

Archives
Closed
LD
175
A40K
Th
503

PREDICTING
"
EXTRAPUNITIVE AND INTROPUNITIVE
HOSTILITY
IN A JUVENILE CORRECTION POPULATION

A THESIS
PRESENTED to
the FACULTY of the GRADUATE SCHOOL
APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY

In PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
of the REQUIREMENTS for the DEGREE
MASTER OF ARTS

BY
GARY R. WOODS
May 1981

35-1
24

PREDICTING
EXTRAPUNITIVE AND INTROPUNITIVE
HOSTILITY
IN A JUVENILE CORRECTION POPULATION

BY

GARY R. WOODS

APPROVED BY:

Richard H. Lewis
Chairman, Thesis Committee

W. Schmidt
Associate Professor of Psychology

William V. Knight
Professor of Psychology

Jayce G. Crouch
Chairperson, Department of Psychology

Jayce V. Lawrence
Dean of The Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Richard Levin, Dr. Henry Schneider, and Dr. William Knight for their suggestions, assistance, and encouragement. Special thanks goes to Dr. Levin for his patience, prodding, advice, and strong support during this project.

I would also like to thank Bill Hartley and other staff members at Western Correctional Center in Morganton. Without their cooperation, completion of this study would have been much more difficult.

A special thanks goes to my wife, Peggy, and my children who stood by me throughout my struggle through the academic program and this project. Their continued support and encouragement will always be appreciated.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the thesis that extrapunitive and intropunitive hostility can be predicted in a juvenile corrections subject population using a projective technique.

Ninety-four inmates from a juvenile corrections center were used as subjects, 38 of whom were convicted of violent crimes and 56 convicted of non-violent crimes. These inmates were administered the Zimmer Sentence Completion Test (ZSC), which measures Hostility, Dependence, Aggression Anxiety, and Projection.

The data from the tests were analyzed using the ANOVA. An ANOVA was computed comparing ZSC scores with type of crime (violent vs non-violent). The results showed significant ($p < .001$) differences between the two groups of inmates on extrapunitive and intropunitive hostility. ZSC Dependence and Independence scales were significantly different for the two subject groups, ($p < .05$). Recommendations are made for further study with presentencing testing and follow-up after incarceration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
LIST OF APPENDICES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
HYPOTHESIS	10
METHOD	11
Subjects	11
Apparatus.	11
Procedure.	12
RESULTS	14
DISCUSSION	19
REFERENCE NOTE	23
REFERENCES	24
APPENDIX A	26
APPENDIX B	29
APPENDIX C	34
APPENDIX D	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Analysis of Mean Differences and Variances for Extrapunitive Hostility Scores on the Zimmer Sentence Completion Test in a Violent and Non-Violent Criminal Population	15
2. Analysis of Mean Differences and Variances for Intropunitive Hostility Scores on the Zimmer Sentence Completion Test in a Violent and Non-Violent Criminal Population	16
3. Analysis of Mean Differences and Variances for Dependence Scores on the Zimmer Sentence Completion Test in a Violent and Non-Violent Criminal Population. . .	17
4. Analysis of Mean Differences and Variances for Independence Scores on the Zimmer Sentence Completion Test in a Violent and Non-Violent Criminal Population. . .	18

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendices	Page
A. Laws Governing Diagnostic and Classification Programs	26
B. Zimmer Sentence Completion Test	29
C. Zimmer Sentence Completion Test Individual Judges Sheet	34
D. Consent Form for Subjects	36

INTRODUCTION

Most professionals in human behavior are alert to the ways in which hostility is expressed. There are various modes used in the expression of one's hostility. Some acts of aggression are overt and direct, such as publicly assaulting someone, while others are covert and indirect, as in the case of vandalism. Overt and direct acts of aggression by one citizen upon another citizen, except in organized competition, are generally not accepted in our society. When a citizen commits an overt act of aggression against another person or covertly against another's property, they can be held responsible by the law. The citizen committing this hostile act is often labeled by our society as being a hostile person, and if convicted by the courts, is subject to be punished according to the law.

All over the United States people worry about criminal violence. In the past two decades crime has reached epidemic proportions. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reports (1979) the chance of being a victim of a major violent crime such as murder, rape, robbery, or aggravated assault nearly tripled between 1960 and 1976; so did the probability of being the victim of a serious property crime, such as burglary, purse snatching, or auto theft. Between 1965 and 1975 homicides soared from ten thousand victims to twenty thousand victims. In 1976 over eleven million Americans were violently victimized. Over thirty-seven million were victims of violent personal or property crimes. Statistics also show that the offender's average age is getting younger. In 1960 approximately 18% of persons arrested were

aged 18-24; in 1978 that age group represented 35% of persons arrested. The percent of persons arrested under 18 years of age in 1960 was only 15%; however, in 1978 that age group represented nearly 25% of those arrested. The federal and state prison population have increased by 50% since 1970. The crime rate in the United States is rapidly increasing faster than the population rate (Barkas, 1978).

Is there a possibility that even though a person commits a hostile act, that the person may not be a hostile person? Do some persons, because of early learning patterns or heredity, develop a predisposition for committing violence against others?

Van den Haag (1975) placed offenders into two groups. One group was motivated by intrapsychic forces or traits of character, however they were acquired. These persons would likely commit crimes in most situations in which they find themselves. This group was subdivided into those only temporarily disposed to committing offenses, such as adolescents going through certain stages in their development, and those that are permanently disposed for characterological reasons. It was indicated by Van den Haag that persons in the other group were no more criminal-ly inclined, as far as character goes, than the non-offender. However, they had been placed in the kind of situation in which the average citizen would commit an offense. The offenses are primarily due to extrapsychic stimuli. The offenders were affected by external stimuli rather than being driven intrapsychically. The intra- and extrapsychic groups overlapped, but most offenders fell between the extreme poles. The intrapsychic group committed more offenses, but most offenders were in the extrapsychic group.

Because the theories on the nature of aggression differ so, psychologists disagree whether hostile acts are a product of character traits or situational variables. Some judges in our judicial system gather data and make a somewhat subjective decision in the disposition of a person convicted of a hostile act. In some cases the data appears insufficient and the convicted person is held for psychological evaluation before sentencing. This evaluation period is quite lengthy, expensive, and creates another clog in our judicial system. However, because of the lack of a better method, this presentence evaluation program is used in North Carolina.

In 1967, the North Carolina General Assembly passed G. S. 148-12, 148-49, a law enabling the North Carolina Department of Corrections to incorporate a Presentence Diagnostic Program into its operation (see Appendix A). This program involves the cooperation of many people in preparing a composite report of all the information that can be gathered regarding the felony committed and the convicted felon. The composite report contains environmental information, past employment and school reports, and the opinions from various professional disciplines: the psychiatric staff; the psychological staff; the medical staff and the custodial staff. A committee uses this information and attempts to determine for a judge the potential dangerousness of the offender and what is needed to control and correct them. The courts when seeking professional opinions regarding a defendant, sometimes turn only to the probation officer for recommendations. These recommendations are not necessarily based on substantial relevant data. However, as reported

in a recent study in California, these recommendations by probation officers were followed by the courts 95% of the time (Traver, 1978).

Much work has been done over the past several decades with the criminal population. Johnson and Cooke (1973) used several MMPI scales to answer questions concerning the subjects' control of their hostility, tendency toward escape and recidivism, and use of alcohol. Their study showed no significant differences in MMPI scale scores between subjects charged with aggressive vs. nonaggressive crimes. Many theories have been developed regarding the source of hostility and aggression. J. Dollard, L. W. Doob, N. E. Miller, O. H. Mowrer, and R. R. Sears (1939) developed the frustration-aggression hypothesis which in part is still relevant today. They proposed that the occurrence of aggression always presupposes the existence of frustration and, contrariwise, that the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression.

Some studies have claimed that aggression and hostility are learned through family relationships. For example, in one report the Rosenzweig Picture Frustration study (RPF) was administered to both parents and siblings of 18 families (Reck and McCary, 1969). Similarities among family members on the direction and type of expressed aggressive reaction as measured by RPF were examined. Correlation methods were used to assess the degree of association for each family member pairing. Even though most of the obtained co-efficients between RPF variables were positive, they were not statistically different from zero. The data did not provide evidence that either member of a family pair expressed aggression in a corresponding manner on the RPF variables. It is possible

that strong similarities in the expression of aggression do not exist because cultural influences are more pervasive than familial ones.

Intelligence profiles have been looked at in trying to solve the problem of violence. Deiker (1973) used as subjects 243 males who were indicted for a capital offense in Massachusetts. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale full scale scores on these subjects were analyzed and also subtest comparisons were made with Wechsler's Norms. A pattern was found on the Block Design and Digit Symbol subtest which included 11.5% of the indicted murderers; however, the same pattern was also found in 9.2% of the normal male population. The predictive validity of even the largest subtest discrepancy was low.

Some studies have been conducted to investigate the genetic make-up of persons convicted of crimes. Bartlett, Hurley, Brand, and Poole (1968) tried to make an association between aggressiveness of males and the presence of the abnormal chromosome configuration of XYY. A total of 204 male inmates of a security prison for the psychiatric treatment of offenders were used in his study. Of the 204 inmates examined, only five (5) were found to have an abnormal chromosome configuration. Only two (2) had an XYY configuration. The difference between the number of abnormal chromosomes found in this study was insignificant when compared to the control population. Therefore, this study is inconclusive in providing data to support the theory that abnormal chromosome configuration contributed to aggressive behavior.

The efficiency of projective techniques in predicting aggression, when compared to that of more direct methods, has been superior in some studies. Handler and McIntosh (1971) found that the prediction of

aggressive and withdrawal behavior in children improved using the Draw-A-Person and Bender-Gestalt tests, when compared to classifications made after a brief observation period and by means of individual self report. It appeared in this study that projective testing allowed a higher rate of correct identification of aggressive and withdrawn subjects than the other two methods.

The MMPI has been used in several studies to portray personality characteristics of prison inmates. Davis and Stines (1971) selected MMPI profiles from three settings: a state hospital, 500 subjects; a state prison, 1136 subjects; and a university hospital, 625 subjects. Clusters of highly similar MMPI profile patterns were selected from each group. The institutional records of these subjects were coded and studied. By comparing the records of selected subjects, Davis and Stines were successful in showing that men who developed the same 4-3 MMPI profile also have many similarities in real life behavior. Not all assaultive men in any of the populations studied generate MMPI profiles that fit the prototype. It was recommended that, if one's primary aim is to discriminate all assaultive men from non-assaultive men, this particular MMPI pattern will be of limited value.

The MMPI has generally been accepted by many correction departments as a valid test to assess the potential personality traits of the inmates. In North Carolina the MMPI is used in the Presentence Diagnostic Program in making decisions regarding the disposition of the convicted criminal. In order to receive this psychological evaluation, the offender must have been convicted of a crime punishable by

imprisonment and the judge's recommendation that certain factors must be considered before sentencing the convicted offender.

Parole violation scales have been developed to predict the success or failure of the paroled criminal. Panton (1962) made comparisons of parole violators and non-violators on the MMPI. Following an item analysis of the differences in the two groups' responses, a violation scale was developed which is still in use in the North Carolina Corrections Department.

Many studies have provided an adequate profile of the convicted, incarcerated criminal. From the MMPI scales developed in several studies, certain criminal behavior is characteristic of men who have similar profiles. Black (1967) developed a 22 item scale and was able to predict recidivism and rehabilitation potential among youthful offenders with an 86% ex-post facto predictive accuracy. Frank (1970) utilized Black's Recidivism-Rehabilitation Scale (which was developed for the juvenile population) on an adult prison population and accurately predicted 130 post-release outcomes from 180 that were tested and released. Even though most studies reviewed were completed on the adult male prison population, it is argued that patterns for aggressive behavior are formed early in childhood and will be expressed more clearly in youthful offenders.

The Department of Corrections' evaluation can give specific personality data for specific types of criminal behavior; however, there seems to be a lack of practical application in applying these profiles in determining the disposition of future convicted criminals. These studies provide a good psychological description only on an individual

who has already committed a crime, has been convicted, and sentenced. The psychoanalytic theory of aggression held that unexpressed hostility is turned inward in the form of depression and masochism (Megaree and Hokanson, 1970). Therefore, assaultive and hostile behavior when expressed will show up extrapunitive and the unexpressed hostility may emerge as displacement. The study by Davis and Stines (1971) possessed a high degree of validity when records of subjects revealed that hostile-aggressive behavior was exhibited by those subjects projecting the same MMPI profiles. It may be argued that, if truly assaultive men can be separated from non-assaultive men, proper disposition may be achieved.

The time and personnel needed to administer and process the MMPI and the other tests used to assess the personality of the offender in the Presentence Diagnostic Program could create quite a bottleneck in our judicial system. The development of a shorter test battery of equal or greater validity, to be administered at the local court level, could help in making decisions regarding the disposition of the offenders without increasing the time and staff now used in the Presentence Diagnostic Program. This test could be used not only for major crimes but also for misdemeanors. It could give the judge additional information regarding the psychological make-up of the offender and would allow a sentencing decision more appropriate for the offender and not necessarily for the crime.

This study explored the use of a projective technique, the Zimmer Sentence Completion Test (ZSC) (Zimmer, 1964), to predict extrapunitive and intropunitive hostility of inmates in a prison population. (See Appendix B for copy of ZSC.) Extrapunitive hostility is

characterized by a tendency to evaluate the source of frustrations as external and to direct one's hostility outward. Intropunitive hostility is responding to frustration by tending to blame oneself.

HYPOTHESIS

Prison inmates having similar ages and achievement test scores who were convicted of violent crimes (assault, murder, armed robbery) will show significantly greater amounts of extrapunitive hostility, as measured by the Zimmer Sentence Completion Test, than those inmates of similar ages and I. Q. who were convicted of non-violent crimes (burglary, car theft, etc.).

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were obtained from the North Carolina Department of Corrections, Western Correctional Center, Morganton, North Carolina. Permission was obtained from North Carolina Department of Corrections in Raleigh, the warden and diagnostics department of Western Correctional Center.

The criteria for inclusion in this study were that the subjects must be able to read on a fifth grade reading level as indicated by a Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) administered at the prison. Every fifth personnel jacket was pulled and reviewed. This process was done until 100 inmates were selected. Six (6) inmates were unavailable for testing; 94 served as subjects. All subjects were male inmates ages 15-18. The mean age was 17.1 years, SD = .77 for violent inmates, and 17.0 years, SD = 1.19 for non-violent inmates. The mean Intelligence Score/Reading Achievement level for the violent inmates was 102, SD = 8.7/5 years 8 months, SD = 1.1. The non-violent inmates mean Intelligence score/Reading Achievement level was 102, SD = 16.2/5 years 7 months, SD = 1.2.

Apparatus

The Zimmer Sentence Completion (1964) test consists of 38 sentence stems. Complete sentences are scored on one of our personality variables: Hostility, Aggression Anxiety, Projection of Hostility, and Dependency. Each personality variable is scored as follows: Hostility, extrapunitive/neutral/intropunitive; Aggression Anxiety, aggression

anxiety/neutral/counterphobic; Projection of Hostility, projection/neutral/introception; Dependence, dependence/neutral/independence. The scoring is based on different sentence completion stems specifically designed to elicit relevant responses, and scored with an explicit scoring standard. The scoring was accomplished by looking up each response in a scoring manual which lists responses of about 1000 normative subjects (Zimmer, 1964). Each response that can be scored on one of the four personality variables is counted as one point. Neutral responses are counted as zero and are not considered (Kinsie and Zimmer, 1968). See Appendix C.)

This study focused on the Hostility variables, attempting to measure the direction of hostility. The Dependence variable was also looked at and discussed regarding the treatment and management of the inmate.

Procedure

The selected inmates were not briefed as to the purpose of the test, other than that the test was needed for the completion of a thesis. They were advised that as volunteers, should they decide not to participate, they could leave at any time. The inmates were further advised that neither their participation nor scores on the test would in any way have any bearing on their chances of parole or entitle them to any special privileges. Each inmate signed a consent form. (See Appendix D.)

The Department of Corrections assigned the 94 inmates into 15 groups of 6 each and 1 group of 4 for testing. These small size groups were necessary because the Department of Corrections did not have

facilities large enough for administration of the test to larger groups. The size of the test groups allowed the examiner to give personal assistance to the subjects when needed.

Instructions were read to the inmates at each session. Each inmate was assigned a code number by the Department of Corrections. These code numbers were placed on the inmates' test booklets when they were distributed. A master list was prepared showing assigned code number, race, date of birth, I.Q., achievement level, the crime for which the inmate was convicted (violent or non-violent), floor assignment, and number of infractions since incarceration.

After each of the test batteries were completed, the test booklets were collected and reviewed for correct code number. Each test was scored according to the scoring manual.

RESULTS

The hypothesis stated that inmates convicted of violent crimes (N=38) would show a significantly higher level of extrapunitive hostility than those inmates convicted of non-violent crimes (N=56) having similar ages, intelligence scores, and achievement level. The analysis of Variance Value for Extrapunitive Hostility was $F(1,94) = 13.38$, $p < .001$ (Table 1). Conversely on Intropunitive Hostility, the non-violent inmates values were the following $F(1,94) = 12.10$, $p < .001$ (Table 2).

While the above results were the only variables significant at the .001 level, there were other significant variables. The analysis of variance revealed that inmates convicted of violent crimes scored significantly lower on the Dependency Variable, $F(1,94) = 7.00$, $p < .01$ (Table 3). Those inmates convicted of non-violent crimes scored significantly lower on the Independence Variable, $F(1,94) = 4.81$, $p < .03$ (Table 4).

A trend toward significance was also noted in that the inmates convicted of violent crimes had more neutral or evasive answers on all variables measured $p < .16$. Surprisingly, but not at a statistically significant level, the inmates convicted of non-violent crimes had almost double the infractions (violations) of the violent inmates since being incarcerated.

TABLE 1

Analysis of Mean Differences and Variances for Extrapunitive
Hostility Scores on the Zimmer Sentence Completion
Test in a Violent and Non-Violent
Criminal Population

a. ANOVA Summary

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Group	1	95.64	13.38
Within-S	93	7.14	
Total	94		

b. Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Violent	38	7.39	2.57
Non-Violent	56	5.33	2.73

TABLE 2

Analysis of Mean Differences and Variances for Intropunitive
Hostility Scores on the Zimmer Sentence Completion
Test in a Violent and Non-Violent
Criminal Population

a. ANOVA Summary

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Group	1	84.44	12.10
Within-S	93	6.97	
Total	94		

b. Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Violent	38	4.15	2.73
Non-Violent	56	6.08	2.57

TABLE 3

Analysis of Mean Differences and Variances for Dependence
Scores on the Zimmer Sentence Completion
Test in a Violent and Non-Violent
Criminal Population

a. ANOVA Summary

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Group	1	28.27	7.00
Within-S	93	4.03	
Total	94		

b. Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Violent	38	4.57	1.76
Non-Violent	56	5.69	2.15

TABLE 4

Analysis of Mean Differences and Variances for Independence
Scores on the Zimmer Sentence Completion
Test in a Violent and Non-Violent
Criminal Population

a. ANOVA Summary

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F</u>
Group	1	22.80	4.81
Within-S	93	4.73	
Total	94		

b. Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Violent	38	6.78	1.86
Non-Violent	56	5.78	2.36

DISCUSSION

The results of this study suggest that extrapunitive and intro-punitive hostility can be measured in a group of adolescent inmates in a juvenile correction center. It is apparent that profiles can be developed accurately using projective techniques, putting inmates into distinct groups. However, individual members of these groups can be expected to vary considerably from the stereotypes.

This research shows that similarities do exist in groups of inmates convicted of violent crimes. It also indicates that many other characteristics differ significantly on a broad array of variables. Along with the similarities, these differences have some implications for the management and treatment of these offenders.

The subjects were a relatively homogeneous group, having basically the same age, I.Q., and achievement levels. It was revealed that this homogeneous group of inmates differed in the way they express their hostility (Table 1 and 2). Those inmates convicted of violent crimes scored significantly higher on extrapunitive hostility than those convicted of non-violent crimes. The ZSC test scores indicated that these violent inmates express their hostility outwardly. No attempts were made to prove or disprove any theories of aggression, or why some inmates were more outwardly or inwardly hostile. As can be seen in Table 3, on Dependence, the non-violent inmates appear to be more dependent than the violent. Non-violent crimes (Larceny, B & E, Auto Theft, Burglary, etc.) are often crimes which require an accomplice or support from others. It may be that those convicted of non-violent crimes are more

vulnerable to pressure from others and are less in control of their own behavior. The inmates convicted of violent crimes showed a significantly higher level of Independence (Table 4). Violent crimes (Murder, Rape, Assault with Deadly Weapon, Armed Robbery, etc.) are more often solitary crimes impulsively committed. These crimes are not always thought out, and frequently the person committing the crime may not feel they have any options and made an independent decision.

The higher level of neutral or evasive answers by the violent inmates may indicate that these inmates are unsure about expressing their thoughts to someone else. Answers were scored neutral if they were irrelevant to the question or if they contained a dual meaning.

The higher number of infractions or violations committed by the non-violent inmates could add some validity to Megargee and Hokanson's (1970) theory of overcontrolled and undercontrolled personalities. It was theorized that some personalities are overcontrolled over an extended period of time and are inhibited from expressing their hostility. These personalities sometime reach a point when they can no longer control their hostility and often commit some heinous crime. An example may be the mild-mannered good neighbor who one day kills his family and himself for no apparent reason. The non-violent inmate with numerous infractions may fall into the undercontrolled category and are apparently unable to control themselves in most situations. They are typically those types who appear to always have a "chip-on-their-shoulder" attitude and are likely to react in an aggressive manner to most situations.

As proposed by the researcher, the results of the Zimmer Sentence Completion Test could be utilized in a presentencing evaluation by court officials to help determine punishment or treatment for the convicted offender. If the information from the Zimmer Sentence Completion Test revealed that an individual, who committed an assaultive crime, did not show any indication of being an aggressive and hostile person, and other information revealed that something external may have instigated the crime, this individual may be able to be rehabilitated in the community and avoid going to prison.

The ZSC Test could be administered at the local court level, combined with a short interview by a trained clinician, and results could be provided to the judge to assist in arriving at a sentence appropriate for the offender and society. The data collected with the ZSC Test and the interview could be more objective and relevant than is now being offered by other professionals as reported by Traver (1979). Their data could also provide corrections officials additional information which could help in the management or treatment of the juvenile while incarcerated. Inmates coming into the correction facility having scored high on the dependent variable of the ZSC Test could be placed in a more structured area.

Relevant data concerning a convicted offender could save time and money by assisting in the proper disposition. Proper disposition of a convicted inmate could also mean a higher success rate with treatment.

It is felt that this study contained several weaknesses. The population studied may be questioned. Inmates already convicted of violent crimes may feel they must project an image of toughness and

project themselves as more violent. It may also be argued that because of the low achievement level of the subjects, some of the sentence stems may not have been understood. However, practical application of this test in a presentencing evaluation would require it to be administered individually reducing the likelihood of their misunderstanding.

Acceptance of the original hypothesis justifies further long term research with the juvenile criminal population, testing at the courtroom level with follow-up after sentencing and disposition, possibly at the time of parole or release.

REFERENCE NOTE

Zimmer, H. Test and Scoring Manual, Zimmer Sentence Completion Test of Hostility, Dependency, Aggression Anxiety, and Projection of Hostility has been deposited with the American Documentation Institute. Order Document No. 10024 from ADI Auxiliary Publications Project, Photoduplication Service, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 20540.

REFERENCES

- Barkas, J. L. Victims. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.
- Bartlett, D. J., Hurley, W. P., Brand, C. R., and Poole, E. W. Nature. 1968, 219-351.
- Black, W. G. The description and prediction of recidivism among youthful offenders by the use of the MMPI. (Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma University, 1967) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1967, 28, 1691-B.
- Davis, K. and Stines, J. O. An antisocial behavior pattern associated with a specific MMPI profile. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 1971 (April), 36(2), 229-234.
- Deiker, T. E. WAIS Characteristics of Indicated Male Murderers. Psychological Reports. 1973 (June), 32(3), 1066.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L. W., Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H., and Sears, R. R. Frustration and Aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.
- Frank, C. H. The Prediction of Recidivism Among Young Adult Offenders by the Recidivism-Rehabilitation Scale and Index (Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma University, 1967) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31, 557-B.
- Handler, L., McIntosh, J., Predicting Aggression and Withdrawal in Children With the Draw-A-Person and Bender-Gestalt. Journal of Personality Assessment. 1971 (August), 35(4), 331-335.
- Johnson, N., and Cooke, G. Relationship of MMPI alcoholism, prison escape, hostility control and recidivism scales to clinical judgments. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1973 (January), 29(1), 32-34.
- Kinsie, W., and Zimmer, H. On Measurement of Hostility, Aggression Anxiety, Projection, and Dependency. Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment. 1968, 32, 388-391.
- Megargee, E. and Hokanson, J. The Dynamics of Aggression. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Panton, J. H. Use of the MMPI as an index to Successful Parole. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science. 1962, 53, 484-488.

- Reck, J. J., McCary, J. L. and Weatherly, J. K. Intra-Familiar Comparisons of Frustration-Aggression Patterns. Psychological Reports. 1969, 25(2), 356.
- Silberman, C. E. Criminal Violence, Criminal Justice. New York: Random House, 1975.
- Traver, H. Offender Reaction, Professional Opinion and Sentencing. Criminology, An Interdisciplinary Journal, 1978 (November), 16(3), 403
- United States Department of Justice, F. B. I. Uniform Crime Reports For The United States, Crime in the United States. 1978, 1979.
- Van den Haag, E. Punishing Criminals. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1975.
- Zimmer, H. Scoring Manual For A Sentence Completion Test of Hostility, Dependency, Aggression Anxiety, and Projection of Hostility. (Second Edition), Athens, Georgia. University of Georgia, 1964, 248.

APPENDIX A

Laws Governing Diagnostic and
Classification Programs

APPENDIX A

Laws Governing Diagnostic and Classification Programs

Diagnostic Centers

G. S. 148-12. "Diagnostic and classification programs--(a) The Department of Correction shall, as soon as practicable, establish diagnostic centers to make social, medical, and psychological studies of persons committed to the Department. Full diagnostic studies shall be made before initial classification in cases where such studies have not been made."

Presentence Studies

G. S. 148-12. (b) "Within the limits of its capacity, and in accordance with standards established by the Department, a diagnostic center may, at the request of any sentencing court, make a presentence diagnostic study of any person who has been convicted, is before the court for sentence, and is subject to commitment to the Department. Where necessary for this purpose, the defendant may be received in the center for such period of study as the court may authorize, but may not be held there for more than 60 days unless the court grants an extension of time, which may be granted for an additional period not to exceed 30 days. The total time spent in the center shall not exceed 90 days or the maximum term of imprisonment authorized as punishment for the offense of which the person has been convicted if the maximum is less than 90 days. Time spent in the center for a diagnostic study shall be credited on any sentence of commitment imposed on the person studied. A copy of the diagnostic study report shall be made available to defense counsel before the court pronounces sentence. The defendant shall be afforded fair opportunity to controvert the contents of the report, if he so requests."

G. S. 148-49.3. "Presentence diagnostic studies. Upon conviction of a youthful offender of an offense punishable by imprisonment, the court may request the Department of Correction to make a presentence diagnostic study of the offender. Where necessary for this purpose, the Department may admit the offender to an appropriate diagnostic and classification center for such period of study as the court may authorize. Within such period as the court may grant, the Department shall report to the court its findings. The time a youthful offender spends confined for a presentence diagnostic study shall not exceed 90 days or the maximum term of imprisonment authorized as punishment for the offense of which the person has been convicted if the maximum is less than 90 days, and this time shall be credited on any sentence of commitment imposed on the offender. A copy of the diagnostic study report shall be made available

to defense counsel before the court pronounces sentence. The defendant shall be afforded an opportunity to controvert the contents of the report if he so requests."

APPENDIX B

Zimmer Sentence Completion Test

APPENDIX B

Zimmer Sentence Completion

- (1) When I was a child, I...
- (2) When somebody bores me, I...
- (3) A wild animal...
- (4) When I have to stand in line, I...
- (5) As soon as the nurse gets the needle ready, I...
- (6) When I succeed at something, I...
- (7) I want a marriage partner who...
- (8) If I found somebody pinned under the wheel of his car, I...
- (9) After I have gotten the better of somebody, I...
- (10) Inconsiderate youngsters are...
- (11) When somebody threatens me, I...

- (12) The kind of animal I would most like to be is...
- (13) When I have to speak to someone I dislike I...
- (14) If an acquaintance asked a favor of me, I...
- (15) Quarreling makes me feel...
- (16) When I do something I know is wrong, I...
- (17) In my spare time, I...
- (18) If I lost the person I love most, I...
- (19) If I could not find a job, I would...
- (20) The criminal who escapes prison...
- (21) When someone keeps me waiting...
- (22) If the person next to me had an epileptic fit, I would...
- (23) Frank people are...
- (24) When I feel blue, I...

- (25) When I get an order to do something immediately, I...
- (26) People who need help...
- (27) If my friend accused me falsely, I...
- (28) A sharp knife is...
- (29) When I am asked to do something I do not like to do, I...
- (30) I am most helpless when...
- (31) Fighting is...
- (32) When somebody picks on me, I...
- (33) The police are...
- (34) When I feel myself getting angry, I...
- (35) Torn skin is...
- (36) If I were in charge of a group, I would...

(37) When I get mad, I...

(38) When I cannot decide something, I...

APPENDIX C

Zimmer Sentence Completion Test
Individual Judges Sheet

APPENDIX C

Subject's Name	Judge's Name			
	<u>Hostility</u>	<u>Aggression Anxiety</u>	<u>Projection</u>	<u>Dependence</u>
8101				D N I
1201	EX N IN			
7301			PR N IC	
1102	EX N IN			
5301		AA N CP		
8102				D N I
8303				D N I
5202		AA N CP		
1303	EX N IN			
7202			PR N IC	
1304	EX N IN			
1105	EX N IN			
1206	EX N IN			
8304				D N I
5203		AA N CP		
1307	EX N IN			
8205				D N I
8106				D N I
8307				D N I
7103			PR N IC	
1208	EX N IN			
5104		AA N CP		

APPENDIX D

Consent Form For Subjects

APPENDIX D

DC-433
2/79

NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

CONSENT FORM

I consent to be interviewed and/or photographed by _____
_____ for the exclusive purpose of _____
_____.

I release the North Carolina Department of Correction, any agency, or any person from any and all claims damage for libel, slander, invasion of the right of privacy, or any other claims based on the use of this material.

I fully understand the stated purpose and intended use of the interview and/or photograph and agree to involve myself without compensation of any kind.

THE ABOVE CONSENT IS GIVEN BY ME FREELY AND VOLUNTARILY WITHOUT ANY PROMISES, THREATS, OR ANY OTHER FORM OF DURESS.

Resident Signature: _____

Address: _____

Date: _____

Witnessing Staff Member: _____

Address: _____