



1971

Volunteering Behavior and Personality Characteristics of Women Prisoners

Kamal K. Mane

Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Mane, Kamal K., "Volunteering Behavior and Personality Characteristics of Women Prisoners" (1971). *Dissertations*. Paper 1206.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1206

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © 1971 Kamal K. Mane

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY

VOLUNTEERING BEHAVIOR AND
PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF
WOMEN PRISONERS

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Field of Psychology

by

KAMAL V. MANE

Chicago, Illinois

May 1971

Volunteering Behavior and
Personality Characteristics of
Women Prisoners

Abstract

This study had two objectives. The first was to examine the differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers for psychotherapy in a women's prison. The volunteers and nonvolunteers were obtained from 100 recidivists and 100 first offenders. The four groups were compared in terms of personality as measured by the California Personality Inventory (CPI), sociological data available from their records, and the behavior ratings obtained from the prison staff. The second objective was to compare the three offense groups, obtained by reclassifying the same data into those who had committed "crimes against others," "crimes against property," and "crimes against self."

The personality measures, behavior ratings, and sociological variables with continuous distributions were analyzed by analysis of variance and the other sociological variables were analyzed by the chi-square technique.

The results showed that volunteers tended to be somewhat better adjusted than the nonvolunteers in terms of two CPI scales, Social presence and Communality. The volunteers were also more educated and had a higher measured grade level on the California Achievement Test than the nonvolunteers. The comparison of recidivists and first offenders indicated that the first offenders were relatively better adjusted in terms of the following CPI scales, Socialization, Self control, Good impression, and Femininity. Thus the hypothesis that recidivists would show greater maladjustment was confirmed. Recidivists were also significantly older than first offenders. There was no significant difference on any of the other sociological variables or the behavior ratings.

As anticipated, the comparison of the three offense groups showed significant differences on several of the CPI scales. The group who committed crimes against property were best adjusted and had the highest scores on the CPI scales for Dominance, Self-acceptance, Communality, Capacity for Status, Responsibility, and Achievement via Conformance. The group who committed crimes against others were the least well adjusted, in terms of these same scales, with the exception of the scale Responsibility. The group who committed crimes against self were intermediate in terms of adjustment on these same scales with the exception of Responsibility on which they scored lowest. The same trend was also noted in the sociological variables, with the crimes-against-others group having the least education and the lower socioeconomic background. There was no significant difference found on the behavior ratings.

The implications of the findings for psychotherapy and rehabilitation were discussed, along with the willingness to volunteer and the other differences obtained between the groups.

Acknowledgments

Many thanks are given to Mrs. Iverne Carter, Superintendent of the California Institution for Women, for permission to collect data and complete this investigation. Special thanks are given to the staff of the Reception Guidance Center for their enthusiastic cooperation in time and effort and without whose help this study would have been impossible.

The writer is also indebted to her advisors Dr. Jeanne Foley, Dr. John Shack and Dr. Kathleen Sheridan for their generous help in time, constructive criticism, comments, guidance and encouragement through all the phases of this project.

An equal debt is owed to my friend, Mr. K.B. Jadhav for all his help in the statistical analyses by the IBM computer.

To all these people I am extremely grateful.

Kamal V. Mane

May 1971

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Method	21
3. Results	28
4. Discussion	53
5. Summary	57
References	59
Appendix A	67
Request Form for Volunteers for Psychotherapy	68
Behavior Rating Form	69

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Sociological Variables of the Four Groups	26
2. Means and Standard Deviations for the 18 CPI Scales for the Four Groups	29
3. Summary of the Analyses of Variance for the Four Groups on the 18 CPI Scales	31
4. Means and Standard Deviations for Behavior Ratings for the Four Groups	35
5. Summary of Analyses of Variance for Behavior Ratings of the Four Groups	36
6. Summary of Analyses of Variance of the Sociological Variables for the Four Groups	37
7. Observed Frequencies of the Sociological Data for the Four Groups	38
8. Summary of Chi-Square of Sociological Variables for the Four Groups	39
9. Means and Standard Deviations of the CPI Scales for the Three Offense Groups	42
10. Summary of Analyses of Variance of the CPI Scales for the Three Offense Groups	44
11. Means and Standard Deviations of the Behavior Ratings for the Three Offense Groups	45
12. Summary of Analyses of Variance for the Behavior Ratings of the Three Offense Groups	47

List of Tables (Continued)

13. Means and Standard Deviations of the Sociological Variables for the Three Offense Groups	48
14. Summary of Analyses of Variance of the Sociological Variables for the Three Offense Groups	49
15. Observed Frequencies of Sociological Data for the Three Offense Groups	50
16. Summary of Chi-Square for Sociological Variables for the Three Offense Groups	51

Chapter 1

Introduction

The present study has two objectives. The first is to examine the differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers for psychotherapy in a women's prison, the California Institution for Women. It is a correctional facility with emphasis on rehabilitative programs including psychiatric ones. Approximately 33 per cent of the inmates processed at the Guidance Center are recidivists. Recidivists are returned for parole violations or with a new charge. Some of these have made as many as six or seven trips and seem to be quite different from the new-comers or first offenders. They have generally failed to complete the probationary period in a satisfactory manner and are considered by the court to be a danger to society and themselves. This study examined the behavior and personality characteristics of volunteers and nonvolunteers who were either recidivists or first offenders.

The second objective of this study is to see whether different types of prisoners, when classified according to their crimes, are also different in their personality make-up and actual behavior. The inmates were classified as (1) having committed crimes against other persons, e.g., murder or assault, (2) having committed crimes against property, e.g., robbery or forgery; and (3) having committed crimes against self, e.g. drug-users or alcoholics.

The relevant literature is reviewed in the following four sections: (1) studies of volunteer-bias, (2) research on recidivists and first offenders, (3) various types of prisoners and their personality, and (4) Cali-

ifornia Personality Inventory.

Volunteer-bias Studies. The basic research done in this area is not vast and generally suggests that volunteers are likely to be different from nonvolunteers.

Some of the earliest work in this area is that of Norman (1948). In his review of research dealing with differences between respondents and nonrespondents to mailed questionnaires he stated that those who respond to a mail questionnaire have been found almost universally to differ radically from those who do not reply. Respondents were found to be more ego-involved in the area investigated by the questionnaire, more intelligent, more articulate, better educated and more likely to be members of medium income groups than nonrespondents.

Wallin (1949) reported that engaged couples who volunteered for a study of factors associated with future marital success differed from both nonvolunteers and the total sample of volunteers and nonvolunteers in a likelihood of successful marriage. He compared the groups for age, religious affiliation, education, ratings by friends on social and political ideas, and poise. Although the differences were not statistically significant, volunteers tended to be better educated, politically conservative, less likely to be Catholic, and more poised. He pointed out that the possible bias resulting from dependence on volunteers may also vary with other conditions, such as the type of information required, the mode of the subject's participation, and the time involved in participation.

Kinsey and Pomeroy (1948) found that males who volunteered for interviews in the area of sexual behavior reported a greater frequency of total sexual outlets than male nonvolunteers. Maslow (1940) reported that female volunteers for an enquiry into sexual attitudes and behavior scored higher than nonvolunteers on dominance ratings. In a similar study, Maslow and

Sakoda (1952) found that volunteers tended to be high in self-esteem and those high in self-esteem differed considerably in their sexual behavior from those low in self-esteem. Maslow and Sakoda have drawn the important conclusion that "it is probable that self-esteem score can be used as a test variable to check volunteer error, not only in the study of sex, but also in the studies of other unconventional forms of behavior [p. 26]."

La Sagna and VonFelsinger (1954), in the course of certain pharmacological studies on 56 healthy young male volunteers, obtained Rorschach tests and psychological interviews. All received one or more drugs and were paid for volunteering. An examination of the psychological data for the volunteers revealed an unusually high incidence of severe psychological maladjustment which raised the question of the representativeness of their sample. An examination of the subjects' reasons for volunteering, though of secondary importance, were more marked than the primary drug effects. They concluded that volunteers may differ markedly from nonvolunteers in a number of important respects and generalizations based on volunteer data should be cautiously made.

Regardless of whether volunteers can be categorized as normal, the personality of such subjects and their reasons for volunteering may be important determinants of their responses to an experimental situation. Richards (1960) used 18 undergraduate students as volunteers for research on a drug (mescaline). They were matched with a control group of nonvolunteers for sex and year in school. Rorschachs, TATS and figure-drawings were obtained and evaluated for both groups. Volunteers were less repressive of their anxiety and were more given to dealing with it by means of intellectualization and entering psychotherapy. This study supplements the position that

inferences drawn from volunteers must be made with extreme caution.

Brower (1948) used a task of visuo-motor conflict as a basis of comparing volunteer college students with nonvolunteers and found significant differences. He concluded that the data suggest differential motivation may be operative in different groups of college students used for research and pointed out that psychological data derived from the university laboratory represent a markedly heterogeneous and skewed group. He recommended that research is needed to establish limitations or to stipulate qualifications before using college students as research subjects.

Bair and Gallagher (1960), using naval aviation cadets as subjects, tried to relate willingness to volunteer for dangerous tasks with other variables, such as personality as measured by the MMPI, general intelligence, mechanical comprehension, and flight aptitude ratings. They found that far from being seriously disturbed, the volunteers were actually superior in many respects to nonvolunteers and that the volunteers also excelled in leadership qualities. Another finding of their study was that the amount of volunteering can be influenced by manipulating the experimental conditions for volunteering.

Myers (1964) reported that 73 per cent of enlisted U.S. Army personnel volunteered to participate in 96 hours of sensory deprivation for which there was no monetary reward. The results of a large battery of tests including the MMPI and a biographical inventory revealed that the volunteer was characterized by a sounder and more stable personality than the nonvolunteer.

Schultz (1967) also attempted to determine the differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers for sensory deprivation study for which the female college students were paid. They had 81 per cent volunteers and the Cattell 16 PF test showed significant trends. Volunteers were found to

be emotionally mature, stable, and adventurous. Dohrenwend, Feldstein, Plosky and Schmeidler (1967) studied student volunteers for sensory deprivation with statements designed to arouse anxiety. They used a psychiatric interview measuring 22 symptoms before and after sensory deprivation experience. Their results also showed that first-borns experienced more anxiety than later-borns despite their having chosen to participate.

Volunteering behavior and birth order has also been studied by other researchers. Copra and Dittes (1962) found first-born students volunteer for small group experiments in greater number than later-borns. A similar finding is reported by Varela (1964) and Snedfeld (1964).

Rosenbaum (1956) treated volunteering itself as a dependent response, i.e., a function of the type of appeal made to the subject, background factors (such as time, place, and response of others present), and the personality of the invitee. He was able to demonstrate the significance of the first two variables. He did not investigate the personality variable, but surmised that personality differences would account for a sizeable portion of the variance. Rosenbaum and Blake (1955) found that more men volunteer for a research project when they observe a project assistant who volunteers than when the assistant declines to volunteer. Schachter and Hall (1952) reported students volunteered more readily for psychological experiments when the restraints against volunteering were low than when the restraints were high.

The purpose of Rosen (1951) was to investigate the presence of consistent personality and attitude differences between student volunteers and nonvolunteers for two types of psychological experiments. He compared volunteers and nonvolunteers by means of the MMPI, the Strong Vocational Inter-

est Blank (SVIB), grade-point average, and time taken to complete the attitude questionnaire. He found evidence of consistent differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers in the situation of a personality experiment and the situation of routine college entrance procedures. Volunteers showed a greater tendency than nonvolunteers to admit discouragement, anxiety, and inadequacy, and some tendency toward being defensive. A lack of significant difference on a number of variables (e.g., grades, vocational interests) lent support to their hypothesis that volunteers differ from nonvolunteers on psychological variables to a greater extent than they do on sociological variables.

Riggs and Kaess (1955) were chiefly concerned with the personality differences between student volunteers and nonvolunteers for psychological experiments. All were given the personality test, Guilford's Inventory of Factors, the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values Test, the verbal-projective sentence completion test, and the TAT. The authors' comparisons showed volunteers to be introversive in thinking and more moody. On a number of other dimensions, such as values and the TAT, no reliable differences appeared. Their original guess that volunteers would be characterized by concern over (and difficulty with) personal adjustment, by anxiety, and by a taste for excitement received some support.

Newman (1957) compared student volunteers and nonvolunteers for personality and perception research by using the Edward's Personality Preference Schedule (EPPS) and Form 40/45 of the F (Fascism) Scale. He found many significant differences and concluded that volunteers and nonvolunteers are not sufficiently equivalent to justify the use of volunteers as representative of the total population.

The personality characteristics of volunteers and nonvolunteers for

four different experimental situations were examined by Martin and Marcuse (1959). A request for volunteers to participate in one of four experimental situations dealing with learning, personality, and attitudes toward sex and hypnosis was made to 400 college students. Reliability of volunteering behavior by test-retest method after one week ranged from .67 to .91 for the different situations. No significant differences were found in any of the comparisons between volunteers and nonvolunteers for the experimental situations of learning, sex, or personality on the measures of Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (MAS), Levinson E (Ethnocentrism) scale, and Bernreuter Personality Inventory. For the hypnosis situation there were significant differences on two variables. The general conclusion of these investigators was that there were personality differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers associated with different types of volunteering situations and that generalizations made from biased samples can be misleading.

Himmelstein (1956), using Taylor's Manifest Anxiety Scale, found no significant difference between student volunteers and nonvolunteers for a psychological experiment, although nonvolunteers tended to be higher in anxiety. However, Scheier (1959), who asked students to volunteer for a study of anxiety, found that volunteers were significantly less anxious in terms of their scores on the IPAT anxiety scale. Howe (1960) invited students to participate, for cash, in experiments involving either a weak or a moderately strong electric shock and compared student volunteers and nonvolunteers for the two experiments on four measures of anxiety including the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale. In this case, the anxiety measure failed to discriminate between volunteers and nonvolunteers. Similar results were obtained by Levitt, Lubin, and Zuckerman (1959) who asked student nurses to volunteer as paid participants for a hypnosis experiment. In addition, administration of the TAT failed to show significant difference between

the attitudes of volunteers and nonvolunteers.

Hersch, Kulik, and Scheibe (1969) compared students asked to volunteer for mental health workers by means of the California Personality Inventory, the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, and life history data. Volunteers were found to be significantly higher on the CPI scores, indicating better adjustment than nonvolunteer students. Sheridan and Shack (1970) offered 81 undergraduate students an opportunity to volunteer to participate in seven weekly sessions of sensitivity training. On the Personal Orientation Inventory and Epistemic Orientation, volunteers were found to be significantly more accepting of themselves and significantly less motivationally dependent on their environment than nonvolunteers. Volunteers also tended to be more self-actualized than nonvolunteers.

Efran and Boylin (1967) studied volunteering for group discussions in introductory psychology classes in terms of social desirability as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability scale. They hypothesized that when faced with a choice, subjects with high self-esteem anticipate social rejection and choose cautious modes of behavior to avoid threats to self-esteem and are reluctant to volunteer for the prominent role, e.g., group discussion. Their results showed that the volunteers had high self-esteem and engaged in ego-defensive behavior by choosing the less prominent role. An investigation of the 44 student volunteers for a leaderless group discussion experiment (compared with 51 nonvolunteers) was undertaken by Frye and Adams (1959). After the discussion, the subjects were given the Edward's Personal Preference Schedule. They failed to find significant difference on the personality variables as measured by Edward's Test.

Kaess and Long (1954) in an effort to investigate the effectiveness of vocational guidance compared student volunteers with those who were required to participate and found several significant differences. Volunteers found the guidance program more effective than the others. Mendelsohn and Kirk (1962) compared students who do and do not use a counseling facility and found that students who seek counseling are more intuitive and somewhat more introverted.

Corotto (1963a) asked 175 male alcoholic patients in a state hospital to volunteer for continued treatment. The California Personality Inventory was used to measure the personality differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers. His findings indicated that the volunteers tended to be relatively less well adjusted than the nonvolunteers and the nonvolunteers achieved significantly higher scores on 7 of the 18 CPI scales. Corotto (1963b) also compared volunteers for commitments to a state hospital with involuntary commitments by using the California Personality Inventory and found nonvolunteers had higher mean scores than volunteers.

Bell (1962) reviewed literature regarding personality characteristics of volunteers for psychological studies under five headings: unconventionality, adjustment, anxiety, social extraversion, and need achievement. He found that volunteers tended to be less conventional than nonvolunteers. Volunteers for certain experimental situations (e.g. drugs, clinical personality studies) tended to be less well-adjusted than nonvolunteers. There was some inconsistency regarding relation of volunteering to anxiety. The amount of evidence for sociability-unsociability of volunteers was not great, but volunteers tended to be less socially extraverted than nonvolunteers.

A review of the above studies indicates that volunteers and nonvolunteers have been compared in widely different situations, but psychotherapy as a situation has not been studied as yet. One consistent result is vol-

unteers and nonvolunteers do differ and seem to have a different psychological make-up, except in studies of Frye and Adams (1959) and Levitt et al. (1959). The differences found between volunteers and nonvolunteers seems to be specific to the situation under which they are studied. While some researchers have found volunteers to be psychologically normal, healthy, and sounder than nonvolunteers (e.g., Bair & Gallagher, 1960; Hersch et al., 1969; Myers, 1964; Richards, 1960; Schultz, 1967) others have found volunteers to be emotionally sick and not as well adjusted as those who did not volunteer (Corotto, 1963a, 1963b; LaSagna & VonFelsinger, 1954; Riggs & Kaess, 1955; Rosen, 1951). The investigators have used a variety of instruments in studying volunteers' characteristics and hence there is a lack of consistency in terms of the dimensions on which they differ. Among the personality tests, the MMPI (Bair & Gallagher, 1960; Myers, 1964; Rosen, 1951) and the California Personality Inventory (Corotto, 1963a, 1963b; Hersch, et al., 1969) and the Edward's Personal Preference Schedule (Frye & Adams, 1959; Newman, 1957) have been used more than some other tests. Projective tests like the TAT have also been used in volunteer-nonvolunteer research (Levitt, et al., 1959; Richard, 1960; Riggs & Kaess, 1955). Almost all the studies reviewed have used college students as subjects except Wallin (1949) who used engaged couples, and Bair and Gallagher (1960) and Myers (1964) who used Navy and Army personnel, and Corotto (1963a, 1963b) who used alcoholic patients. The experimental situations investigated by many researchers are sex-attitudes (Kinsey and Pomeroy, 1948; Martin & Marcuse, 1958; Maslow, 1940; Maslow & Sakoda, 1952), sensory deprivation (Dohrenwend et al., 1967; Myers, 1964; Schultz, 1967) and dangerous tasks (Bair & Gallagher, 1960; Howe, 1960) drug research (LaSagna & VonFelsinger, 1954; Richard, 1960), group discussion (Efran & Boylin, 1967; Frye & Adams, 1959), guidance or

counseling (Kaess & Long, 1954; Mendelsohn & Kirk, 1962), and hypnosis (Levitt et al., 1959; Martin & Marcuse, 1958). Volunteering behavior itself has been studied and the fact that it can be manipulated has been demonstrated by Bair and Gallagher (1960) and Rosenbaum and Blake (1955).

Some researchers have also studied sociological variables. Although no significant differences were noted, one particular variable has received more attention than others; namely, birth order (Copra & Dittes, 1962; Dohrenwend et al., 1967; Snedfeld, 1964; Varela, 1964).

In the literature reviewed above, there are no studies in which the volunteering behavior of a prison population was studied nor are there any studies which investigated volunteering for psychotherapy per se. The only studies which may be relevant to the present investigation are not consistent with respect to their findings relevant to the personality and adjustment of the volunteers and nonvolunteers. The investigation of alcoholic patients who volunteered for continued treatment (Corotto, 1963a) or for commitment to a state hospital (Corotto, 1963b) indicated that the volunteers were less well adjusted. Mendelsohn and Kirk (1962), studying students who did or did not use a counseling facility, found that students who sought counseling were more intuitive and tended toward introversion. In the former case the population is most like the subjects in this study and in the latter case the situation is most like the one used by the writer. Because of these differences, it is not possible to form a specific hypothesis. Thus this study investigated the differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers, if any, in terms of personality, behavior, and sociological variables.

Recidivists vs. Nonrecidivists. One of the strongest motives that prompts the study of various prisoners is to aid in the prevention of, or recurrence of, illegal or criminal behavior in the future. One of the most common class-

ifications of prisoners is, therefore, that of recidivists vs. nonrecidivists.

Many researchers have attempted to develop an instrument to distinguish the recidivist from the nonrecidivist. Clark (1948) developed a 24-item AWOL (Absent Without Leave) scale by administering the MMPI to 100 military offenders placed in a center for rehabilitation. In 1953, Clark reported he was able to differentiate between a group who was absent once and a second group, who was absent twice or more on the basis of his scale. Freeman (1952) also attempted to develop a scale from the MMPI to discriminate recidivists from nonrecidivists but was unsuccessful. Panton (1962) also developed a scale from the MMPI to discriminate between parole violators and nonviolators. Black (1967) attempted to develop a Recidivist Rehabilitation Inventory.

The list of attempts cited above reflects the belief that recidivists and nonrecidivists form two different groups in a prison population and the writer shares this view. The investigation of the characteristics of recidivists and first offenders in this study represents an interest in a seemingly similar sort of variable.

There are also a few studies comparing recidivists and nonrecidivists in terms of various social and psychological factors. Wattenberg (1955) compared the records of 427 repeaters with 655 nonrepeaters of the Detroit Youth Bureau in 1952. Of the items associated with repeating, the largest cluster related to friction with parents and with schools. As compared to a similar study of boys, repeating among girls was linked to a more narrow range of factors, such as the present relationships within the home, particularly those involving their mothers. Vaughn (1965) sought to compare three groups of juvenile delinquent, recidivist boys with respect to indiv-

idual, family, school, and court data. Two hundred Negro boys classified as frequent, occasional, and infrequent recidivists were compared and he found that individual determinants, e.g., age, intelligence, religious preference, and school data did not differ significantly for the three groups. Frequent recidivists were found to have moderate personality disturbance and although their crimes were fewer initially, they became more serious later. Mack (1969a) compared 65 male adolescent recidivists with 59 nonrecidivists by means of the ratings given by the parole agents and found that recidivists were rated significantly more aggressive than nonrecidivists but not more neurotic.

Dunham (1950, 1954) compared male recidivists and nonrecidivists on the MMPI and found that recidivists were high on the Depression and Psychopathic Deviate Scales. Mack (1969b) also compared the MMPI scores of 80 recidivists and 68 parole success cases. No important differences were identified and he concluded that the MMPI alone is not useful in identifying recidivists but recommended its use in combination with historical information.

Bartholomew (1959) compared 50 recidivists with 50 first offenders on the Extraversion-Introversion (E-I) and Neuroticism-Normality (N-N) continuum of the Maudsley Personality Inventory (MPI). He found that recidivists were significantly higher on the E-I Scale and that first offenders were higher on the N-N continuum. Blackler (1968) compared 242 male recidivists with 438 first offenders to examine the hypothesis that recidivism is correlated with an increasing isolation from society. The results showed that recidivists tended to remember their homes as being less happy and, as adults, they had less contact with their family but depended more on distant relatives and friends. The recidivists were more likely to be separated from their wives, to change jobs and residence more frequently, and to mix with casual acquaint-

ances. On the Maudsley Personality Inventory, the recidivists tended to be high on Extraversion, but the difference was not significant.

Yoshimasu, Takemura, and Tsuboi (1959) studied 81 Japanese female recidivists over 40 years of age. Their histories were comparatively shorter than those of male recidivists, comparatively more had begun their crimes after age 25 indicating that women's crimes were largely influenced by marriage and environment. Taylor (1960) studied a sample of 100 male recidivists age 30 or older. He found that recidivists tended to have a later entry into crime and had generally not been juvenile delinquents. The majority favored breaking laws and committing crimes which had been abandoned by other criminals of their age group and their offenses were not dangerous or violent. There was a low incidence of crime among relatives, but few maintained contacts with relatives and friends. There was a high incidence of ill-health in their past and a likelihood of an emotionally disturbed boyhood. Social avoidance was a dominant feature of the group.

Guze (1964) did a follow-up study of 217 convicted felons to determine recidivism rates and measure the association of these rates with certain social and psychiatric factors. Recidivism rates were compared by race, age, and educational level. The only significant results were that Negroes had a significantly higher number of arrests and that those who were 40 years of age or older had significantly fewer arrests. The differences associated with educational level were inconsistent. No significant difference was found on the basis of family history. Regarding psychiatric diagnoses, the recidivism rates were significantly higher for alcoholics and drug addicts. The single most important factor associated with recidivism rates was the extent of the previous criminal career.

Mandel, Collins, Moran, Barron, Gelbman, Gadbois, and Kaminstein (1965) in a 5-year follow-up study of 446 prisoners found that almost two-thirds of the group were recidivists. Comparisons of recidivists with non-recidivists on pre-, intra-, and postinstitutional factors indicated that the recidivists were educationally and vocationally handicapped.

These studies support the hypothesis that recidivists differ from nonrecidivists on sociological and psychological factors. As measured by the Maudsley Personality Inventory recidivists tended to be high on Extraversion. They were educationally and vocationally handicapped. They had a later entry into crime and almost invariably there was a likelihood of emotional disturbance in their past, friction in the home with parents, and also an increasing isolation from society. There are no studies of adult female prisoners, but the populations of adult males and juvenile boys and girls in the studies cited above suggest that similar differences might be expected in adult female prisoners.

Types of Offenses. Prisoners have been classified in many different ways for the purposes of research. One such classification has been reviewed above. This section reviews the literature regarding different classifications to see whether it can supply any basis for hypothesis formation for the crime classification proposed for this study.

Hovey (1942) was able to show that antisocial recidivists are clearly different from a control group of normal adult inmates on many sociological variables such as ability to adjust to group life; early family, school, and occupational adjustment; heterosexual interest; and history of crime beginning during adolescence. Wolk (1959) explored differences in personality structure among antisocial offenders divided into six categories according to type of crimes. His findings based on 180 inmates suggested that personality differences exist among various groups of offenders. The groups

Aggressive Sex, Passive, and Passive Sex Offenders most resembled each other in personality, but the groups Passive Motor Vehicle and Armed Robber Offenders did not resemble each other. Some were seen as emotionally disturbed and the others as possessing distorted attitudes.

Blair (1950) found that 151 items of the MMPI discriminated offenders in the Canadian Army compared with matched and random control groups of nonoffenders. Craddick (1962) studied prisoners who were psychopathic and those who were not so labeled by a psychiatric checklist of 12 items. He compared the two groups by the MMPI and found the groups differed on three scales. The psychopaths appeared to be significantly higher on the Pd, Pt, and Ma scales with their respective K weightings added. Gynther (1962) investigated the relationship between type of crime and age, intelligence, and degree of psychopathology as measured by the MMPI. He found individuals who committed sexual crimes were the most seriously emotionally disturbed.

East (1945) suggested that if criminals show marked social maladjustment, they are best classified under such clinical types as alcohol or drug addicts, sexual perverts, or schizoid, cycloid, or paranoid.

Hayner (1961) interviewed 6000 prisoners and stated five patterns that emerged frequently were "the con forger," "the alcoholic forger" who is raised by his parents to be a dependent personality, "the rapo" of low socio-economic background and deviant sexual experience, "the heavy" who conceives himself as a criminal, and "the graduate" who developed psychopathic traits in childhood and is characterized by a lack of conscience and impulsive behavior.

Freedman (1961) studied 150 criminals, 50 in each of three categories, "sexuality," "aggressive" which was defined as showing forceful and harmful action directed at another person, and "acquisivity" meaning illegal possession of property without aggression. The groups were studied by structured

therapeutic interview, participant observation in group therapy sessions and psychological testing. Those classified as "aggressive" had ambivalent approach to their sexual lives. Those classified as "acquisitive" were more typically a phenomenon of their subculture, whose values were not those of the community. Those classified as "sex" and "aggressive" criminals reflected a more individual psychopathological response. "Acquisitive" subjects manifested a kind of group anomie (or normlessness) and this seemed to be a phenomenon of their subculture.

Wilcock (1964) demonstrated that neurotic differences could be found among prison inmates according to characteristics of their criminal behavior. He compared three groups: (1) an "individualized" group whose crimes were violent, aggressive, and lacked a financial motive, (2) a "socialized" group whose crimes were committed to acquire ends which are socially accepted in the broader cultural milieu, e.g., a thief who steals for economic gain and security, and (3) an "aggressive socialized" group whose crimes involved both aggression and money, committed with or without the aid of an accomplice. The three groups showed significantly different elevations on several subscales of the MMPI and the California Personality Inventory (CPI). The results reflected more neurotic traits in the "individualized" group than in the more common socialized criminal groups. On the CPI where elevation is generally a positive indication, the "individualized" group scored significantly lower on the subscales which measure Social Presence (SP), Self Acceptance (SA), and Intellectual Efficiency (IE) and significantly higher on Femininity (Fe). Although many of the other differences were not significant, the MMPI and the CPI profiles consistently showed differences which suggested that the individualized group was more severely disturbed.

The studies reviewed above indicate that there are possible personality

differences when the offenders are classified on the basis of their crimes. Although none of these studies investigated personality differences in terms of the classification used in the present study (i.e. crimes against others, against property, and against self), Wilcock's (1964) comparisons appeared to involve two similar groups. His individualized group is comparable to "crimes against others" and the socialized group to "crimes against property." It might be anticipated, therefore, that the group classified as "crimes against others" is characterized by significantly lower scores on most of the CPI subscales. There is no basis for formulating a hypothesis regarding the group "crimes against self." This study will investigate whether there are any differences between the three crime categories.

The California Personality Inventory (CPI). The CPI was developed to provide descriptive concepts which possess broad personal and social relevance. Two hundred of its 480 items were taken from the MMPI. Eleven of the CPI scales were constructed by what has been called the "empirical technique" and the other scales were created by the technique of internal consistency analysis. Additional information relevant to its development appear in the CPI manual (1964).

Gough and Peterson (1952) constructed the Delinquency (De) scale of the CPI, later called Socialization (So), which was capable of differentiating significantly between delinquents and nondelinquents in both the original and the cross-validation samples. Gough (1954) validated the So scale on a sample of 3285 males ranging from "best citizens" to young delinquents and prisoners. A similarly defined sample of 3999 females was also tested. The biserial r for males was .67 and for females .86.

Thorne (1963) tried to test the relationship between severity of crimes and the So scores and found no relationship, but he discovered a difference

between social and solitary delinquent boys, the latter getting lower So scores. Reckless, Dinitz, and Kay (1957) compared "good" boys and potential delinquents by means of the Delinquency (De) and Social Responsibility (Re) scales of the CPI. Both scales were found to discriminate between the groups with "good" boys obtaining significantly lower De scores and significantly higher Re scores.

Hymes (1963) reported high test-retest reliability for prisoners who obtained low scores on the Socialization scale. Knapp (1964) reported that the So scale was able to discriminate between offenders and nonoffenders in a sample of Navy enlisted men.

Gough, Wenk, and Rozytko (1965) were able to show significant differences on the So scale (lower for parole nonviolators) and significantly higher scores on Self-acceptance (Sa) and Social Presence (Sp) for the initial and cross validation samples composed of parole violators and nonviolators. Sarbin, Wenk, and Sherwood (1968) correctly identified 73 per cent of all assault prone offenders by means of the Wagner Hand Test and the So scale of the CPI.

Stein (1967) divided inmates into high and low ideational groups as measured by the Motoric-Ideational Activity Preference Scale (MIAPS). The total prison sample showed a CPI profile lower in elevation than Gough's normative sample (Gough, 1957) although the high ideational group secured scores not too divergent from the norm. Stein interpreted these findings as indicating greater social and interpersonal effectiveness of the high ideational group.

The CPI as an instrument has been used especially with the prison population and the Socialization scale has demonstrated reliability and validity as a screening device in identifying delinquents. There is no specific literature regarding various crime categories used in this study except that of Wilcock (1964). This study provides a further attempt to investigate the

validity of the CPI in terms of its ability to differentiate different groups of female prisoners.

Chapter 2

Method

Subjects

From successive admissions to the California Institution for Women, 100 recidivists and 100 first offenders were selected. Three factors were considered in the selection of these subjects.

Age: Inmates between the ages of 18 and 48 only were included in the study.

Education: Only those who scored at the sixth-grade level or higher on the California Achievement Test were included. The sixth-grade level was used as a cutting point because it was believed that persons scoring below this level might have difficulty in responding to the other measures included in this investigation.

Mental condition: Inmates with obvious psychotic symptoms and those who needed immediate psychiatric attention were excluded because most were under medication which might have affected their test performance.

The 200 subjects, recidivists and first offenders, were further classified as volunteers and nonvolunteers on the basis of their response to a request for volunteers for psychotherapy. The following frequencies were obtained for the four groups.

	Volunteers	Nonvolunteers	Total
Recidivists	69	31	100
First Offenders	66	34	100
	135	65	200

For the second part of this study, the same 200 subjects were divided into three groups. The basis of this classification was the type of criminal offense as follows:

1. Those who had committed crimes against others (vs. Others). This group included those who had committed such crimes as assault with a deadly weapon, voluntary manslaughter, murder, or crimes which caused harm to other people.
2. Those who had committed crimes against property (vs. Property). This group included those who had a record of such crimes as theft, burglary, forgery, and writing checks without sufficient funds.
3. Those who had committed crimes against self (vs. Self), including drug users and alcoholics.

Many of the inmates had committed more than one kind of offense. Their inclusion in more than one group resulted in a total of more than 200 for the three categories. The frequency of the three groups was as follows: vs. Others (32); vs. Property (135); vs. Self (85).

Measures

Information concerning each subject's willingness to volunteer for psychotherapy was obtained by means of a form (see Appendix A) which asked the subject to indicate whether she would like to participate in psychotherapy by checking the "Yes" or "No" box. Each subject was also required to sign her name and write her number on this form. All who indicated their willingness to volunteer were classified as volunteers and the others were classified as nonvolunteers.

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) has 18 scales; their name and purpose appear below.

Dominance (Do) -- To assess factors of leadership ability, dominance, persistence and social initiative.

Capacity for Status (Cs) -- To serve as an index of an individual's capacity for status. The scale attempts to measure the personal qualities and attributes which underlie and lead to status.

Sociability (Sy) -- To identify persons of outgoing, sociable, participative temperament.

Social Presence (Sp) -- To assess factors such as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction.

Self-acceptance (Sa) -- To assess factors such as sense of personal worth, self-acceptance and capacity for independent thinking and action.

Sense of Well-Being (Wb) -- To identify persons who minimize their worries and complaints and who are relatively free from self-doubt and disillusionment.

Responsibility (Re) -- To identify persons of conscientious responsible and dependable disposition and temperament.

Socialization (So) -- To indicate the degree of social maturity, integrity, and rectitude which the individual has attained.

Self-control (S) -- To assess the degree and adequacy of self-regulation and self-control and freedom from impulsivity and self-centeredness.

Tolerance (To) -- To identify persons with permissive, accepting, and non-judgmental social beliefs and attitudes.

Good Impression (Gi) -- To identify persons capable of creating a favorable impression, and who are concerned about how others react to them.

Communality (Cm) -- To indicate the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established for the inventory.

Achievement via Conformance (Ac) -- To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where

conformance is a positive behavior.

Achievement via Independence (Ai) -- To identify those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where autonomy and independence are positive behaviors.

Intellectual Efficiency (Ie) -- To indicate the degree of personal and intellectual efficiency which the individual has attained.

Psychological-mindedness (Py) -- To measure the degree to which the individual is interested in and responsive to the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others.

Flexibility (Fx) -- To indicate the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior.

Femininity (Fe) -- To assess the masculinity or femininity of interests. (High scores indicate more feminine interests, low scores more masculine).

The test was administered and scored according to the instructions contained in the manual. Higher scores on all scales indicate a more socially well-adjusted personality while low scores indicate a less well-adjusted personality.

Two measures of each subject's behavior were obtained on the basis of the Behavior Rating Scale (see Appendix A). The first behavior rating, four weeks after admission to the Guidance Center, was obtained from the custody personnel, the Women's Correctional Supervisor, who directly observed the inmates. The second behavior rating was obtained by the writer by transcribing the descriptive evaluation made by Women's Correctional Supervisor at the end of an 8-week period.

The Behavior Rating Scale consisted of seven items describing various behaviors. Evaluation of each item was based on a 5-point scale ranging

from the rating 1 (poor) to 5 (exceptionally good). The sum of ratings for the seven items constituted the total score with higher scores indicating better behavior.

In addition to the above measures, information was obtained from the case summary sheet contained in each subject's record and the counselor's interview report describing the subject's history. The information included age, education (number of years the subject claimed to have attended school), educational grade level (measured by the California Achievement Test), I.Q. (Revised Beta Test). The number of children the subject had was also considered. Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of these sociological variables. The subject's race (white or black), marital status (single, married, and separated, divorced or widowed), and religion (Catholic, Protestant, Mormon, Christian Science, or none) was also noted. The subject's birth rank, whether first or other, was another variable. The subject's home background was categorized as "stable," (meaning "normal" condition of home in which the subject grew up), "unstable" (meaning there were parent figures in the family but lack of geographical and/or financial stability), or "broken" (meaning lack of one or both parental figures, including subjects who were brought up in orphanages). Information relevant to socio-economic level was limited to a simple dichotomy based on "poor" (those who were on welfare or whose records described their background as lacking the means to meet the daily necessities of life) or "not poor" (including all others) was used in classifying the subjects.

Procedure

All inmates, when admitted to the institution, are given a packet of legal papers to be completed and returned to the Record's Officer. It was decided to attach the form requesting volunteers to this packet so that all

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations of the Sociological Variables of the Four Groups

Sociological Variable	Nonvolunteers				Volunteers			
	Recidivists N=31		First Offenders N=31		Recidivists N=69		First Offenders N=66	
	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Age	34.71	6.81	27.97	7.20	35.28	6.82	29.07	7.92
Education	10.45	1.98	10.38	2.03	10.76	1.90	11.24	1.86
Grade Level	8.47	1.75	7.99	1.76	9.01	1.73	8.89	1.95
IQ	104.32	10.31	103.67	8.96	104.10	10.72	104.98	11.33
Number of Children	1.70	1.57	2.29	2.05	1.91	1.79	1.98	1.67

inmates would receive the form. The packet and the form were returned to the Record's Officer by the second week following admission.

In the second or third week after admission, the inmate was seen by one of the counselors and a psychologist. The counselor administered the Revised Beta Intelligence Test and the California Personality Inventory was administered by the writer.

At the end of the fourth week, each subject's Women's Correctional Supervisor filled out the first Behavior Rating Scale. At the end of the eighth week following admission, the second Behavior Rating Scale was completed by the writer from the subject's records. The raters, including the writer, did not know whether the subjects were volunteers or nonvolunteers and were unfamiliar of their status in the other measures.

Chapter 3

Results

The comparison of volunteers vs. nonvolunteers and recidivists vs. first offenders was based on analysis of variance using a 2 x 2 factorial design. Since the sizes of the four groups were unequal, the 18 CPI scale scores, the two behavior ratings, and the sociological variables with continuous distributions were analyzed by using the least-square solution for unequal cell frequencies (Winer, 1962, pp. 291-293). The other sociological variables were analyzed by the chi-square technique (Siegel, 1956, pp. 175-179).

The Four Groups

Although no specific hypothesis were stated regarding the volunteers and nonvolunteers, the goal was to investigate the differences, if any, in terms of personality, behavior and the sociological variables. There was no supported rationale for formulating directional hypotheses regarding the recidivist and first offender groups, but on the basis of adult male inmates and juvenile boys and girls, it was anticipated that similar differences would be found for the present subjects in terms of psychological and sociological variables.

Personality Measure

Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations for the 18 CPI scales for the four groups. Table 3 provides the summary of the analyses of variance for these same variables. The groups of volunteers and nonvolunteers differed significantly ($p < .05$) on two of the scales, Social presence and Communitality. In each instance, the volunteers scored higher than the nonvolunteers. These findings indicated that volunteers were more enthusiastic,

Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for the 18 CPI Scales for the Four Groups

CPI Scale	Nonvolunteers				Volunteers			
	Recidivists N=31		First Offenders N=34		Recidivists N=69		First Offenders N=66	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Dominance	22.94	6.09	22.76	7.18	24.28	5.96	23.39	5.99
Capacity for Status	15.71	4.78	16.38	4.99	16.75	4.49	17.51	4.08
Sociability	21.71	4.48	21.62	6.40	22.04	5.76	22.77	4.84
Social Presence	31.09	5.29	30.94	6.66	33.10	6.29	33.69	6.11
Self Acceptance	20.29	4.31	18.71	4.94	20.13	4.58	19.46	4.27
Sense of Well Being	30.68	6.41	31.94	6.62	31.65	6.21	33.19	6.59
Responsibility	22.29	6.52	24.52	6.09	24.22	5.05	24.41	5.66
Socialization	25.13	4.85	27.97	6.77	26.00	4.89	28.46	6.31
Self Control	24.03	7.66	27.82	7.27	23.97	7.57	26.50	8.38
Tolerance	17.32	6.02	17.17	5.76	17.21	5.80	18.44	5.26
Good Impression	14.58	7.34	16.91	5.22	14.79	6.00	16.16	5.93
Communality	23.55	2.88	24.21	3.42	24.84	2.85	25.09	2.23
Achievement via Conformance	21.48	6.09	23.32	6.57	22.33	5.02	23.21	4.80

Table 2 (Continued)

CPI Scale	Nonvolunteers				Volunteers			
	Recidivists <u>N=31</u>		First Offenders <u>N=34</u>		Recidivists <u>N=69</u>		First Offenders <u>N=66</u>	
	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Achievement via Independence	15.71	5.06	15.97	4.06	16.18	4.55	16.98	4.47
Intellectual Efficiency	32.81	6.58	32.94	6.25	32.98	6.29	34.03	5.65
Psychological Mindedness	9.42	2.91	9.41	2.66	9.52	3.07	10.28	3.26
Flexibility	9.00	3.98	9.11	4.30	9.08	3.55	9.15	3.50
Femininity	21.22	3.23	22.97	3.50	22.04	3.40	22.51	3.25

Table 3
Summary of the Analysis of Variance for the
Four Groups on the 18 CPI Scales

CPI Scale		Volunteers vs Nonvolunteers	Recidivists vs First Offenders	Interaction
Dominance	$\frac{F}{MS}$	1.07 42.36	.55 21.79	.15 5.76
Capacity for Status	$\frac{F}{MS}$	2.52 52.02	1.30 26.81	.00 .09
Sociability	$\frac{F}{MS}$.83 24.93	.36 10.69	.25 7.39
Social Presence	$\frac{F}{MS}$	6.47 ^b 250.20	.16 6.18	.16 6.18
Self Acceptance	$\frac{F}{MS}$.21 4.29	2.22 46.09	.45 9.34
Sense of Well Being	$\frac{F}{MS}$	1.29 54.84	2.49 105.53	.02 .86
Responsibility	$\frac{F}{MS}$	1.03 33.85	1.11 36.63	1.39 45.91
Socialization	$\frac{F}{MS}$.61 20.30	10.00 ^a 335.17	.05 1.51
Self Control	$\frac{F}{MS}$.35 21.94	6.92 ^a 431.38	.28 17.45
Tolerance	$\frac{F}{MS}$.48 15.53	.93 30.22	.63 20.50
Good Impression	$\frac{F}{MS}$.09 3.33	3.73 ^c 141.26	.27 10.13
Communality	$\frac{F}{MS}$	6.52 ^b 51.48	.93 7.31	.23 1.82
Achievement via Conformance	$\frac{F}{MS}$.19 5.60	2.36 70.80	.34 10.11
Achievement via Independence	$\frac{F}{MS}$	1.19 24.85	.92 19.36	.15 3.14
Intellectual Efficiency	$\frac{F}{MS}$.48 18.23	.73 28.05	.24 9.07

Table 3 (Continued)

CPI Scale		Volunteers vs Nonvolunteers	Recidivists vs First Offenders	Interaction
Psychological Mindedness	<u>F</u>	1.15	1.40	.69
	<u>MS</u>	10.89	13.25	6.56
Flexibility	<u>F</u>	.01	.02	.00
	<u>MS</u>	.16	.33	.03
Feminity	<u>F</u>	.11	3.42 ^c	1.55
	<u>MS</u>	1.21	39.12	17.75

Level of Significance

a \leq .01b \leq .05c \leq .10

df for all variables were: volunteers-nonvolunteers = 1, recidivists-first offenders = 1, interaction = 1, within = 196.

imaginative, spontaneous, and talkative, and generally were characterized as having a more expressive nature. In addition, the volunteers' scores, according to the interpretation of the CPI, meant they were more sincere, realistic, conscientious, and characterized by having more common sense good judgment than nonvolunteers.

The groups of recidivists and first offenders differed significantly on two scales. The scales Socialization and Self Control showed differences significant at .01 level. Two other scales, Good Impression and Femininity, showed difference that approached significance ($p < .10$). On each of these four scales the first offenders had higher scores than the recidivists. These results suggest that the first offenders tended to be more conscientious, responsible, conforming, inhibited, thoughtful and deliberate, outgoing, and concerned with making a good impression, as well as being respectful and accepting of others. Thus, as anticipated, there were several indications that the first offenders tended to be better adjusted than the recidivists. There were no significant differences on any of the other scales and none of the interactions was significant.

Behavior ratings

Since the two ratings of behavior were obtained in different ways, two reliability measures were computed. For the first measure, the inter-observer reliability (between two Women's Correctional Supervisors) of the scale computed for 20 randomly selected cases was .82. For the second 8-week measure, the interjudge reliability (between the Women's Correctional supervisor and the writer's ratings based on the descriptive evaluations) for the same 20 cases was .86. A third measure, the test-retest reliability for the 4-week and 8-week Behavior Ratings was computed for the 200 subjects

and was found to be .71.

Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations for the behavior ratings. The analyses of variance (Table 5) indicated that for the groups of volunteers and nonvolunteers the second and the total behavior rating showed difference significant at .01 level of confidence. The mean scores were higher for the volunteers than the nonvolunteers which indicated that the volunteers behaved better than the nonvolunteers. None of the main effects for the recidivists and first offenders and none of the interactions for any of the comparisons was significant.

Sociological Variables

The four groups were also compared with respect to their scores on the eleven sociological variables. The means and standard deviations for the five continuous variables (age, education, grade level, IQ, and number of children) appear in Table 1. The analysis of variance for these variables (Table 6) showed that the volunteer-nonvolunteer dimension had significant main effects for grade level and education ($p < .01$ and $.05$ respectively). In terms of means, the volunteers were higher on both the variables than the nonvolunteers. The recidivists-first offenders comparison showed recidivists were significantly older in age ($p < .01$) than the first offenders. None of the other comparisons yielded any significant results.

The observed frequencies for the other sociological variables (Table 7) were analyzed by the chi-square technique and are presented in Table 8. For the variables race, birth rank and socioeconomic level, a 2×4 analysis was used, and for the variables marital status, home background and religion a 3×4 analysis was performed. Thus the differences on these four groups were inferences derived by inspecting data for the four groups. The only significant difference was found for the variable of religion ($p < .05$), indicating

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviation for Behavior

Ratings for the Four Groups

Behavior Rating	Nonvolunteers				Volunteers			
	Recidivists <u>N=31</u>		First Offenders <u>N=34</u>		Recidivists <u>N=69</u>		First Offenders <u>N=66</u>	
	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
First	20.13	2.73	20.12	2.27	20.78	2.60	20.59	3.30
Second	18.65	2.81	19.56	2.73	21.74	2.23	21.36	3.27
Total	38.77	5.14	39.68	4.56	42.49	4.46	41.95	6.18

Table 5

Summary of Analyses of Variance for the Behavior
Ratings for the Four Groups

Behavior Ratings		Volunteers vs Nonvolunteers	Recidivists vs First Offenders	Interaction
First	<u>F</u>	1.69	.11	.04
	<u>MS</u>	13.81	.88	.36
Second	<u>F</u>	32.79 ^a	.01	2.30
	<u>MS</u>	259.65	.09	18.20
Total	<u>F</u>	14.06 ^a	.01	.82
	<u>MS</u>	389.50	.24	22.72

Level of Significance

a \leq .01b \leq .05c \leq .10

df for all variables were: volunteers-nonvolunteers = 1, recidivists-first offenders = 1, interaction = 1, within = 196.

Table 6
 Summary of Analyses of Variance of Sociological
 Variables for the Four Groups

Variable		Volunteers vs Nonvolunteers	Recidivists vs First Offenders	Interaction
Age	<u>F</u>	.59	37.77 ^a	.06
	<u>MS</u>	31.59	2036.02	3.02
Education	<u>F</u>	4.10 ^b	1.17	.85
	<u>MS</u>	15.51	4.43	3.24
Grade Level	<u>F</u>	6.75 ^a	.80	.42
	<u>MS</u>	22.77	2.70	1.40
IQ	<u>F</u>	.12	.07	.22
	<u>MS</u>	13.82	7.47	25.62
Number of Children	<u>F</u>	.05	.89	.90
	<u>MS</u>	.15	2.83	2.88

Level of Significance

a \leq .01

b \leq .05

c \leq .10

df for all variables were: volunteers-nonvolunteers = 1, recidivists-
 first offenders = 1, interaction = 1, and within = 196.

Table 7
Observed Frequencies of Sociological Data for the Four Groups

	Nonvolunteer		Volunteer	
	Recidivist <u>N=31</u>	First Offender <u>N=34</u>	Recidivist <u>N=69</u>	First Offender <u>N=66</u>
Race				
White	18	24	39	48
Black	13	10	30	18
Marital Status				
Single	8	9	11	16
Married	5	10	15	17
Separated, Divorced or Widowed	18	15	43	33
Birth Rank				
First	16	17	28	33
Other	15	17	41	33
Home Background				
Stable	14	22	36	38
Unstable	9	6	11	9
Broken	8	6	22	19
Socioeconomic Level				
Poor	12	9	31	23
Not Poor	19	25	38	43
Religion				
Catholic	19	12	21	24
Other	9	21	46	39
None	3	1	2	3

Table 8
Summary of Chi-Square of Sociological
Variables for the Four Groups

Variable	<u>df</u>	<u>χ^2</u>	<u>p</u>
Race	3	4.98	ns
Marital Status	6	5.04	ns
Birth Rank	3	1.79	ns
Home Background	6	6.08	ns
Socioeconomic Level	3	3.61	ns
Religion	6	13.51	.05

that the four groups differed significantly. The volunteers had the highest proportion of Catholics, the first offenders had the highest proportion of non-Catholics while the nonvolunteers had the highest proportion of all the groups that practice no religion.

In summary, the comparisons of the volunteer and nonvolunteer groups indicated that the volunteers were higher on two of the personality scales, an indication that they were somewhat better adjusted than the nonvolunteers. Volunteers also reported more years of education, had a higher measured grade level (on the California Achievement Test) and had a higher percentage of Catholics than the nonvolunteers. Their behavior in the prison (at the end of 8 weeks) was better than that of the nonvolunteers.

The recidivist and first offender groups showed several significant differences on personality variables which suggested that the first offenders were relatively better adjusted than the recidivists. However, the two groups did not differ on behavior ratings. The recidivists were found to be older than the first offenders. The first offenders had more nonCatholics than the recidivists.

The Three Offense Groups

In order to investigate the possibility that the three types of offenders (crimes against others, property, and self) differed in terms of personality, behavior, and the sociological characteristics, the existing data were further analyzed on the basis of type of offense. As noted in Chapter 2, subjects who were characterized by more than one type of offense were included in more than one group. Thus the N for these comparisons was 252. The personality scores, behavior ratings and five of the sociological variables were analyzed by analysis of variance and the other sociological variables were compared by the chi-square technique.

No hypothesis could be stated regarding the group, crimes against self. With respect to the other two groups, it was anticipated that the group, crimes against others, has lower scores on the CPI than the group, crimes against property. No hypotheses were formulated for the behavior ratings or the sociological variables.

Personality Measure

Table 9 shows the means and standard deviations for the CPI scales for the three offense groups. The results of the analyses of variance for these variables (Table 10) showed that there were significant differences between the groups on three of the scales, Dominance ($p < .01$) and Self Acceptance, and Communality ($p < .05$). On three other scales (Capacity for Status, Responsibility, and Achievement via Conformance) the differences approached significance ($p < .10$). It may be noted, with reference to Table 9, that the group, crimes against property, had the highest mean scores on all of these six scales and the group, crimes against others, had the lowest mean scores on all these scales except Responsibility. The group, crimes against self, scored between the other two groups on all these scales except Responsibility, on which it was the lowest. Thus on the basis of this personality measure, those who committed crimes against property were the most well adjusted group while those who committed crimes against self were less well adjusted, and those who committed crimes against others were the least well adjusted. These findings confirm the hypothesis about the personality variables.

Behavior ratings

The behavior ratings were also used in comparing the three offense groups. The means and standard deviations for these ratings are presented in Table 11

Table 9
Means and Standard Deviations of the CPI Scales for the Three Offense Groups

CPI Scale	Type of Offense					
	vs Others N=32		vs Property N=135		vs Self N=85	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Dominance	21.34	4.49	24.46	6.34	22.34	5.94
Capacity for Status	15.28	3.84	17.24	4.50	16.44	4.44
Sociability	20.96	4.41	22.40	5.43	21.85	5.50
Social Presence	31.18	4.82	32.71	6.15	32.89	6.18
Self Acceptance	18.12	3.62	20.26	4.48	19.57	4.44
Sense of Well Being	29.81	8.66	32.06	6.35	32.22	5.62
Responsibility	23.31	5.76	24.31	5.98	22.35	5.29
Socialization	26.15	5.93	27.11	5.47	25.89	5.62
Self Control	26.34	7.91	24.90	7.77	24.95	7.90
Tolerance	16.62	5.41	17.75	5.76	17.74	5.43
Good Impression	15.68	5.93	15.55	6.30	14.61	5.77
Communality	23.18	2.95	24.71	2.82	24.55	2.92
Achievement via Conformance	21.37	4.71	23.08	5.45	21.60	5.42

Table 9 (Continued)

CPI Scale	Type of Offense					
	vs Others <u>N=32</u>		vs Property <u>N=135</u>		vs Self <u>N=85</u>	
	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Achievement via Independence	15.18	4.11	16.60	4.71	16.04	4.32
Intellectual Efficiency	31.91	5.90	33.60	6.13	32.90	5.88
Psychological Mindedness	8.96	3.17	9.97	2.93	9.41	3.17
Flexibility	8.18	3.71	9.10	3.75	9.70	3.74
Femininity	21.93	4.16	22.15	3.23	21.49	3.38

Table 10
 Summary of Analyses of Variance of the
 CPI Scales for the Three Offense Groups

CPI Scale	<u>MS</u> Between	<u>MS</u> Within	<u>F</u>
Dominance	191.82	36.46	5.26 ^a
Capacity for Status	54.84	19.64	2.79 ^c
Sociability	26.86	28.85	1.01
Social Presence	36.37	36.57	1.00
Self Acceptance	61.53	19.36	3.18 ^b
Sense of Well Being	75.48	42.36	1.78
Responsibility	90.87	33.26	2.73 ^c
Socialization	41.90	31.59	1.33
Self Control	28.26	62.17	.45
Tolerance	17.68	31.85	.55
Good Impression	26.67	37.45	.71
Communality	30.52	8.34	3.66 ^b
Achievement via Conformance	75.92	29.02	2.62 ^c
Achievement via Independence	28.41	20.60	1.38
Intellectual Efficiency	40.95	36.67	1.12
Psychological Mindedness	16.76	9.41	1.78
Flexibility	27.89	14.19	1.96
Femininity	11.42	11.81	.97

Level of Significance

a \leq .01

b \leq .05

c \leq .10

df for all variables were: Between = 2, Within = 249

Table 11
Means and Standard Deviation of the
Behavior Ratings for the Three Offense Groups

Behavior Rating	Type of Offense					
	vs Others <u>N=32</u>		vs Property <u>N=135</u>		vs Self <u>N=85</u>	
	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
First	20.43	2.81	20.43	2.76	20.22	2.66
Second	20.56	2.97	20.69	2.89	20.41	3.02
Total	41.00	5.20	41.11	5.20	40.63	5.26

and the analyses of variance appear in Table 12. None of the differences between the groups was significant.

Sociological Variables

As before, the sociological variables with continuous distributions were studied by one-way analysis of variance. A summary of these analyses for the three offense groups appears in Table 14. Education was the only variable that showed a difference significant at .05 level. With reference to Table 13, it may be noted that the group, crimes against property, was again the highest of the three offense groups; the group, crimes against others, was the lowest, and the group, crimes against self, was intermediate.

The observed frequencies for the other sociological variables appear in Table 15 and the chi-square analysis for these same variables are presented in Table 16. For the variables of race, birth rank and socioeconomic level a 2 x 3 analysis was made, and for the variables of marital status, home background and religion a 3 x 3 analysis was used. The differences between two of the variables, race and socioeconomic level, approached significance ($p < .10$). The difference for race indicated that although there were equal number of whites and Negroes in the group, crimes against others, there were approximately twice as many whites as Negroes in the other two groups. With respect to socioeconomic level, the group, crimes against others, had a larger number of poor subjects than the other two groups.

Thus the comparison of the three offense groups confirmed the anticipation that the group, crimes against others, would have significantly lower scores on the CPI scales, indicating that it was the least well adjusted group of the three groups. A similar trend was noted in the sociological variables. The subjects who committed crimes against others were also the least educated of all the groups, had almost equal numbers of whites and

Table 12
Summary of Analyses of Variance for the
Behavior Ratings of the Three Offense Groups

Behavior	<u>MS</u> Between	<u>MS</u> Within	<u>F</u>
First	1.28	7.57	.17
Second	2.11	8.81	.24
Total	6.15	27.66	.22

df for all the measures were Between = 2, Within = 249.

Table 13
Means and Standard Deviations of Sociological
Variables for the Three Offense Groups

Variable	Type of Offense					
	vs Others N=32		vs Property N=135		vs Self N=85	
	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Age	30.59	7.79	32.86	7.99	31.63	7.96
Education	10.09	1.79	10.98	1.99	10.65	1.77
Grade Level	8.19	1.68	8.83	1.87	8.73	1.81
IQ	101.09	9.72	105.00	10.83	105.37	9.77
Number of Children	1.75	1.80	1.94	1.72	1.69	1.60

Table 14
 Summary of Analyses of Variance of the Sociological
 Variables for the Three Offense Groups

Variable	<u>MS</u> Between	<u>MS</u> Within	<u>F</u>
Age	84.66	64.12	1.32
Education	10.96	3.65	3.01 ^b
Grade Level	5.34	3.34	1.60
IQ	233.37	108.38	2.15
Number of Children	1.71	2.92	.59

Level of Significance

a \leq .01

b \leq .05

c \leq .10

df for all variables were: Between = 2, Within = 249.

Table 15
Observed Frequencies of Sociological Data
For the Three Offense Groups

Variable	Type of Offense		
	vs Others <u>N=32</u>	vs Property <u>N=135</u>	vs Self <u>N=85</u>
Race			
White	14	87	57
Black	18	48	28
Marital Status			
Single	5	30	21
Married	8	33	15
Separated, divorced or widowed	19	72	49
Birth Rank			
First	14	63	40
Other	18	72	45
Home Background			
Stable	15	69	41
Unstable	6	28	16
Broken	11	38	28
Socioeconomic Level			
Poor	18	50	30
Not Poor	14	85	55
Religion			
Catholic	11	54	37
Other	19	75	42
None	2	6	6

Table 16
Summary of Chi-Square for Sociological
Variables for the Three Offense Groups

Variable	<u>df</u>	χ^2	<u>p</u>
Race	2	5.78	.10
Marital Status	4	2.35	ns
Birth Rank	2	.11	ns
Home Background	4	.83	ns
Socioeconomic Level	2	4.72	.10
Religion	4	1.74	ns

Negroes, and had a larger number of poor subjects than the other two groups.

Chapter 4

Discussion

The present findings for the groups of volunteers and nonvolunteers for psychotherapy in the prison setting indicated that the volunteers were: (1) better adjusted in terms of two CPI scores, Social Presence and Communality, (2) showed better behavior during imprisonment on the 8-week and total scores, and (3) were better educated.

The findings provide some support for the frequent claim that volunteers tend to differ from nonvolunteers. However, it appears difficult to predict what the differences between the two groups will be in a particular situation with some studies providing evidence that the volunteers were less well adjusted than nonvolunteers while others indicated the reverse.

If one considers the studies which investigated volunteering for counseling or treatment, it appears that the present findings are somewhat different than those obtained by other investigators. For example, Corotto (1963a, 1963b) reported that the alcoholic patients who volunteered for treatment were less well adjusted than the nonvolunteers. In addition, Bell's (1962) conclusion that volunteers tended to be less socially extraverted and the findings of Mendelsohn and Kirk (1962) and Kaess and Long (1954) that volunteers for counseling and guidance tend to be more introverted apparently were not replicated in the present study. Although the CPI does not include an extraversion-introversion scale, the finding that volunteers scored significantly higher on Social Presence (i.e. poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interactions) scarcely suggests that they were more introverted than the nonvolunteers.

Because of the disparities in the various findings relevant to volunteering for treatment, it does not appear possible to predict what the

differences between the two groups are likely to be although the type of subject and the type of situation are probably important variables.

The obtained differences between the prison volunteers and nonvolunteers suggest that any investigation of the effectiveness of psychotherapy for prison inmates should consider the subject's willingness to participate in treatment. For example, if the present group of volunteers had actually received treatment, it seems quite possible that they might appear to be more improved than a control group of nonvolunteers who did not receive treatment. Such improvement might well be attributable to the fact that they were actually better adjusted and showed better adjustment than the untreated group even without treatment or had various characteristics which could contribute to successful outcomes. That is, the volunteers were better educated, were higher in certain desirable social characteristics, and probably were more highly motivated. These possibilities suggest that research on the provision of treatment for prison groups should be based on designs which would permit evaluation of adjustment and other behavioral and sociological factors prior to treatment as well as the willingness of the prisoner to participate. If possible, groups of volunteers and nonvolunteers should be assigned to both the treatment and no-treatment (or control) conditions.

A comparison of the recidivists and first offenders in terms of the CPI personality variables revealed that first offenders were better adjusted than the recidivists. The validity of the Socialization scale is confirmed by the significantly higher scores of first offenders than the recidivists. The results of this study lent further support to the findings of other investigators who found recidivists more emotionally disturbed (Bartholomew 1959; Dunham 1950, 1954). Among the sociological variables,

only age showed a significant difference which indicated that recidivists, as might be anticipated, were older than the first offenders. Mandel et al. (1965) found that recidivists were educationally handicapped, but the present study did not find differences between the groups for either amount of education or educational level (based on the California Achievement Test). A possible explanation for this fact is that the trend in prison and on parole is to help inmates and to encourage them to finish their educational and/or vocational training.

The three offense groups compared in terms of personality variables indicated the group who committed crimes against property was the best adjusted and the group who committed crimes against others was the least well adjusted. This finding is similar to that of Wilcock (1964) who compared an "individualized" group similar to the present crimes against others group with a "Socialized" group similar to the present crimes against property group. He found that the MMPI and the CPI profiles consistently showed the "individualized" group to be more severely disturbed. The present study further supports validity of the CPI as an instrument which discriminates between various offense groups. It is interesting to note that the trend found for personality variables was also noted on sociological variables. The complete picture of the group, crimes against others, is that of maladjustment and lower socioeconomic background. The behavior ratings did not show any significant differences between the offense groups and this suggests that the inmates' behavior in the prison was not related to the type of offense she had committed.

It is possible that the results would have been more clear-cut for the three offense groups if a subject was not included in more than one group and if only pure types of subjects, clearly classifiable in one group could be used. A need for further research is thus indicated in this area.

In concluding, the findings for the comparisons of the first offender and recidivist groups and the three offense groups suggest additional ways in which prisoners may differ. These, in turn, have implications for the treatment and rehabilitation of these groups. Thus in addition to considering the willingness of the prisoner to volunteer for psychotherapy, it would be advisable to consider her status on these other variables. It might also be suggested that if treatment can not be provided for all inmates, those who appear better adjusted may be the best candidates for psychotherapy and other remedial programs. This possibility should, of course, be investigated along the lines suggested earlier before limiting therapy to certain groups.

Finally, the present comparisons of the various groups on the basis of the California Personality Inventory indicated that several of the scales reliably discriminated between the groups (i.e., volunteers-nonvolunteers, recidivists-first offenders, and the three types of offenders). While the number of significant differences obtained for each type of comparison was somewhat limited, the present findings provide further support for the proposal that the CPI is useful in investigating the personality characteristics of various prison groups.

Chapter 5

Summary

This study had two objectives. The first was to examine the differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers for psychotherapy in a women's prison. The volunteers and nonvolunteers were obtained from 100 recidivists and 100 first offenders. The four groups were compared in terms of personality as measured by the California Personality Inventory (CPI), sociological data available from their records, and the behavior ratings obtained from the prison staff. The second objective was to compare the three offense groups, obtained by reclassifying the same data into those who had committed "crimes against others," "crimes against property," and "crimes against self."

The personality measures, behavior ratings, and sociological variables -- with continuous distributions were analyzed by analysis of variance and the other sociological variables were analyzed by the chi-square technique.

The results showed that volunteers tended to be somewhat better adjusted than the nonvolunteers in terms of two CPI scales, Social Presence and Communalinity. The volunteers were also more educated and had a higher measured grade level on the California Achievement Test than the nonvolunteers. The comparison of recidivists and first offenders indicated that the first offenders were relatively better adjusted in terms of the following CPI scales, Socialization, Self control, Good impression, and Femininity. Thus the hypothesis that recidivists would show greater maladjustment was confirmed. Recidivists were also significantly older than first offenders. There was no significant difference on any of the other sociological variables or the behavior ratings.

As anticipated, the comparison of the three offense groups showed significant differences on several of the CPI scales. The group who committed

crimes against property were best adjusted and had the highest scores on the CPI scales Dominance, Self-acceptance, Communality, Capacity for Status, Responsibility, and Achievement via Conformance. The group who committed crimes against others were the least well adjusted, in terms of these dominance scales, with the exception of the scale Responsibility. The group who committed crimes against self were intermediate in terms of adjustment on these same scales with the exception of Responsibility on which they scored lowest. The same trend was also noted in the sociological variables, with the crimes-against-others group having the least education and the lower socioeconomic background. There was no significant difference found on the behavior ratings.

The implications of the findings for psychotherapy and rehabilitation were discussed, along with the willingness to volunteer and the other differences obtained between the groups.

References

- Bair, J.T., & Gallagher, T.J. Volunteering for extrahazardous duty. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 329-331.
- Bartholomew, A.A. Extraversion, Introversion and Neuroticism in first-offenders and recidivists. British Journal of Delinquency, 1959, 10, 120-129.
- Bell, C.R. Personality characteristics of volunteers for psychological studies. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1962, 1, 81-95.
- Black, W.G. The description and prediction of recidivism and rehabilitation among youthful offenders by the use of the MMPI. Dissertation Abstracts, 1967, 28, (4B), 1691.
- Blackler, C. Primary recidivism in adult men: differences between men on first and second prison sentence. British Journal of Criminology, 1968, 8, 130-169.
- Blair, W.R.N. A comparative study of the disciplinary offenders and non-offenders in the Canadian Army. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1950, 4, 49-62.
- Blake, R.R., Berkowitz, H., Bellamy, R.Q., & Mouton, J.S. Volunteering as an avoidance act. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 154-156.
- Brower, D. The role of incentive in psychological research. Journal of General Psychology, 1948, 39, 145-147.
- Callard, M.P. Significant differences between recidivists and non-recidivists. British Journal of Criminology, 1967, 7, 93-102.
- Clark, J.H. Application of the differentiating A.W.O.L. recidivists from non-recidivists. Journal of Psychology, 1948, 26, 229-234.

- Copra, P.C., & Dittes, J.E. Birth-order as a selective factor among volunteer subjects. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 302.
- Corotto, L.V. An exploratory study of the characteristics of alcoholic patients who volunteer for continued treatment. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 1963, 24, 432-442 (a).
- Corotto, L.V. Personality characteristics of patients who volunteer. California Mental Health Research Digest, 1963, 1, 13-14 (b).
- Craddick, R.A. Selection of Psychopathic from non-psychopathic prisoners within a Canadian prison. Psychological Reports, 1962, 10, 495-499.
- Dohrenwend, B.S., Feldstein, S., Plosky, J., & Schmeidler, G.R. Factors interacting with birth-order in self-selection among volunteer subjects. Journal of Social Psychology, 1967, 72, 125-128.
- Dunham, R.E. Factors related to recidivism in adults. Journal of Social Psychology, 1954, 39, 77-91.
- East, W.N. Psychopathic personality and crime. Journal of Mental Science, 1945, 91, 426-446.
- Efran, J.S., & Boylin, E.R. Social desirability and willingness to participate in group discussion. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20, 402.
- Eysenck, H.J. The differentiation between normal and various neurotic groups on the ~~My~~ Madsley Personality Inventory. British Journal of Psychology, 1959, 50, 176-177.
- Freedman, L.Z. Sexual, aggressive and acquisitive deviates. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorders, 1961, 132, 44-49.
- Freeman, R.A., & Mason, H.M. Construction of a key to determine recidivists from non-recidivists using the MMPI. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1952, 8, 207-208.

- Frye, R.L., & Adams, H.E. Effect of the volunteer variable on leaderless group-discussion experiment. Psychological Reports, 1959, 5, 184.
- Gough, H.G., & Peterson, D.R. The identification and measurement of predispositional factors in crime and delinquency. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1952, 16, 207-212.
- Gough, H.G. Systematic validation of a test for delinquency. American Psychologist, 1954, 9, 380.
- Gough, H.G. Manual for the California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto, California; Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1957.
- Gough, H.G., Wenk, E.A. & Rozytko, V.V. Parole outcome as predicted from the CPI, the MMPI, and a base expectancy index. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1965, 70, 432-441.
- Guze, S.B. A study of recidivism based upon a follow-up of 217 consecutive criminals. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1964, 138, 575-580.
- Gynther, M.D. Crime and psychopathology. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1962, 64, 378-380.
- Hayner, N.S. Characteristics of 5 offender types. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 96-102.
- Hersch, P.D., Kulik, J.A., & Scheibe, K.E. Personal characteristics of college volunteers in mental hospitals. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33, 30-34.
- Himmelstein, P. Taylor scale characteristics of volunteers and non-volunteers for psychological experiments. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 138-139.

- Hovey, H.B. Behavior characteristics of anti-social recidivists. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, 1942, 32, 636-642.
- Howe, E.S. Quantitative motivational differences between volunteers and non-volunteers for a psychological experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44, 115-120.
- Hymes, J.P., & Blackman, S. Stability in socially relevant attitudes among prisoners. American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 468.
- Kaess, W., & Long, L. An investigation of the effectiveness of vocational guidance. Educational Psychological Measurement, 1954, 14, 423-433.
- Kinsey, A.C., & Pomeroy, W.B., & Martin, C.E. Sexual Behavior in human male. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948.
- Knapp, R.R. Value and personality differences between offenders and non-offenders. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 59-62.
- LaSagna, L., & VonFelsinger, J.M. The volunteer subject in research. Science, 1954, 120, 359-361.
- Lazarus, R. Motivation and personality in psychological stress. U.S. Office of Naval Research, Progress Report No. 2, Clarke Univeristy, 1956.
- Levitt, E.E., Lubin, B., & Zuckerman, M. Note on the attitude toward hypnosis of volunteers and non-volunteers for an hypnosis experiment. Psychological Reports, 1959, 5, 712.
- Mack, J.L. Behavior ratings of recidivist and non-recidivist delinquent males. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 260-265.(a).
- Mack, J.L. The MMPI and recidivism. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1969a, 74, 612-614.(b).

- Mandel, N.G., Collins, B.S., Moran, M.R., Barron, A.J., Gelbman, R.J., Gadbois, C.B., & Kaminsteine, P. Recidivism studies and defined. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology & Police Science, 1965, 56, 59-66.
- Martin, R.M., & Marcuse, F.L. Characteristics of volunteers and non-volunteers in psychological experimentation. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 475-479.
- Maslow, A.H. A test for dominance feeling.(self-esteem). Journal of Social Psychology, 1940, 12, 255-270.
- Maslow, A.H., & Sakoda, J.M. Volunteer error in Kinsey study. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 259-262.
- McClelland, D.C. Methods of measuring human motivations. Chapter I in Atkinson, J.W. Motives in fantasy, action and society. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1958.
- Mendelsohn, G.A., & Kirk, B.A. Personality differences between students who do and do not use a counseling facility. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 341-346.
- Monachesi, E.D. American studies in the prediction of recidivism. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1950, 41, 268-269.
- Myers, T.I. The isolation experience. Unpublished manuscript 1964 reported in Schultz, D.P. Sensory restriction: Effects on behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1965, pp. 184-186.
- Newman, M. Personality differences between volunteers and nonvolunteers, self-actualization of volunteers and nonvolunteers for researches in personality and perception. Dissertation Abstracts, 1957, 17, 684.
- Norman, R.D. A review of some problems related to the mail-questionnaire technique. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1948, 8, 235-247.

- Panton, J.H. The identification of habitual criminalism with the MMPI. Journal of Criminal Psychology, 1962, 18, 133-136.
- Reckless, W.C., Dinitz, S., and Kay, B. The self-component in potential delinquency and potential non-delinquency. American Sociological Review, 1957, 22, 566-570.
- Richards, T.W. Personality of subjects who volunteer for research on a drug (mescaline). Journal of Projective Techniques, 1960, 24, 424-428.
- Riggs, M.M., & Kaess, W. Personality differences between volunteers and non-volunteers. Journal of Psychology, 1955, 40, 229-245.
- Rosen, E. Differences between volunteers and non-volunteers for psychological studies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1951, 35, 185-193.
- Rosenbaum, M.E. The effect of stimulus and background factors on the volunteering response. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 53, 118-121.
- Rosenbaum, M.E., & Blake, R.R. Volunteering as a function of field-structure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 193-196.
- Sarbin, T.R., Wenk, E.A., & Sherwood, W.W. An Effort to identify assault-prone offenders. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1968, 5, 66-71.
- Schachter, S., & Hall, R. Group derived restraints and audience persuasion. Human Relations, 1952, 5, 397-406.
- Scheier, I.H. To be or not to be a guinea pig: preliminary data on anxiety and the volunteer for experiment. Psychological Reports, 1959, 5, 239-240.

- Schultz, D.P. The volunteer subject in sensory restriction research. Journal of Social Psychology, 1967, 72, 123-124.
- Sheridan, K., & Shack, J.R. Personality correlates of the undergraduate volunteer subject. Journal of Psychology, 1970, 76, 23-26.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1956.
- Snedfeld, P. Birth order of volunteers for sensory deprivation. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 195-196.
- Stein, K.B. Correlates of the ideational preference dimension among prison inmates. Psychological Reports, 1967, 21, 553-562.
- Taylor, R.S. The habitual criminal: observations on some of the characteristics of men sentenced to preventive detention. British Journal of Criminology, 1960, 1, 21-36.
- Thorne, G. Discriminations within the delinquency continuum using Gough's socialization scale. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 193.
- Varela, J.R. A cross-cultural replication of an experiment involving birth-order. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 456-457.
- Vaughn, N.N. Recidivism and certain characteristics of juvenile delinquents in a short-term detention center. Dissertation Abstracts, 1965, 25 (7), 4286-4287.
- Wallin, P. Volunteer subjects as a source of sampling bias. American Journal of Sociology, 1949, 54, 539-544.
- Wattenberg, W.W., & Saunders, F. Recidivism among girls. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 405-406.
- Wilcock, K.D. Neurotic differences between individualized and socialized criminals. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1964, 28, 141-145.
- Winer, B.J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962.

60
Wolk, R.L. A psychological differentiation of anti-social offenders.

Dissertation Abstracts: 1959, 20, 2393.

Yoshimasu, S., Takemura, N., & Tsuboi, T. A study on criminal process of female recidivist. Japanese Journal of Criminal Law, 1959, 9, 208-220 in Psychological Abstracts, 1960, 6339.

Appendix A

Request Form for Volunteers for Psychotherapy

If a therapy program is initiated, which would help you get an insight in your behavior and counsel you in solving your problem, would you like to volunteer for such a program?

Please indicate your choice below by checking the appropriate box.

Yes. I want it.

No. I don't want it.

Inmate's signature
and Number.

BEHAVIOR RATING SCALE

Name: _____

Number: _____

Date: _____

Rater: _____

Please check the appropriate box to indicate your evaluation of the inmate's behavior.

	Exceptional- ly good	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor
Obeys rules and regulations.					
Efforts in seeking help to improve herself.					
Efforts in helping others.					
Getting along with peers.					
Getting along with staff.					
Work performance.					
Personal appearance.					

APPROVAL SHEET

The Dissertation submitted by Kamal V. Mane has been read and approved by members of the Department of Psychology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the Dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the Dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content and form.

The Dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

May 24, 1971
Date

Jeanne M. Foley
Signature of Advisor