^a

Grade Level	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
16	5	1.7	100.0
15	-	-	-
14	6	2.0	98.3
13	2	.7	96.3
10 - 12	139	46.3	95.6
7 - 9	129	43.0	49.3
5 - 6	19	6.3	6.3

TABLE 21. Scores on the Ohio Penal Classification Test of 300 male property offenders.^a

Scores	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
Superior (125 and over)	40	13.3	100.0
Bright normal (110 - 124)	63	21.0	86.7
Normal (90 - 109)	142	47.4	65.7
Dull normal (80 - 89)	55	18.3	18.3

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 22. Marital Status of 300 male property offenders.^a

Marital Status	Frequency	Per Cent
Total	300	100.0
Single	79	26.3
Married	109	36.3
Separated	35	11.7
Divorced	74	24.7
Widower	3	1.0

TABLE 23. Type of occupation at time of offense of 300 male property offenders.^a

Type of Occupation	Frequency	Per Cent
Total	300	100.0
Professional	5	1.6
White-collar	20	6.7
Skilled	58	19.3
Semi-skilled	59	19.7
Unskilled laborer	155	51.7
Unemployed	3	1.0

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 24. Number of arrests under 18 years of age of 300 male property offenders.^a

Number of Arrests	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
Over 10	9	3.0	100.0
6 - 10	15	5.0	97.0
3 - 5	38	12.7	92.0
1 - 2	70	23.3	79.3
None	168	56.0	56.0

TABLE 25. Number of arrests after 17 years of age of 300 male property offenders.^a

Number of Arrests	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
Over 10	50	16.7	100.0
6 - 10	58	19.3	83.3
3 - 5	108	36.0	64.0
1 - 2	84	28.0	28.0

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 26. Total number of arrests of 300 male property offenders.^a

Number of Arrests	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
Over 10	73	24.3	100.0
6 - 10	67	22.3	75.7
3 - 5	98	32.7	53.4
1 - 2	62	20.7	20.7

TABLE 27. Number of felonies for which commitment had been made to a prison for 300 male property offenders.^a

Number of Felonies	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
8	2	.7	100.0
7	1	.3	99.3
6	9	3.0	99.0
5	20	6.7	96.0
4	28	9.3	89.3
3	57	19.0	80.0
2	99	33.0	61.0
1	84	28.0	28.0

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1962, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 28. Number of times previously incarcerated of 300 male property offenders.^a

Number of Times	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
7	5	1.6	100.0
6	8	2.7	98.4
5	16	5.3	95.7
4	29	9.7	90.4
3	50	16.7	80.7
2	67	22.3	64.0
1	89	29.7	41.7
0	36	12.0	12.0

TABLE 29. Length of time spent in juvenile correctional institution by 300 male property offenders.^a

Length of Time	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
7 years and over	1	.3	100.0
5 - 6 years	2	.7	99.7
3 - 4 years	16	5.3	99.0
1 - 2 years	21	7.0	93.7
7 - 12 months	18	6.0	86.7
1 - 6 months	20	6.7	80.7
None	222	74.0	74.0

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 30. Length of time spent in jail and/or workhouse by 300 male property offenders.^a

Length of Time	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
5 - 6 years	1	.3	100.0
3 - 4 years	5	1.6	99.7
1 - 2 years	17	5.7	98.1
7 - 12 months	29	9.7	92.4
1 - 6 months	113	37.7	82.7
None ^b	135	45.0	45.0

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1962, to February 16, 1962.

^bTime served less than one month considered as none.

TABLE 31. Length of time spent in state or federal reformatory by 300 male property offenders.^a

Length of Time	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
11 years and over	3	1.0	100.0
9 - 10 years	1	.3	99.0
7 - 8 years	2	.7	98.7
5 - 6 years	16	5.3	98.0
3 - 4 years	33	11.0	92.7
1 - 2 years	86	28.7	81.7
None	159	53.0	53.0

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 32. Length of time spent in state or federal penitentiary by 300 male property offenders.^a

Length of Time	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
11 years and over	22	7.3	100.0
9 - 10 years	9	3.0	92.7
7 - 8 years	10	3.3	89.7
5 - 6 years	19	6.3	86.4
3 - 4 years	47	15.7	80.1
1 - 2 years	54	18.0	64.4
None	139	46.4	46.4

TABLE 33. Total amount of time spent in correctional institutions by 300 male property offenders.^a

Length of Time	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
73 months and over	42	14.0	100.0
25 - 72 months	84	28.0	86.0
13 - 24 months	102	34.0	58.0
7 - 12 months	4	1.3	24.0
1 - 6 months	32	10.7	22.7
None	36	12.0	12.0

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 34. Number of times of parole violation by 300 male property offenders.^a

Number of Times	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
5 and over	1	.3	100.0
2 - 4	11	3.7	99.7
1	39	13.0	96.0
None	249	83.0	83.0

TABLE 35. Socialization scale scores of 300 male property offenders.^a

Scores	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
45 - 49	1	.3	100.0
40 - 44	14	4.7	99.7
35 - 39	40	13.3	95.0
30 - 34	72	24.0	81.7
25 - 29	80	26.7	57.7
20 - 24	60	20.0	31.0
14 - 19	33	11.0	11.0

Mean = 27.94

Median = 28.55

^a Admitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 36. Morale scale scores of 300 male property offenders.^a

Scores	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
88 - 92	4	1.3	100.0
83 - 87	4	1.3	98.7
78 - 82	7	2.3	97.4
73 - 77	14	4.7	95.1
68 - 72	20	6.7	90.4
63 - 67	42	14.0	83.7
58 - 62	39	13.0	69.7
53 - 57	42	14.0	56.7
48 - 52	53	17.7	42.7
43 - 47	43	14.3	25.0
38 - 42	18	6.0	10.7
33 - 37	11	3.7	4.7
28 - 32	3	1.0	1.0

Mean = 56.25

Median = 55.60

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 37. Interpersonal competence items scores of 300 male property offenders.^a

Scores	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
11	20	6.7	100.0
10	27	9.0	93.3
9	34	11.3	84.3
8	48	16.0	73.0
7	40	13.3	57.0
6	44	14.7	43.7
5	39	13.0	29.0
4	26	8.7	16.0
3	15	5.0	7.3
2	6	2.0	2.3
1	1	.3	.3

Mean = 6.93

Median = 7.48

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

TABLE 38. Law scale scores of 300 male property offenders.^a

Scores	Frequency	Per Cent	Cumulative Per Cent
Total	300	100.0	100.0
129 - 138	17	5.7	100.0
119 - 128	36	12.0	94.3
109 - 118	42	14.0	82.3
99 - 108	49	16.3	68.3
89 - 98	42	14.0	52.0
79 - 88	51	17.0	38.0
69 - 78	34	11.3	21.0
59 - 68	20	6.7	9.7
49 - 58	7	2.3	3.0
39 - 48	2	.7	.7

Mean = 96.69

Median = 97.57

^aAdmitted to the Ohio Penitentiary, November 29, 1961, to February 16, 1962.

APPENDIX II
QUALITY OF SCALES

QUALITY OF SCALES

Validity

Validity of a scale is that quality which testifies that the scale measures what it is supposed to measure.

The Socialization Scale (SO Gough) has been repeatedly tested for its validity; the scores by various criterion groups, as shown in Table 39 below, have been found to vary in the right direction.

TABLE 39. Cross-validating data for the socialization scale of the California Psychological Inventory.^a

Samples	N	M	S.D.
Nominated high school "best citizens"	90	39.44	4.95
Banking executives	121	39.00	4.59
City school officials	200	37.58	4.19
Business executives	116	37.47	4.72
College students	1745	37.41	5.28
Correctional officers	620	36.72	5.47
High school students	4474	36.46	5.95
Military officers	495	36.38	4.74
Semi-skilled workers	108	36.62	5.17
High school disciplinary problems	91	31.25	5.40
County jail inmates	177	29.27	6.44

TABLE 39. Continued

Samples	N	M	S.D.
Prison inmates, New York	94	28.28	5.80
Young delinquents, California	426	28.07	5.72
Prison inmates, California	177	27.76	6.03
Training school inmates, New York	100	26.53	4.89
Inmates, federal reformatory	230	26.23	6.53
Ohio Reformatory for Women inmates ^b	324	28.15	6.30
<u>Ohio property offenders</u>	300	27.94	6.71
Ohio Penitentiary inmates ^c	336	26.99	6.12
Ohio property offenders ^d	300	26.50	6.01
Total	10,524		

^aHarrison G. Gough, "Theory and Measurement of Socialization," Journal of Counseling Psychology, XXIV, 1 (1960), 25.

^bKay, op. cit. ^cClark, op. cit. ^dFradkin, op. cit.

The validity of the morale scale constructed by Rundquist and Sletto has also been tested by the authors; its validity is supported by the fact that it is related to the largest number of outside variables. Moreover, the evidence that it is the most generalized of the six scales used in their study may be considered, according to the authors, as evidence for its validity.¹

Regarding the interpersonal competence items, their validity was not tested in this study. However, due to the fact that these items

¹Rundquist and Sletto, op. cit., p. 215.

correlate very poorly with the other self measures, theoretically, one may suspect lack of validity.

Evidence for the validity of the law scale developed in this study is incomplete. However, its validity is supported by the fact that it correlates well with the other inventories which were designed to measure self-perceptions of prisoners and in expected directions, and that in five out of the six subgroups of the prisoners based on the amount of criminal history, there were significant mean score differences. This scale has face validity also, because the items are consistent with the concepts of lawlessness used in this study.

Reliability

Reliability of the scales was determined by the split-half technique. As shown in Table 40 below, reliability coefficients ranged from .63 to .94.

TABLE 40. Reliability coefficients of socialization scale, morale scale, interpersonal competence items and law scale, using split-half technique.

Scale	Coefficient	Corrected by Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula
Socialization (Gough)	.67	.80
Morale (Rundquist and Sletto)	.81	.90
Interpersonal competence (Rothstein)	.46	.63
Law	.89	.94

The correlations are moderately high. They fall within the range usually considered as acceptable.

APPENDIX III
SCHEDULES

SCHEDULE A

OPINION SURVEY

The Ohio State University

You have been selected to take part in a study being conducted by the Ohio State University. We are interested in finding out how men like yourselves look at things.

There are many items included in this questionnaire. They all concern how you think about the things that we all have had some dealings with in our lifetime.

Although there is nothing in this questionnaire that will affect your stay here in any way, we are asking you not to put your name or number on this paper. The only person who will see these papers will be Mr. Mylonas. The Ohio Penitentiary administration or other officials will not see the papers, so what you say cannot in any way affect your treatment here or your parole. Please don't sign your name or number.

You can help us most by being as frank as you can in your answers. There are no "wrong" or "right" answers on the questionnaire. There are no angles or trick statements. The "right" answers are the ones that best fit the way you actually feel about things. Please follow the directions as they are read to you and answer every item as best you can.

The Way I Look at Things

This first set of things can be answered by either True or False. Remember, this is not a test. The "right" answer for you is the way you look at things. Just put a circle around "T" if you think the statement is True, or put a circle around "F" if you think the statement is False. Be sure to answer every item.¹

- T F 1. I get nervous when I have to ask someone for a job.
- T F 2. I often feel I made a wrong choice in deciding what kind of work to do.
- T F 3. I would never play cards with a stranger.
- T F 4. I think Lincoln was greater than Washington.
- T F 5. Life usually hands me a pretty raw deal.
- T F 6. A person is better off if he doesn't trust anyone.
- T F 7. Sometimes I used to feel that I would like to leave home.
- T F 8. If the pay was right, I would like to travel with a circus or carnival.
- T F 9. I would do almost anything on a dare.
- T F 10. As a youngster in school, I used to give the teachers lots of trouble.
- T F 11. Even when I have gotten into trouble, I was usually trying to do the right thing.
- T F 12. My parents never really understood me.
- T F 13. My home as a child was less peaceful and quiet than those of most other people.
- T F 14. I think that I am stricter about right and wrong than most people.
- T F 15. Even the idea of giving a talk in public makes me afraid.
- T F 16. It is very important to me to have enough friends and social life.
- T F 17. I never worry about my looks.
- T F 18. I hardly ever get excited or thrilled.

- T F 19. My parents have often disapproved of my friends.
- T F 20. My home life was always happy.
- T F 21. I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.
- T F 22. I seem to do things that I regret more often than other people do.
- T F 23. I would rather go without something than ask for a favor.
- T F 24. I have had more than my share of things to worry about.
- T F 25. I go out of my way to meet trouble rather than try to escape it.
- T F 26. When I meet a stranger, I often think that he is better than I am.
- T F 27. It is pretty easy for people to win arguments with me.
- T F 28. Before I do something, I try to consider how my friends will react to it.
- T F 29. In school, I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up.
- T F 30. I keep out of trouble at all costs.
- T F 31. I often think about how I look and what impression I am making upon others.
- T F 32. I find it easy to "drop" or "break with" a friend.
- T F 33. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people.
- T F 34. I have often gone against my parents' wishes.
- T F 35. I have never done any heavy drinking.
- T F 36. I have been in trouble one or more times because of my sex behavior.
- T F 37. Most of the time, I feel happy.
- T F 38. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.
- T F 39. I know who is responsible for most of my trouble.

- T F 40. I get pretty discouraged with the law when a smart lawyer gets a criminal free.
- T F 41. I have used alcohol excessively.
- T F 42. When I was going to school, I played hookey quite often.
- T F 43. People often talk about me behind my back.
- T F 44. I often feel as though I have done something wrong or wicked.
- T F 45. I don't think I am quite as happy as others seem to be.
- T F 46. I used to steal sometimes when I was a youngster.
- T F 47. I am somewhat afraid of the dark.
- T F 48. I never cared much for school.
- T F 49. The members of my family were always very close to each other.
- T F 50. I sometimes wanted to run away from home.
- T F 51. With things going as they are, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something.
- T F 52. My parents have generally let me make my own decisions.
- T F 53. My home life was always very pleasant.
-

¹Favorable direction of answer counts 1. The favorable score is then added. The true responses on the following items are favorable: 3, 4, 11, 14, 15, 16, 20, 26, 28, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37, 38, 47, 49, 52, 53. The false responses on the following items are favorable: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51. One item of the original scale (I have never been in trouble with the law) was omitted because of its obvious lack of discriminating power.

The following pages contain a number of statements about which there is no general agreement. People differ widely in the way they feel about each item. There are no right answers. The purpose of the survey is to see how different groups feel about each item. We should like your honest opinion on each of these statements.

Read each item carefully and underline quickly the phrase which best expresses your feeling about the statement. Wherever possible, let your own personal experience determine your answer. Do not spend much time on any item. If in doubt, underline the phrase which seems most nearly to express your present feeling about the statement. WORK RAPIDLY. Be sure to answer every item.²

54. THE FUTURE IS TOO UNCERTAIN FOR A PERSON TO PLAN MARRYING.³
55. IT IS DIFFICULT TO THINK CLEARLY THESE DAYS.
56. THE FUTURE LOOKS VERY BLACK.
57. LIFE IS JUST ONE WORRY AFTER ANOTHER.
58. MOST PEOPLE CAN BE TRUSTED.
59. TIMES ARE GETTING BETTER.
60. IT DOES NOT TAKE LONG TO GET OVER FEELING GLOOMY.
61. THE DAY IS NOT LONG ENOUGH TO DO ONE'S WORK WELL AND HAVE TIME FOR FUN.
62. NO ONE CARES MUCH WHAT HAPPENS TO YOU.
63. ANY MAN WITH ABILITY AND WILLINGNESS TO WORK HARD HAS A GOOD CHANCE OF BEING SUCCESSFUL.
64. IT IS GREAT TO BE LIVING IN THESE EXCITING TIMES.
65. THESE DAYS ONE IS INCLINED TO GIVE UP HOPE OF AMOUNTING TO SOMETHING.
66. THERE IS LITTLE CHANCE FOR ADVANCEMENT IN INDUSTRY AND BUSINESS UNLESS A MAN HAS UNFAIR PULL.
67. THE YOUNG MAN OF TODAY CAN EXPECT MUCH OF THE FUTURE.
68. THIS GENERATION WILL PROBABLY NEVER SEE SUCH HARD TIMES AGAIN.

² On the administered questionnaire, items 54 through 185 were followed by the responses strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree, which are here omitted.

69. REAL FRIENDS ARE AS EASY TO FIND AS EVER.
70. LIFE IS JUST A SERIES OF DISAPPOINTMENTS.
71. ONE SELDOM WORRIES SO MUCH AS TO BECOME MISERABLE.
72. A MAN DOES NOT HAVE TO PRETEND HE IS SMARTER THAN HE REALLY IS TO "GET BY."
73. SUCCESS IS MORE DEPENDENT ON LUCK THAN ON REAL ABILITY.
74. A PERSON CAN PLAN HIS FUTURE SO THAT EVERYTHING WILL COME OUT ALL RIGHT IN THE LONG RUN.
75. THERE IS REALLY NO POINT IN LIVING.
76. THE LAW PROTECTS PROPERTY RIGHTS AT THE EXPENSE OF HUMAN RIGHTS.
77. A PERSON SHOULD OBEY ONLY THOSE LAWS WHICH SEEM REASONABLE.
78. IT IS ALL RIGHT TO EVADE THE LAW IF YOU DO NOT ACTUALLY VIOLATE IT.
79. A MAN SHOULD OBEY THE LAWS NO MATTER HOW MUCH THEY INTERFERE WITH HIS PERSONAL AMBITIONS.
80. PERSONAL CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD NEVER BE CONSIDERED AN EXCUSE FOR LAW-BREAKING.
81. A PERSON WHO REPORTS MINOR LAW VIOLATIONS IS ONLY A TROUBLE-MAKER.
82. A HUNGRY MAN HAS A RIGHT TO STEAL.
83. ALL LAWS SHOULD BE STRICTLY OBEYED BECAUSE THEY ARE LAWS.
84. LAWS ARE SO OFTEN MADE FOR THE BENEFIT OF SMALL SELFISH GROUPS THAT A MAN CANNOT RESPECT THE LAW.
85. IT IS DIFFICULT TO BREAK THE LAW AND KEEP ONE'S SELF-RESPECT.
86. VIOLATORS OF THE LAW ARE NEARLY ALWAYS DETECTED AND PUNISHED.
87. IT IS ALL RIGHT FOR A PERSON TO BREAK THE LAW IF HE DOESN'T GET CAUGHT.
88. WE WOULD HAVE LESS CRIME IF OUR LAWS WERE MORE STRICT.
89. THE LAW DOES NOT BENEFIT THE COMMON MAN.

90. A PERSON GETS PRETTY DISCOURAGED WITH THE LAW WHEN A SMART LAWYER GETS A CRIMINAL FREE.
91. OUR LAWS SHOULD BE GREATLY REVISED.
92. IF A PERSON TRIES TO BE HONEST, HE WILL NEVER GET ANYWHERE IN BUSINESS.
93. MOST PEOPLE HAVE TO DO SOMETHING DISHONEST ALMOST EVERY DAY.
94. IN ORDER TO GET AHEAD THESE DAYS, ONE HAS TO REALIZE THAT THE LAWS ARE MADE TO BE BROKEN.
95. WE HAVE TOO MANY LAWS.
96. THE LAW AS A WHOLE IS SOUND.
97. IN THE LONG RUN LAW AND JUSTICE ARE THE SAME.
98. I BELIEVE IN THE USE OF FORCE TO GET RID OF LAWS.
99. WE SHOULD HAVE COMPLETE FREEDOM OF SPEECH EVEN FOR THOSE WHO CRITICIZE THE LAW.
100. MEN ARE NOT ALL EQUAL BEFORE THE LAW.
101. IT IS MORE WRONG TO GET CAUGHT THAN IT IS TO STEAL.
102. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE LAW SHOULD BE TAUGHT IN ALL SCHOOLS.
103. THE LAW IS MADE IN RESPONSE TO PRESSURE OF PRIVATE INTERESTS.
104. NEARLY ALL LAWS DESERVE OUR RESPECT.
105. CROOKS OFTEN HIDE BEHIND THE LAW.
106. IT IS NOT JUDGES WHO PUNISH CRIMINALS, IT IS THE LAW.
107. LAW IS THE ENEMY OF FREEDOM.
108. LAW PREVENTS WHOLESALE CRIME AND MURDER.
109. INDIVIDUAL LAWS ARE FREQUENTLY UNJUST.
110. THE LAW SHOULD TAKE ITS COURSE NO MATTER HOW INDIVIDUALS MAY SUFFER.
111. SOME PARTS OF THE LAW ARE BAD.
112. THE LAW IS FUNDAMENTALLY SOUND IN SPITE OF MISTAKES BY LEGISLATURES AND COURTS.

113. IT IS OUR DUTY TO OBEY ALL LAWS.
114. THE INDIVIDUAL WHO REFUSES TO OBEY THE LAW IS A MENACE TO CIVILIZATION.
115. THE LAW IS FOR THE POOR TO OBEY, AND FOR THE RICH TO IGNORE.
116. ALL LAWS SHOULD BE OVERTHROWN.
117. THE LAW ENSLAVES THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE FOR THE BENEFIT OF A FEW.
118. LAWS ARE USUALLY BAD.
119. NO MAN CAN VIOLATE THE LAW AND BE MY FRIEND.
120. WE SHOULD OBEY THE LAW EVEN THOUGH WE CRITICIZE IT.
121. WE WOULD BE BETTER OFF WITHOUT ANY LAWS AT ALL.
122. THE LAW IS ROTTEN TO THE CORE.
123. THE LESS ONE TAMPERS WITH THE LAW, THE BETTER.
124. THOUGH WE OBEY THE LAW, WE CAN STILL CRITICIZE IT.
125. JUDGES ARE MORE INTERESTED IN THE LAW THAN IN THE INDIVIDUAL.
126. THE JUDGES' SENTENCES ARE DETERMINED BY THEIR PREJUDICES.
127. ON THE WHOLE, JUDGES ARE HONEST AND KIND-HEARTED.
128. ALMOST ANY JURY CAN BE FIXED.
129. COURT DECISIONS ARE ALMOST ALWAYS JUST.
130. IN THE COURTS A POOR MAN WILL RECEIVE AS FAIR TREATMENT AS A MILLIONAIRE.
131. MY TRIAL WAS A FARCE.
132. A MAN SHOULD TELL THE TRUTH IN COURT, REGARDLESS OF THE CONSEQUENCES.
133. A PERSON IS JUSTIFIED IN GIVING FALSE TESTIMONY TO PROTECT A FRIEND ON TRIAL.
134. ALMOST ANYTHING CAN BE FIXED IN THE COURTS IF YOU HAVE ENOUGH MONEY.
135. MY TRIAL WAS A FAIR ONE.

136. YOU CAN'T GET JUSTICE IN COURT.
137. MY TRIAL DID NOT GET AT ALL THE TRUTH.
138. THE BIG CRIMINAL ALWAYS HAS A GOOD CHANCE TO ESCAPE CONVICTION IN COURT.
139. FOR THE MOST PART, POLICE AND THE COURTS ARE JUST.
140. A JUDGE IS A GOOD MAN.
141. JURIES SELDOM UNDERSTAND A CASE WELL ENOUGH TO MAKE REALLY JUST DECISIONS.
142. MOST JURIES ARE FIXED.
143. MANY OF THE PEOPLE IN PRISONS ARE ACTUALLY INNOCENT OF THE CRIME FOR WHICH THEY WERE CONVICTED.
144. ON THE WHOLE, LAWYERS ARE HONEST.
145. FAMOUS LAWYERS WILL DEFEND EVEN NOTORIOUS CRIMINALS IF THE MONEY IS AVAILABLE.
146. LAWYERS PLAY WITH THE JURORS' EMOTIONS.
147. PROSECUTORS ARE NOTHING BUT POLITICIANS.
148. NO DECENT LAWYER WOULD EVER BE A PROSECUTOR.
149. FAKE WITNESSES ARE OFTEN PRODUCED BY THE PROSECUTORS.
150. ON THE WHOLE, POLICEMEN ARE HONEST.
151. A COP IS A FRIEND TO PEOPLE IN NEED.
152. ALL COPS ARE CORRUPT.
153. COPS OFTEN CARRY A GRUDGE AGAINST MEN WHO GET IN TROUBLE WITH THE LAW AND TREAT THEM CRUELLY.
154. POLICE ARREST ONLY THE POOR MAN.
155. THE BIG-TIME CROOKS NEVER GET ARRESTED; IT IS JUST THE LITTLE GUY THAT GETS CAUGHT.
156. POLICE PUT ON A SHOW BY ARRESTING PEOPLE.
157. A POLICEMAN USUALLY JUDGES YOU AS GUILTY.
158. POLICE HOUND EX-CONVICTS.

159. POLICE WORK RESTS MAINLY UPON INFORMATION GIVEN BY STOOL PIGEONS.
160. THE POLICEMAN'S STANDING IN HIS DEPARTMENT DEPENDS UPON THE NUMBER OF ARRESTS HE MAKES.
161. POLICE OFTEN USE THE THIRD DEGREE TO SECURE CONFESSIONS.
162. WITHOUT THE THIRD DEGREE THE POLICE WOULD BE HELPLESS IN COMBATING CRIME.
163. THE POLICE DEPARTMENTS DO NOT USE HUMANE METHODS IN OBTAINING CONFESSIONS.
164. POLICEMEN ARE MORE LOYAL TO THE POLICE THAN TO THE CITIZENS.
165. INFLUENTIAL OR RICH SUSPECTS ARE NOT GIVEN THE THIRD DEGREE; IT IS RESTRICTED TO PETTY OR NON-INFLUENTIAL CASES.
166. OUR SOCIETY WOULD BE BETTER OFF IF THERE WERE MORE POLICEMEN.
167. POLICEMEN ARE MOSTLY MEN OF INFERIOR INTELLIGENCE.
168. POLICEMEN ARE SELDOM SELECTED FOR PERSONAL MERIT AND ABILITY.
169. POLICEMEN ARE MOSTLY POORLY TRAINED FOR THEIR JOB.
170. POLICE SHOW FAVORITISM TO POLITICIANS.
171. POLICE RARELY GET THEIR MAN IN DIFFICULT CASES.
172. POLICE ARE CAREFUL NOT TO ARREST INNOCENT PERSONS.
173. POLICE SELDOM TREAT SUSPECTED CRIMINALS COURTEOUSLY.
174. POLICE DISREGARD CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN THE INTEREST OF EFFICIENCY.
175. POLICE USUALLY APPREHEND CRIMINALS IN DIFFICULT CASES.
176. POLICEMEN ARE MOSTLY SELECTED FOR PERSONAL MERIT AND ABILITY.
177. YOU CAN SELDOM FIND A POLICEMAN WHO DOESN'T TAKE BRIBES.
178. POLICEMEN ARE JUST AS CROOKED AS THE PEOPLE THEY ARREST.
179. POLICE RARELY TRY TO HELP PEOPLE.
180. POLICEMEN DO MORE FOR PEOPLE THAN PREACHERS DO.
181. POLICEMEN SHOULD BE PAID MORE FOR THEIR WORK.

- 182. POLICE ALMOST NEVER TREAT SUSPECTED CRIMINALS BRUTALLY.
 - 183. POLICEMEN ARE USUALLY NOT WELL LIKED.
 - 184. LIFE WOULD BE BETTER WITH FEWER POLICEMEN.
 - 185. POLICE ALMOST ALWAYS RESPECT CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF SUSPECTED CRIMINALS.
-

³Items 54 through 75 constitute the Rundquist-Sletto Morale Scale. The scoring was always from low to high morale. High total scores indicated low morale; low total scores, high morale.

The response of strongly agree was scored 5; agree, 4; undecided, 3; disagree, 2; strongly disagree, 1, when the direction indicated low to high morale. The response of strongly agree was scored 1; agree, 2; undecided, 3; disagree, 4; strongly disagree, 5, when the direction indicated high to low morale. The following items were scored 5, 4, 3, 2, 1: 54, 55, 56, 57, 61, 62, 65, 66, 70, 73, 75. The following items were scored 1, 2, 3, 4, 5: 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 74.

On this page, you will find some statements which you feel will describe yourself and others which you feel do not describe yourself. Remember: There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. The way you actually feel is the answer you should use. Please read each statement and then put an "X" in front of the answer that you think is most likely to be true in your case. Be sure to answer every item.

186. I can see as good (with glasses if I wear them) and I can hear as good as most other people can.⁴

_____ Like me _____ Not like me

187. I often feel tired and 'all in' even when I haven't been working hard.
188. If I can't do something the first time, I don't mind spending a lot of time trying to figure out other ways to do it.
189. I thought that just about every book in school was too tough for students to understand by themselves.
190. I would find things a lot easier if I didn't keep making the same mistake over and over again.
191. Even when somebody doesn't agree with me, I can usually understand his reasons for not agreeing with me.
192. I trust the judgement of my friends more often than I do my own judgement.
193. I often make up my mind after it is too late.
194. Too many things just don't turn out the way I expect them to.
195. I often get into hot water because I speak or act without thinking.
196. I often find myself with a lot of time on my hands with nothing to do.

⁴Items 186 through 196 were all followed by the responses "Like me" and "Not like me" as shown.

The favorable response was scored 1. A high total score indicates a high interpersonal competence; a low total score, a low interpersonal competence. The response "Like me" was the favorable direction and received 1 for favorable score in the instance of items 186, 188, and 191. The response of "Not like me" was the favorable direction and received 1 for favorable score in the instance of items 187, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196.

SOME FACTS ABOUT YOURSELF

Marital Status: (Check one)

Religion: (Check one)

☐ Married
☐ Divorced
☐ Separated
☐ Single

☐ Catholic
☐ Protestant--What kind? _____
☐ Jew--What kind? _____
☐ Other--What? _____
☐ None

Last school grade completed _____ Do you belong to a labor union? Yes
 No

What did you do in the last work-job you had on the outside? _____

How long did you hold it? _____ When did you leave? _____
 (Month) (Year)

Were you working steady at the time of this offense? Yes _____ No _____

Which one of these comes closest to what you made the last year you worked? (Check)

☐ Under \$1,000 ☐ \$2,000 to \$2,999 ☐ \$4,000 to \$4,999
☐ \$1,000 to \$1,999 ☐ \$3,000 to \$3,999 ☐ \$5,000 and above

What did the head of the family do in the family you grew up in? _____

Date of Birth: _____ Place of Birth: _____
 (Month)(Day)(Year) (City)(County)(State)

Type of place where you grew up as a boy: (Check one)

☐ On a farm ☐ In a town (2,500 to 10,000)
☐ In the country but not farmers ☐ In a small city (10,000-50,000)
☐ In a village (Under 2,500) ☐ In a city (Over 50,000)

How many times have you changed the place where you lived in the last five years? _____

Town and county from which committed: _____ Offense: _____

Number of arrests up through age 17 _____ Number of arrests after 18 _____

How many times have you been in a state or federal prison before this time? (Circle One) 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

How much time have you spent in: (Use "M" for months, "Y" for years)

☐ Juvenile institutions ☐ Reformatories, state or federal
☐ Jail or workhouse (county, city) ☐ Penitentiaries, state or federal

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP

SCHEDULE F

CASE RECORD DATA SHEET - Case No. _____

Ohio Penitentiary No. _____

Race: White _____ Negro _____

Birthdate _____ Birthplace _____ Residence _____
(city)(State) (City)(State)

Religion _____ Last grade completed _____ Commitment county _____

Psychological: OPCT _____ OTIS _____ Other _____

Medical _____

Marital status _____ Number of marriages _____ Status of present marriage _____

Number of children _____ Occupation _____

Last job: _____ Began _____ Left _____
(Type)

Offense: _____ Sentence _____ Type of Trial _____
Judge

_____ Jury _____ Parole Violation _____
Plea: Guilty _____ Not guilty _____ Other _____

Prior institutionalization

1.	_____	to	_____	_____
2.	_____		_____	_____
3.	_____		_____	_____
4.	_____		_____	_____
5.	_____		_____	_____

F.B.I. Criminal Record

1.	<u>(Date)</u>	<u>(Offense)</u>	<u>(Age)</u>	<u>(Term)</u>	<u>Disposition</u>	<u>(Where)</u>
2.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Other Behavioral Data

1.	_____
2.	_____
3.	_____
4.	_____
5.	_____
6.	_____
7.	_____
8.	_____
9.	_____
10.	_____

SCHEDULE C

TWENTY-TWO ITEMS FROM COMPLETE LAW SCALE OF RUNDQUIST AND SLETTO⁵ USED IN THIS STUDY

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>
76	The law protects property rights at the expense of human rights.
77	A person should obey only those laws which seem reasonable.
78	It is all right to evade the law if you do not actually violate it.
79	A man should obey the laws no matter how much they interfere with his personal ambitions.
80	Personal circumstances should never be considered an excuse for law-breaking.
81	A person who reports minor violations is only a trouble-maker.
82*	A hungry man has a right to steal.
83	All laws should be strictly obeyed because they <u>are</u> laws.
84*	Laws are so often made for the benefit of small selfish groups that a man cannot respect the law.
85	It is difficult to break the law and keep one's self-respect.
86	Violators of the law are nearly always detected and punished.
87	It is all right for a person to break the law if he doesn't get caught.
126	The sentences of judges in courts are determined by their prejudices. ⁶
127*	On the whole, judges are honest. ⁶

⁵Rundquist and Sletto, op. cit., p. 25.

⁶The item was slightly modified.

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>
129*	Court decisions are almost always just.
130*	In the courts a poor man will receive as fair treatment as a millionaire.
132	A man should tell the truth in court, regardless of consequences.
133	A person is justified in giving false testimony to protect a friend on trial.
134*	Almost anything can be fixed in the courts if you have enough money.
141	Juries seldom understand a case well enough to make a really just decision.
144*	On the whole, lawyers are honest.
150*	On the whole, policemen are honest.

*The item was retained in the final thirty-item Law Scale of this study (see Schedule E).

SCHEDULE D

SELECTED ITEMS FROM KATZ LAW SCALES⁷ USED IN THIS STUDY

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>
95*	We have too many laws.
99	We should have complete freedom of speech even for those who criticize the law.
100	Men are not all equal before the law.
106	It is not judges who punish criminals, it is the law.
107	Law is the enemy of freedom.
108	The law prevents wholesale crime and murder.
109	Individual laws are frequently unjust.
110	The law should take its course no matter how individuals may suffer.
111	Some parts of the law are bad.
114	The individual who refuses to obey the law is a menace to civilization.
115*	The law is for the poor to obey, and the rich to ignore.
116	All laws should be overthrown.
119	No man can violate the law and be my friend.
120	We would be better off without any laws at all.

⁷Daniel Katz, "Attitude toward the Law," Scale No. 27, Forms A and B, The Measurement of Social Attitudes, ed. L. L. Thurstone (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931).

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>
122*	The law is rotten to the core.
123	The less one tampers with the law, the better.

*The item was retained in the final thirty-item Law Scale of this study (see Schedule E).

SCHEDULE E

THE LAW SCALE

Prepared by A. D. Mylonas

1. A hungry man has a right to steal.⁸
2. Laws are so often made for the benefit of small selfish groups that a man cannot respect the law.
3. The law does not benefit the common man.
4. Most people have to do something dishonest every day.
5. In order to get ahead these days, one has to realize that the laws are made to be broken.
6. We have too many laws.
7. It is more wrong to get caught than it is to steal.
8. The law is for the poor to obey, and for the rich to ignore.
9. The law enslaves the majority of people for the benefit of a few.
10. The law is rotten to the core.
11. On the whole, judges are honest and kind-hearted.
12. Almost any jury can be fixed.
13. Court decisions are almost always just.
14. In the courts a poor man will receive as fair treatment as a millionaire.
15. Almost anything can be fixed in the courts if you have enough money.
16. The big criminal always has a good chance to escape conviction in court.
17. For the most part, police and the courts are just.

18. On the whole, lawyers are honest.
19. Prosecutors are nothing but politicians.
20. Fake witnesses are often produced by the prosecutors.
21. Police put on a show by arresting people.
22. A policeman usually judges you as guilty.
23. Police hound ex-convicts.
24. Police work rests mainly upon information given by stool pigeons.
25. The policeman's standing in his department depends upon the number of arrests he makes.
26. Police often use the third degree to secure confessions.
27. Policemen are more loyal to the police than to the citizens.
28. Influential or rich suspects are not given the third degree; it is restricted to petty or non-influential cases.
29. Police are careful not to arrest innocent persons.
30. Policemen are just as crooked as the people they arrest.

8

On the administered questionnaire, the items of the above scale were followed by the responses strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree, which are here omitted.

The scoring of these items was always from unfavorable to favorable attitude. High total scores indicated unfavorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions; low total scores, favorable attitudes. The response of strongly agree was scored 5; agree, 4; undecided, 3; disagree, 2; strongly disagree, 1, when the direction indicated unfavorable to favorable attitude. The response strongly agree was scored 1; agree, 2; undecided, 3; disagree, 4; strongly disagree, 5, when the direction indicated favorable to unfavorable attitude. In the 30 items listed above, the following were scored 5, 4, 3, 2, 1: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30. The following items were scored 1, 2, 3, 4, 5: 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 29.

APPENDIX IV
LAW SCALE ITEM ANALYSIS

LAW SCALE ITEM ANALYSIS

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>SVD</u>	<u>MPSVD</u>	<u>SVDR</u>	<u>C.R.</u>
76	The law protects property rights at the expense of human rights.	.74	2.02	.37	5.81
77	A person should obey only those laws which seem reasonable.	.59	1.62	.36	4.61
78	It is all right to evade the law if you do not actually violate it.	.68	2.02	.34	5.34
79	A person should obey the laws no matter how much they interfere with his personal ambitions.	.69	1.44	.48	5.81
80	Personal circumstances should never be considered an excuse for law-breaking.	.78	1.89	.41	5.82
81	A person who reports minor law violations is only a trouble-maker.	.98	2.13	.46	8.03
82*	A hungry man has a right to steal.	1.16	1.91	.61	9.45
83	All laws should be strictly obeyed because they <u>are</u> laws.	.78	1.91	.40	6.09
84*	Laws are so often made for the benefit of small selfish groups that a man cannot respect the law.	1.18	2.03	.58	10.05
85	It is difficult to break the law and keep one's self-respect.	.39	2.00	.19	2.82

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>SVD</u>	<u>MPSVD</u>	<u>SVDR</u>	<u>C.R.</u>
86	Violators of the law are nearly always detected and punished .	.81	2.32	.35	5.62
87	It is all right for a person to break the law if he doesn't get caught.	.70	1.31	.53	6.10
88	We would have less crime if our laws were more strict.	.70	1.58	.47	5.58
89*	The law does not benefit the common man.	1.19	2.13	.56	9.72
90	A person gets pretty discouraged with the law when a smart lawyer gets a criminal free.	.10	1.98	.05	.73
91	Our laws should be greatly revised.	.56	1.45	.39	5.12
92	If a person tries to be honest, he will never get anywhere in business.	.93	1.63	.57	7.51
93*	Most people have to do something dishonest every day.	.99	1.79	.55	8.46
94*	In order to get ahead these days, one has to realize that the laws are made to be broken.	1.02	1.43	.71	9.62
95*	We have too many laws.	1.29	1.95	.66	11.15
96	The law as a whole is sound.	.67	1.63	.41	5.55
97	In the long run law and justice are the same.	.58	2.26	.26	4.08
98	I believe in the use of force to get rid of laws.	.51	1.03	.49	5.50

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>SVD</u>	<u>MPSVD</u>	<u>SVDR</u>	<u>C.R.</u>
99	We should have complete freedom of speech even for those who criticize the law.	-.43	1.06	--	4.61
100	Men are not all equal before the law.	.83	1.47	.56	7.18
101*	It is more wrong to get caught than it is to steal.	1.08	1.75	.62	8.90
102	The importance of the law should be taught in all schools.	.33	1.01	.33	3.73
103	The law is made in response to pressure of private interests.	.87	1.82	.48	6.58
104	Nearly all laws deserve our respect.	.66	1.11	.59	6.42
105	Crooks often hide behind the law.	.67	1.09	.61	6.82
106	It is not the judges who punish criminals, it is the law.	.51	1.82	.28	3.94
107	Law is the enemy of freedom.	.98	1.75	.56	8.21
108	Law prevents wholesale crime and murder.	.47	1.66	.28	3.28
109	Individual laws are frequently unjust.	.65	1.29	.50	6.30
110	The law should take its course no matter how individuals may suffer.	.43	2.24	.19	3.00

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>SVD</u>	<u>MPSVD</u>	<u>SVIDR</u>	<u>C.R.</u>
111	Some parts of the law are bad.	.57	1.01	.56	6.51
112	The law is fundamentally sound in spite of mistakes by legislatures and courts.	.50	1.51	.33	4.36
113	It is our duty to obey all laws.	.57	.95	.60	6.07
114	The individual who refuses to obey the law is a menace to civilization.	.77	2.12	.36	5.99
115*	The law is for the poor to obey, and for the rich to ignore.	1.39	2.41	.58	9.63
116	All laws should be overthrown.	.47	1.01	.46	5.38
117*	The law enslaves the majority of people for the benefit of a few.	1.31	2.09	.63	11.26
118	Laws are usually bad.	.73	1.16	.62	7.01
119	No man can violate the law and be my friend.	.41	1.01	.40	4.42
120	We should obey the law even though we criticize it.	.33	.67	.49	5.04
121	We would be better off without any laws at all.	.35	1.24	.28	3.66
122*	The law is rotten to the core.	1.17	1.54	.76	10.17

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>SVD</u>	<u>MPSVD</u>	<u>SVDR</u>	<u>C.R.</u>
123	The less one tampers with the law, the better.	.13	1.23	.11	1.11
124	Though we obey the law, we can still criticize it.	.19	.76	.25	2.22
125	Judges are more interested in the law than in the individual.	.60	1.61	.37	4.79
126	The judges' sentences are determined by their prejudices.	1.02	2.00	.51	8.31
127*	On the whole, judges are honest and kind-hearted.	1.17	1.92	.61	10.29
128*	Almost any jury can be fixed.	1.17	2.15	.54	9.56
129*	Court decisions are almost always just.	.97	1.93	.50	8.53
130*	In the courts a poor man will receive as fair treatment as a millionaire.	1.02	1.75	.58	8.36
131	My trial was a farce.	.87	2.00	.43	6.75
132	A man should tell the truth in a court, regardless of the consequences.	.69	1.95	.35	5.22
133	A person is justified in giving false testimony to protect a friend on trial.	.67	1.55	.43	5.85
134*	Almost anything can be fixed in courts if you have enough money.	1.23	1.69	.72	11.01
135	My trial was a fair one.	1.00	2.32	.43	7.21

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>SVD</u>	<u>MPSVD</u>	<u>SVDR</u>	<u>C.R.</u>
136	You can't get justice in court.	.91	1.84	.49	8.00
137	My trial did not get at all the truth.	.72	1.77	.41	5.68
138*	The big criminal always has a good chance to escape conviction in court.	1.30	2.02	.64	10.77
139*	For the most part, police and the courts are just.	1.07	1.73	.62	10.52
140	A judge is a good man.	.72	1.40	.51	6.75
141	Juries seldom understand a case well enough to make really just decisions.	.89	1.55	.57	8.11
142	Most juries are fixed.	.77	1.33	.58	7.34
143	Many of the people in prisons are actually innocent of the crime for which they were convicted.	.85	2.09	.41	7.95
144*	On the whole, lawyers are honest.	.87	1.91	.45	7.80
145	Famous lawyers will defend even notorious criminals if the money is available.	.43	.97	.44	4.92
146	Lawyers play with the jurors' emotions.	.33	.87	.38	3.97
147*	Prosecutors are nothing but politicians.	.94	1.47	.64	9.15
148	No decent lawyer would ever be a prosecutor.	.80	1.97	.41	6.41
149*	Fake witnesses are often produced by the prosecutor.	1.00	1.77	.56	9.32

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>SVD</u>	<u>MPSVD</u>	<u>SVIDR</u>	<u>C.R.</u>
150	On the whole, policemen are honest.	1.02	1.95	.52	9.00
151	A cop is a friend to people in need.	.96	1.73	.55	9.00
152	All cops are corrupt.	.37	.97	.38	4.07
153	Cops often carry a grudge against men who get in trouble with the law and treat them cruelly.	.93	1.50	.62	8.37
154	Police arrest only the poor man.	.95	1.34	.71	8.87
155	The big-time crooks never get arrested, it is just the little guy that gets caught.	.99	1.42	.70	9.08
156*	Police put on a show by arresting people.	1.22	1.87	.65	11.96
157*	A policeman usually judges you as guilty.	1.06	1.37	.77	10.19
158*	Police hound ex-convicts.	1.06	1.59	.67	9.46
159*	Police work rests mainly upon information given by stool pigeons.	1.22	1.65	.74	11.44
160*	The policeman's standing in his Department depends upon the number of arrests he makes.	1.12	1.78	.63	11.12
161*	Police often use the third degree to secure confessions.	1.04	1.51	.69	10.00
162	Without the third degree the police would be helpless in combating crime.	.77	1.77	.43	7.07

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>SVD</u>	<u>MPSVD</u>	<u>SVDR</u>	<u>C.R.</u>
163	The police departments do not use humane methods in obtaining confessions.	.67	1.87	.36	5.52
164*	Policemen are more loyal to the police than to the citizens.	.93	1.29	.72	9.72
165*	Influential or rich suspects are not given the third degree; it is restricted to petty or non-influential cases.	1.04	1.68	.62	9.93
166	Our society would be better off if there were more policemen.	.72	1.51	.48	6.96
167	Policemen are mostly men of inferior intelligence.	.35	1.63	.21	3.12
168	Policemen are seldom selected for personal merit and ability.	.67	1.67	.40	6.17
169	Policemen are mostly poorly trained for their job.	.91	1.87	.49	8.00
170	Policemen show favoritism to politicians.	.75	1.08	.69	8.75
171	Police rarely get their man in difficult cases.	.83	1.74	.48	7.71
172*	Police are careful not to arrest innocent persons.	1.00	1.47	.68	9.32
173	Police seldom treat suspected criminals courteously.	.69	1.69	.41	5.63
174	Police disregard constitutional rights in the interest of efficiency.	.94	1.45	.65	9.10

<u>Item Number on Schedule A</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>SVD</u>	<u>MPSVD</u>	<u>SVDR</u>	<u>C.R.</u>
175	Police usually apprehend criminals in difficult cases.	.80	1.61	.50	7.89
176	Policemen are mostly selected for personal merit and ability.	.67	1.56	.43	6.41
177	You can seldom find a policeman who doesn't take bribes.	.85	1.79	.47	7.38
178*	Policemen are just as crooked as the people they arrest.	1.40	1.89	.74	13.72
179	Police rarely try to help people.	.59	1.73	.34	5.05
180	Policemen do more for people than preachers do.	.40	1.08	.37	4.34
181	Policemen should be paid more for their work.	.85	1.83	.85	7.09
182	Police almost never treat suspected criminals brutally.	.80	1.51	.53	7.32
183	Policemen are usually not well liked.	.45	1.22	.37	4.19
184	Life would be better with fewer policemen.	.68	1.34	--	6.82
185	Police almost always respect constitutional rights of suspected criminals.	.81	1.74	.46	6.87

*Item was retained in the final 30-item Law Scale of this study. (see Appendix II, Schedule E).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aschaffenburg, Gustav. Crime and Its Repression. Trans. Adalbert Albrecht. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1913.
- Bonger, W. G. Criminality and Economic Conditions. Trans. Henry P. Horton. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1916.
- Bright, David E. "A Study of Institutional Impact upon Adult Male Prisoners." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1951.
- Bronner, Augusta F. "The Contribution of Science to a Program for Treatment of Juvenile Delinquency," in The Child, The Clinic and the Court. New York: 1925.
- Burgess, Ernest W. "Factors Determining Success or Failure on Parole," in Andrew Bruce, et al., The Workings of the Indeterminate-Sentence Law and the Parole System in Illinois. Springfield, Illinois: 1928.
- Chapman, Ames W. "Attitudes Toward Legal Authorities by Juveniles" in Psychological Abstracts, XXXI. 1957. No. 3673.
- Clark, John P. "Blame Acceptance Among Ohio Prisoners." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1960.
- Clinard, Marshall B. "Rural Criminal Offenders," American Journal of Sociology, L, 1. 1944. Pp. 38-45.
- Cloward, Richard A. and Ohlin, Lloyd E. Delinquency and Opportunity. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960.
- Ferguson, Leonard W. Personality Measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952.
- Ferris, Laune F. Predicting Criminality. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1936.
- Fradkin, Howard E. "Criminal Background and Self-Concept as Prognostic Factors in the Lives of Prisoners." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1958.
- Galway, Edward J. "A measurement of the Effectiveness of a Reformatory Program." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1948.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. After-Conduct of Discharged Offenders. London: Macmillan and Co., 1945.

_____. Criminal Careers in Retrospect. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1943.

_____. Five-Hundred Criminal Careers. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1930.

Goring, Charles. The English Convict. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1913.

Gough, Harrison G. and Peterson, Donald. "The Identification and Measurement of Predispositional Factors in Crime and Delinquency." Journal of Consulting Psychology, XVI. June, 1952. Pp. 207-212.

Hakeem, Michael. "Forecasting Parole Outcome by Parole Officers and Laymen." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1950.

Healy, William and Bronner, Augusta. New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Katz, Daniel. Attitude Toward The Law, Scale No. 27. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

Kay, Barbara Ann. "Differential Self-Perceptions of Female Offenders." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1961.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.

Murchison, Carl. Criminal Intelligence. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University, 1926.

North, Cecil C. and Hatt, Paul K. "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation." Opinion News. September, 1947.

Parsons, Frank. Legal Doctrine and Social Progress. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1911.

Reckless, Walter C. The Crime Problem. 3rd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961.

_____, Dinitz, Simon and Kay, Barbara. "The Self-Component in Potential Delinquency and Potential Non-Delinquency." American Sociological Review, XXII, 5. 1957. Pp. 566-570.

_____, _____ and Murray, Ellen. "Self-Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency." American Sociological Review, XXI. December, 1956. Pp. 744-46.

- Reckless, Walter C. et al. "Teacher Nominations and Evaluations of 'Good' Boys in High Delinquency Areas," The Elementary School Journal. January, 1957. Pp. 221-223.
- Redl, Fritz and Wineman, David. Children Who Hate. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951.
- Rothstein, Edward. "An Analysis of Status Images as Perception Variables between Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Boys." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1961.
- Sabine, George E. A History of Political Theory. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1937.
- Schuessler, Karl F. and Cressey, Donald. "Personality Characteristics of Criminals." American Journal of Sociology, LV. March, 1950. Pp. 476-484.
- Sell, DeWitt E. Manual for the Ohio Penal Classification Test. Chicago: Psychiatric Affiliates. 1952.
- Sorokin, P. A. Society, Culture and Personality: Their Structure and Dynamics. New York: Harper and Bros., 1947.
- Sutherland, Edwin H. "Mental Deficiency and Crime," in Kimball Young (ed.). Social Attitudes. New York: 1931.
- _____. Principles of Criminology. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1947. 4th ed.
- Sykes, Gresham M. and Matza, David. "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." American Sociological Review, XXII, December, 1957. Pp. 664-670.
- _____. "Juvenile Delinquency and Subterranean Values." American Sociological Review, XXV, 5. October, 1961. Pp. 712-713.
- Tappan, Paul. Crime, Justice and Correction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.
- United States Department of Commerce. Statistical Abstract of the United States. 80th ed. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1959.
- United States Department of Justice. Federal Prison, 1956. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957.
- United States Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Report, XXIV, 2. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1957.

- Van Vechten, Courtland C. "Differential Criminal Case Mortality in Selected Jurisdictions," American Sociological Review, VII. 1942. Pp. 833-839.
- Vold, George B. Prediction Methods and Parole. Hanover: The Sociological Press, 1931.
- Watt, Norman and Maher, B. A. "Prisoners' Attitudes toward Home and the Judicial System." The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, II, 4. November-December, 1958. P. 330.
- Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Zeleny, D. Leslie. "Feeble-Mindedness and Criminal Conduct." American Journal of Sociology, XXXVIII. January, 1933. P. 574.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

I, Anastassios Demosthenes Mylonas, was born in Platania, Greece, January 29, 1925. I received my secondary-school education in the Gymnasium of Kyparissia, Greece. I attended the School of Law at the University of Athens, Greece, which granted me the Bachelor of Law degree in 1946. During the following years I practiced law in Athens, Greece. In 1952, I was awarded a British Council scholarship, and for the academic year 1952-53 I did graduate work in criminology at the London School of Economics and Political Sciences. During the following two academic years I did graduate work in criminology at the University of Chicago and the University of Northern California, which I attended on scholarships. In June, 1955, I received the Master's degree in criminology from the University of California. For the academic year 1955-56 I was selected to receive a University Fellowship for graduate work in criminology at the Ohio State University. During that year, while a special student, I held the position of an assistant to the Executive Secretary of the National Conference on Social Welfare, in Columbus, Ohio. For the summer of 1956 I was a counselor at the Boys' Industrial School, Lancaster, Ohio, and from October, 1956, until September, 1958, I was a counselor at the Ohio Penitentiary. In 1958-59, while attending the Ohio State University, I was research assistant to Professor Walter C. Reckless. In September, 1959, I was

appointed a teaching assistant in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, The Ohio State University, and assistant instructor in September, 1961. I held this position while completing the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.