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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Sociological and criminological literature is replete with investigations concerning three principal divisions: (a) the sociology of law, which is an attempt at scientific analysis of the conditions under which criminal laws develop; (b) criminal etiology, which is an attempt at scientific analysis of the causes of crime; and (c) penology and corrections, which is concerned with the control of crime.¹

Although significant achievements have been made in these areas, many obstacles still hinder the development of a well-integrated theory which would permit an accurate interpretation and prediction of criminal behavior.

This study is directed toward inmate adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary, located at Fort Madison. It is hoped that the findings will contribute to the increasing knowledge in the area of institutional routine and its impact on the inmate.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Before discussing the specific problem for study, a general discussion of crime, as a basic social problem, is essential. This discussion will be of assistance to the reader for three reasons. First, a discussion of this nature will lend insight into the numerous researchable areas that might be deduced from the larger problem area. Second, a comprehensive consideration will suggest a few of the infinite inconsistencies confronting social scientists who conduct research in the area of criminal behavior. Third, a general discussion of the crime problem will lead directly to the specific problem being investigated in this study.

Crime is a social problem. Arnold Rose defines a social problem as:

A situation affecting a significant number of people that is believed by them and/or by a significant number of others in the society to be a source of difficulty or unhappiness and one that is considered capable of amelioration. ²

Raab and Selznick state in their definition of a social problem:

A social problem exists (1) where prevailing relationships among people frustrate the important personal goals of a substantial number

of people, or (2) where organized society appears to be seriously threatened by an inability to order relationships among people.\(^3\)

The seriousness of criminal behavior hardly needs description. By definition, the general public is always the victim of crime.

The general public suffers losses from crime either directly (as in treason or theft and destruction of public property), or indirectly (in the form of the expense of maintaining the police and the courts and in the form of uneasiness or even terror because of the prevalence of crime). In this sense every individual in the state is a victim of crime.\(^4\)

Hence, we can see why crime is called a social problem; but one must remain cognizant of the fact that it is a unique social problem in that it is carefully defined in the law. So we see crime not only as a social problem, but as a legal concept.

It must be so defined by the law, for crime is a creature of the law and attains its identity through the action of our legislative bodies and courts. In the absence of being labeled as a crime by the law, an act or a failure to act is not a crime, even though it may be shocking to the individual conscience.\(^5\)


\(^4\)Sutherland and Cressey, op. cit., p. 21.

A crime may be generally defined as "the commis-
sion or omission of an act which the law forbids or
commands under pain of a punishment to be imposed by
the state by a proceeding in its own name."\(^6\)

Conceptual ambiguities in the study of criminal
behavior are not restricted to an accurate definition
of crime, but involve, too, which individuals, under
given circumstances, should be designated as criminals.

A definition that the criminal is one who has
committed a crime has definite shortcomings. One such
shortcoming is that the word criminal lacks rigorous
reference, and, because of this weakness, has served as
the basis for non-factual generalizations advanced
about persons who violate the law.

Herbert A. Bloch and Gilbert Geis suggest a pos-
sible solution to the difficulty of operationally
defining the concept criminal:

A healthy scientific trend in recent crimino-
logical studies appears in attempts to break
through roadblocks imposed by the use of the
term "criminal" by concentrating on particular
categories of crime, such as arson, embezzlement,
automobile theft, murder, and incest, and on
homogeneous systems of criminal behavior such as
white-collar crime, professional crime, and

\(^6\)Justin Miller, Handbook of Criminal Law (St.
Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Company, 1934),
p. 16.
organized crime. 7

Cavan, in Criminology, presents a detailed classification of criminals, 8 but Caldwell, pointing out the ambiguity of any criminal classification, offers constructive criticism. 9

Caldwell states further:

The fact is that the term "criminal" refers to such a heterogeneous group of persons ... that it is impossible to construct a detailed classification which has rigid and mutually exclusive categories. To endeavor to do this would amount to an attempt to classify all human beings. At present, the inadequacy of human knowledge precludes this possibility. However, the classification of criminals into more homogeneous subgroups ... does provide deeper insights into criminal behavior and more systematic basis for further research. 10

Criminal behavior, as defined by law, poses a threat to social organization. Therefore, to insure the general welfare of society, the legal disposition of criminals is necessary.

Concerning the methods of criminal disposition, Elliot and Merrill state:

The community's disapproval of the criminal is expressed by convicting him. He may be placed on probation if the judge believes his

9 Caldwell, op. cit., p. 33.
10 Ibid.
previous conduct warrants it. Otherwise the judge must sentence him to prison (unless he is given the death penalty).\textsuperscript{11}

Probation is defined as a "legal disposition which allows the offender his usual freedom during a period in which he is expected to refrain from unlawful behavior."\textsuperscript{12} It has been increasingly utilized since its inception in 1841, "when John Augustus, a Boston shoemaker, became interested in befriending violators of the law."\textsuperscript{13}

The decision that probation is inappropriate, for reasons none of which in American jurisprudence must be revealed,\textsuperscript{14} dictates the offender's incarceration in a correctional institution.

Correctional institutions and confinement as punishment are creations of relatively modern society. The penologist recognizes that historically, prisons were neither universal nor inevitable. Of all the physical structures raised by society, they are perhaps the most obvious symbols of social improvising and expediency.\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{multicols}{2}
\begin{itemize}
\item Ibid., p. 189.
\item Elliott and Merrill, \textit{loc. cit.}
\end{itemize}
\end{multicols}
Society not only dictated the erection of such institutions, but it is generally accepted that the objectives of contemporary penology are also a result of society's demands.

Contemporary society, according to Robinson, has formulated several objectives in regard to crime control:

First, . . . the prison is expected to "reform" or rehabilitate criminals. Next, society wants protection from criminals. The prison isolates criminals from general society. . . . Also, society wants retribution. The prison is expected to make life unpleasant for people who, by their crimes, have made others' lives unpleasant. Finally, society wants to reduce crime rates . . . not only by reforming criminals but also by deterring the general public. . . .

It is generally accepted that the American correctional institution is a distinct and unique society within the larger society, but is in reality separated from it.

. . . prison is a community, a society, which though a part of the larger society, and an instrument of it, is in reality apart from it and reflects it only to a very limited degree. . . . It has values almost diametrically opposed to the prevailing outside social values. Its chief cohesive force is a measure of resentment and hostility for the larger society. . . .

Shulman points out the existing dichotomy between the prisoner community and the official community:


Relations between the prisoner community and the official community are distant and strained. The object of the official community is to maintain its control system over the prisoner community and the object of the prisoner community is to negate that control system. Under these circumstances, social relations between the two groups is normally not for the purpose of serving the welfare of all, but to accomplish the objects of each separately.

This structure of social relationships does not encourage constructive social learning, productivity, initiative and individual growth. . . .18

It is often contended that American correctional institutions are inadequate, perhaps obsolete, institutions that do not perform the functions for which they are presently intended. With this the writer would generally agree. However, there is one qualification that must be reserved. Correctional institutions are inadequate only because of their present organization. With considerable change and improvement, prisons could be turned into the kind of institutions which would actually carry out the basic purpose presently intended: namely rehabilitation.

Role conflict is evident in American penology:

American penology stands immobilized today with one foot in the road of rehabilitation and the other in the road of punishment.19

---


19 Ibid., p. 662.
Schnur questions the goals of contemporary penology:

What is the goal of the new penology? It is to get men ready, as rapidly and economically as possible, to go out and stay out by returning them to society, as useful, law-abiding, self-supporting, self-sufficient, independent citizens who will not contribute to the commission of crime by others—men who obey the law because they want to and not because they are afraid not to. What kinds of professional people, and how many, have been hired to implement the new penology? Not many!  

Robert Smith, a social worker at the Wisconsin State Prison, soundly states his criticism:

It would appear to be a basic assumption that the purpose of a correctional institution is to "correct" or to eliminate the types of social behavior which cause individuals to be committed to its care. . . . We have sincerely hoped that education, vocational training, camp systems, pre-release centers, and numerous other programs would mysteriously bear fruit. Yet our rate of recidivism continues to be disturbingly high.  

Recidivism  is a crucial question in American

---


22 For this study, recidivism will be defined as the repetition or recurrence of criminal conduct which results in the conviction and imprisonment of the offender. "Recidivist" will be the term used to indicate that an individual has been imprisoned at least one time prior to his most recent imprisonment.
penology. The rate of return in many institutions is from "56 to 80 per cent," as numerous writers on the subject indicate. It appears that the stated objectives of the correctional institution are not being attained, for releasing individuals inadequately prepared for life in conventional society means risking the welfare of its members.

It has always been assumed that inmates change in prison; parole and the indeterminate sentence are founded on the assumption that constructive change will take place. Donald Clemmer coined the term "prisonization".

---


25 For this study, prisonization will be defined as the process of assimilation of the prison culture by inmates as they become acquainted with the prison world.
to designate such change.

Sociological literature, however, suggests that prisoners become criminally oriented during imprisonment; that prison is criminogenic in nature.

The over-all effect of prisonization is to produce a person who generally conforms to the prison expectations and whose behavior upon release is contradictory to anticriminal norms.²⁶

Tannenbaum and Gillin wrote that exposing an individual to the penal process increases the probability that he will engage in criminal behavior:

Every time the apprehension of a child involves throwing him in contact with other young criminals who are confined together there is an increased stimulus in the education of crime. . . . The institutional experience is thus a concentration of stimuli adapted to develop delinquent interests.²⁷

What monuments of stupidity are these institutions we have built—stupidity not so much of the inmates as of free citizens. What a mockery of science are our prison discipline, our massing of social iniquity in prisons, the good and the bad together in one stupendous potpourri. How silly of us to think we can prepare men for social life by reversing the ordinary process of socialization.²⁸


Every inmate in the penitentiary is exposed to the "universal factors of prisonization," and undergoes the prisonization process to some extent.

In addition, conditions which maximize prisonization are:

1. A sentence of many years, thus a long subjection to the universal factors of prisonization.
2. A somewhat unstable personality made unstable by an inadequacy of "socialized" relations before commitment, but possessing, nonetheless, a capacity for strong convictions and a particular kind of loyalty.
3. A dearth of positive relations with persons outside the walls.
4. Readiness and a capacity for integration into a prison primary group.
5. A blind, or almost blind, acceptance of the dogmas and mores of the primary group and the general penal population.
6. A chance of placement with other persons of a similar orientation.
7. A readiness to participate in gambling and abnormal sex behavior.

Clemmer points out the undesirable aspects of prisonization:

The phases of prisonization which concern us most are the influences which breed or deepen criminality and antisociality and make the inmate characteristic of the prison community. Even if no other factor of the prison culture touches the personality of an inmate of many years residence, the influence of these universal factors are sufficient to make a man characteristic of the penal community and probably so disrupt his personality that a happy adjustment to any community becomes next to impossible.

---

30 Ibid., pp. 301-302. 31 Ibid., p. 300. 32 Ibid.
It becomes apparent that the intended role of the correctional institution is to re-socialize the convicted offender so that he may live properly in the law-abiding community. However, the attempts at rehabilitative treatment have been relatively unsuccessful as demonstrated by the high rates of recidivism.

The problem which this study is designed to investigate, is a comparison of first time properly offenders and property crime recidivists in relation to their adjustment to Iowa State Penitentiary's institutional routine.

It will attempt to investigate using the recidivism rate of the study sample as a measure, whether the penal experience serves to make a man a well-adjusted inmate, and in the process alienates him from conventional society.

**DEFINITION OF TERMS**

In order to prevent confusion, the concepts that will be used throughout this study must be restricted and defined.

**Recidivism.** For purposes of this study, recidivism will be defined as the repetition or recurrence of criminal conduct which results in the conviction and imprisonment of the offender.
Recidivist. The term used to indicate that an individual has been imprisoned at least one time prior to his most recent imprisonment.

Structure. This concept will be defined as "a relatively fixed relationship between elements, parts, or entities containing gross, observable parts that maintain a fixed relationship to one another for an appreciable time."33

Norm. This term will designate "a statement by the organization describing the behavior expected from the incumbent or incumbents in a given set of circumstances."34

Socialization. This concept will be defined as "the (1) process of communicating the culture to the biological human infant so that he understands it and uses it in his behavior, and (2) the process of communicating a subculture to those not already familiar with it."35

Prisonization. "It is the process of assimilation of the prison culture by inmates as they become

---


35 Rose, op. cit., p. 731.
acquainted with the prison world." For this study, prisonization and the latter definition of socialization will be used synonymously.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this investigation can be viewed in terms of four major objectives.

The first purpose was to study inmate adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary, in an attempt to determine if there were any significant adjustment differences between first time property offenders and property crime recidivists admitted to the institution during 1964.

The second purpose was to compare and contrast first time property offenders and property crime recidivists on carefully selected variables. The variables were education, occupation, marital status, race, age, crime for which convicted, and length of sentence.

A third purpose was to ascertain the recidivism rate for the sample in the study.

A final purpose was to test the validity of a hypothesis advanced by Donald Clemmer in The Prison Community.

---

36 Clemmer, op. cit., p. 299.
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

It is intended that this study will contribute some valuable information concerning the behavior of property crime offenders while they are confined within a maximum security penitentiary. Small bits of knowledge, gleaned from many investigations of this general nature, may allow us to develop effective re-socialization methods that will return the individual to conventional society adequately prepared to assume his role as a contributing citizen.

It is mandatory that this study be concentrated on one basic problem within a single homogeneous system of criminal behavior, rather than superficially attempting to study the entire penal population and all of its problems. As an exploratory study, it serves as a pilot project providing a sociological interpretation of a prison community and its impact on property offenders committed to its care during 1964. Its findings and conclusions serve as a point of departure for future studies.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much has been written in regard to the control of crime, but only the research pertinent to this study will be considered. This chapter is comprised of three sections: (1) literature on rehabilitation, (2) literature on inmate adjustment, and (3) literature on recidivism.

LITERATURE ON REHABILITATION

The rehabilitative ideal, the conviction that only through humane treatment methods can convicted offenders be returned to normal social living, has, until recently, been an uncertain and controversial issue in American penology. At present, most knowledgeable people would agree that re-socialization must be the goal of the correctional institution. There has been little effort, however, to integrate the underlying principles of human behavior into a standard program of reform.

Coulter and Korpi\textsuperscript{38} conducted a study in 1954 to determine the extent to which re-socialization programs were utilized by American correctional institutions. Questionnaires were sent to 317 correctional facilities in the United States. From the 176 questionnaires returned, it was concluded that a well-integrated re-socialization program had not been formulated.\textsuperscript{39}

Contemporary penology lacks a philosophy of rehabilitation. The objectives have not been clearly stated and the methods to be employed are undefined. Floch\textsuperscript{40} states that rehabilitation will remain an empty word until it is recognized that certain goals must be attained. The first objective should be the prevention of loyalty transfer from the larger community to the prisoner community. The second major objective would be to assist the inmate in acquiring substitute status for the status he enjoyed in the larger society. Third, it must hold a hope before the inmate so that he can eventually regain his social standing in the larger

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{39}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 615.
\item \textsuperscript{40}Floch, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 444-450.
\end{itemize}
society.\footnote{Ibid., p. 447} Imprisonment, after all, means ejection from the social whole. It means being told that one cannot remain part of regular society and must leave for a place of segregation where contact with the larger society is held down to the minimum. It also means, a status reduction, that is, the individual is by the act of imprisonment suddenly reduced from whatever status he might have had to the status of a subordinate, slave-like character who enjoys a minimum of legal rights and is limited by a large number of rules and regulations.\footnote{Ibid., p. 444.} Floch emphasizes that status reduction creates resentment and hostility in the inmate. As a result, loyalty is transferred from the larger society to the prisoner society. Loyalty to the prisoner community is continually strengthened by emphasizing the separateness of the two communities. This is accomplished through the formulation of a different set of values from that of the larger society.

Floch concluded that inmate alienation from the larger society "is the major handicap in the way of any rehabilitative efforts attempted by prison officials."\footnote{Ibid., p. 446.}

Another major roadblock to institutional rehabilitation is the emphasis on routine and the reluctance to institute social change.

Ohlin\footnote{Lloyd E. Ohlin, "The Routinization of Correctional Change," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 51:400-411, November-December, 1954.} describes the correctional system by
utilizing the sociological concept culture lag. He points to the correctional institution as one of the most conservative and change resistant institutions in our society. Correctional adjustments usually follow severe crises which dramatize and focus attention on outmoded penal practices. The changes which are instituted under these conditions are hasty and incomplete and do relatively little to ease conflict within the institutional setting.\textsuperscript{45}

Ohlin concludes that as long as correctional officials rely on change through crisis, rather than initiating progressive changes as more effective rehabilitation warrants them, the correctional system cannot keep pace with changes occurring in related American institutions. Neither can it prepare men to live in an ever-changing society.\textsuperscript{46}

Functional indecision is the third major hindrance to the development of an effective rehabilitation program. American penology, unfortunately, is called upon to execute a program of rehabilitation within a structure dominated by punishment.

Toby\textsuperscript{47} discusses the compatibility of punishment

\textsuperscript{45}Ibid., p. 400 \quad \textsuperscript{46}Ibid., p. 401

and rehabilitation. The long debated question, whether punitive action has a place in corrective treatment, must be considered from the point of view of the meaning of punishment to the offender. Those offenders who regard punishment as a deserved deprivation resulting from their own behavior are different from offenders who regard punishment as a misfortune bearing no relationship to their deviant behavior. Toby hypothesizes that punishment has rehabilitative significance only for the former.48

Toby concludes that punishment, as it is now practiced in the correctional process, is usually an obstacle to rehabilitation, and as a method of deterrence is unnecessary. He states:

The socialization process prevents most deviant behavior. Those who have introjected the moral norms of their society cannot commit crimes because their self-concepts will not permit them to do so. Only the unsocialized (and therefore amoral) individual . . . is deterred from expressing deviant impulses. . . . 49

Peizer, Lewis, and Scollon,50 using the socialization process as the basis, discuss rehabilitation in the form in which they think it would be most effective in

48Ibid., p. 336.  
49Ibid., p. 333.  
correctional endeavors. Their basic premise is that inmate rehabilitation is a learning task. They are primarily interested in social learning, the learning of acceptable behavior patterns. These patterns can be learned in no other way than through interaction with other people who have internalized them and use them consistently in their overt behavior. Peizer, Lewis, and Scollon refer to this as "interpersonal relations." 51

They conclude that in order for a program of rehabilitation to be successful, it must have two phases: (1) the process of unlearning old behavior patterns and (2) the process of relearning new ones. 52

A study directed at determining the success of American rehabilitation programs was undertaken by Westover 53 who, in 1957, visited a number of federal penal institutions. He visited the institution for juvenile and youth offenders at Ashland, Kentucky; the women's reformatory at Alderson, West Virginia; the reformatory at Petersburg, Virginia; the penitentiaries at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, and Terre Haute, Indiana, the maximum security prison at Leavenworth, Kansas, and the institution for youth and juvenile offenders at

51 Ibid., p. 632. 52 Ibid., p. 635.

Englewood, Colorado.

He concluded that the rehabilitation program now utilized in federal penal institutions is not as successful as it should be because it does not go far enough. As far as it goes, it is a good program. "Within the prison it is effective; but to be entirely successful rehabilitation must be extended beyond prison walls."\(^{54}\)

Our rehabilitative process, as it is presently administered, leaves much to be desired. Definite measures must be taken to formulate a well-integrated program of re-socialization, which will return individuals to normal society adequately prepared to meet its demands in culturally prescribed ways.

LITERATURE ON INMATE ADJUSTMENT

Of the numerous problems confronting correctional administrators, one of the most crucial concerns the prediction of inmate adjustment to institutional routine. At present, the most reliable solution to this problem is the classification process, although this has been deficient in many respects.\(^{55}\) There is a definite need

\(^{54}\)Ibid., p. 5.

for a prediction instrument to accurately determine inmate adjustment, based on antecedent characteristics.

In 1961 Coe conducted an investigation of inmate adjustment to the routine of the Illinois State Penitentiary at Menard, in an effort to provide a start toward construction of such an instrument. The purpose of the study was to determine whether there are characteristics which would differentiate those inmates who have a record of good adjustment from those who have a record of poor adjustment.

The statistical analysis revealed that twenty-two of the forty-one characteristics studied did not significantly differentiate well adjusted from poorly adjusted inmates.

The nineteen statistically significant characteristics provided a basis for comparison of well adjusted

---


57 Coe defined "good" adjustment as no more than one minor disciplinary report in the past six months, long time on a preferred job, long time in the same cell and/or with the same cell partner. Conversely, "poor" adjustment has been defined as three or more major infractions or five or more minor violations of institutional regulations, frequent changes in work assignments, frequent changes in cell assignment and/or cell partner.

58 Ibid., p. 182.
and poorly adjusted inmates. First, well adjusted offenders tended to be white men (eighty-two per cent) who were older at the time of admission to prison. The majority of poorly adjusted prisoners were also white (sixty-five per cent), but that group contained a significantly high proportion of Negroes.  

Second, early social data indicated that forty-nine per cent of the well adjusted inmates came from homes classified as average or superior. In contrast, the poorly adjusted prisoners came from average or superior homes in only twenty-nine per cent of the cases.  

Third, only thirty-one per cent of the well adjusted inmates were single compared to sixty-one per cent of the poorly adjusted group. Over one-half (fifty-three per cent) of the well adjusted inmates had lived in the same community most of their lives compared to only twenty-four per cent of the poorly adjusted men.  

Fourth, well adjusted inmates committed offenses of theft and stealth less often than the poorly adjusted group (forty-nine and sixty-nine per cent respectively) and more frequently were involved in offenses of violence and emotion (twenty-nine and twenty-three per cent respectively). As a result, well adjusted offenders

\[59^{ibid.}\] \[60^{ibid., p. 183.}\] \[61^{ibid.}\]
received the longest sentences. Classification reports showed that well adjusted prisoners were generally classified as improvable or questionably improvable and tended to be first or occasional offenders (fifty-seven per cent). In contrast, poorly adjusted inmates received questionably or doubtfully improvable classifications and tended to have fewer first or occasional offenders (thirty-nine per cent). Recidivists made up thirty per cent of the well adjusted group and nearly one-half (forty-seven per cent) of the poorly adjusted group.62

On the basis of the findings, Coe concluded that there were certain factors which differentiate well adjusted inmates from poorly adjusted inmates.63

Wolfgang's study, conducted in 1961, was directed at quantitative analysis of adjustment to the prison community. The purpose of the investigation was two-fold: (1) as a pilot study of the offender after the crime, to follow up the adjustment patterns of persons who have been convicted of and incarcerated for having committed murder; (2) to provide an index of prison

62Ibid.  
63Ibid.  
adjustment that is based upon an empirically quantitative analysis and that affords opportunity for replication and expansion.65

The study was a follow-up of a select group of persons who had committed murder and had been sentenced to a term of life imprisonment in Eastern State Penitentiary at Philadelphia. An index was constructed to determine their adjustment to the subculture of the maximum security prison. The index was comprised of (a) the number and duration of prison jobs, (b) job dismissals for reason of misconduct (c) schedules on the conduct of inmates reported by cell block guards.66

Hypotheses were tested on the basis of a division of the subjects into adjusted and maladjusted groups. The findings seemed to indicate that there were significant associations between prison adjustment and inmates (1) who were thirty-five years of age and older, (2) who were or had been married, (3) whose murder was other than a felony murder, and (4) who had some previous penal experience. No associations were found between adjustment and race, or between adjustment and length of incarceration.67

Wolfgang's data revealed a persistently significant association between age and adjustment in prison.

---

65 Ibid., p. 607. 66 Ibid., p. 617. 67 Ibid.
"It is principally the young adult in his late teens or twenties who contributes most disproportionately to crime in the community and who persists in his maladjustment within the prison community."  

Wolfgang concluded that the construction of a prison index should be tested as an aid in determining in advance success or failure on release. Should the adjustment index prove useful in this capacity, the treatment and custodial officials in prison as well as parole authorities outside would have additional clues to guide them in their maximal task of rehabilitation and in their minimal function of restraining former offenders from additional criminality.

Bates stated that, "Ordinarily speaking there are three classes of prisoners: the unadjustable, the adjustable, and the self-adjusting." The first are purely custodial cases, and the last cause no trouble in prison and are of help to officials as school teachers, and so on. The larger number are the "adjustable" group with whom re-educative work must be done to reclaim them and prevent recidivous developments. Clemmer, using

68 Ibid.  
69 Ibid., p. 618.  
71 Ibid., p. 224.  
72 Clemmer, op. cit., p. 196.
the three-fold classification developed by Bates, applied it to the study population of The Prison Community. The "unadjustables" were the psychopaths and unstable personalities. The self-adjusting, Clemmer found, were the stable personalities who would adjust quickly to almost any situation, and most of these had relatively short sentences. The "adjustables", who comprised the bulk of the population, were the common garden variety of prisoner, and age or criminality had little effect on conduct adjustment. The "unadjustables" were in constant trouble; the "self-adjusting" were almost never in trouble, but the "adjustables" reactions were primarily reactions to situations, and their behavior reflected the situation more than the intrinsic personality make-up as in the other two groups.73

Schnur74 studied the relationship between institutional conduct and recidivism, of men who were released from the Wisconsin State Prison between January 1, 1936 and December 31, 1941. The purpose of the investigation was to assist in (1) explaining the already discovered association of prison conduct with recidivism,

73Ibid.

(2) determining if the independent discriminating power yielded by classification according to prison conduct is great enough to warrant inclusion in an instrument for selecting treatment and determining fitness for release, and (3) revealing factors which a prison classification committee could use in anticipating the prison conduct of a man upon arrival. On the basis of the findings, Schnur concluded:

(1) The number of misconduct citations is most closely related to the length of time served. The longer a man is in prison the more frequently he will be in trouble in prison.

(2) Men who have accomplices are more likely to misbehave in prison than those without accomplices.

(3) The older a man is when he comes to prison, the less likely he is to misbehave in prison and to get into trouble after leaving prison. The older a man is when he arrives at prison and the less trouble he gets into in prison, the less trouble he will get into after release.

(4) The type of crime for which a man is sent to prison is associated with conduct in prison. Men who are admitted for abandonment, non-support, desertion, embezzlement, and forgery behave best in prison. Behavior is a little worse among men admitted for adultery, bigamy, assault with no intent to rob, drunkenness, vagrancy, rape, fornication, carnal knowledge and abuse, indecent liberties, and sodomy. Still worse behavior is found among men committed for arson, breaking and entering, burglary, larceny, assault with intent to rob, robbery, and operating automobile without owner’s consent.

(5) Divorced and widowed men are in little trouble in prison; married men in more. Single

75 Ibid., p. 36.
men are the most troublesome.

(6) The older a man is when he leaves prison the less trouble he is likely to have had in prison. The better behaved he has been in prison, the better his chances are of avoiding trouble after release.

(7) The more serious a man's criminal activity before coming to prison the more often he is cited for misconduct.

(8) The older a man is when he quits attending school, the more trouble he causes in prison. The proportion of men who engage in further criminal activity increases the more a man misbehaves in prison no matter what his age.\(^7\)

In an investigation conducted by Fox,\(^7\) on the effect of professional counseling on adjustment in prison, the primary conclusion was:

... if rehabilitation of personalities is to be successfully achieved, the institutional facilities must be organized around the needs of these personalities rather than for the convenience of the institution. While a high degree of specialization gets a specific task done faster, the generalized integration of services is more effective in influencing the adjustment of the personalities within the institution. When attempting to help personalities, the program should be organized in such a way that an inmate may have the same therapist over a long term, preferably his entire treatment period. Further, the therapist should have functions that will insure his integration into the daily routines of the prison.\(^7\)

Adjustment of the inmate to prison routine is an

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 41.


\(^7\)Ibid., p. 289.
increasingly important topic in penological literature. However, as in any area of investigation in the behavioral sciences, operational definitions are difficult to establish. This has hindered the accumulation of reliable knowledge. More studies, similar to the ones reviewed in this chapter and the one being conducted, are needed if the problems of inmate adjustment are to be adequately understood.

LITERATURE ON RECIDIVISM

A measure of the efficiency and effectiveness of treatment methods may be found in the statistics on recidivism. While it is true that these statistics may be inaccurate, they may, however, serve to indicate what happens to the criminal population after it has been treated. A survey of statistics on recidivism reveals that "many convicted offenders do not benefit to any considerable extent from their treatment experiences. Thus in 1935, of all prisoners received in Federal prisons, state prisons, and reformatories, over fifty percent of them had some previous commitment."79

Cason and Pescor\textsuperscript{80} conducted an investigation based on the clinical records of 286 male psychopathic federal offenders admitted to and later discharged from the Medical Center for Federal Prisoners at Springfield, Missouri. Twenty-five per cent were released from the Medical Center in 1940 and 1941, thirty-eight per cent during 1942, and thirty-seven per cent during 1943. In 1945 all had been out at least one year and some over four years. On the basis of Federal Bureau of Investigation reports, forty-two per cent had become recidivists and the remainder were presumably out of trouble.

A revealing finding in this study was certain statistically significant characteristics which distinguished a recidivist from a non-recidivist.

The recidivist was characterized by the following:
1. While at Medical Center was serving a sentence for violation of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act.
2. History of previous commitments to all types of penal and correctional institutions including juvenile.
3. While at Medical Center placed in punitive segregation for violation of institutional rules.
4. Upon release from Medical Center given a poor prognosis for social rehabilitation.
5. While at Medical Center was not assigned to work.

6. Principal antisocial activity, offenses against property.
7. While at Medical Center made a poor dormitory adjustment.
9. Residence in one of the Central States.
11. Arrested for the first time when less than thirteen years of age.
12. Parents separated or divorced before the subject reached the age of 18.
13. Subject the youngest child in the family.
14. History of four commitments with sentences of over one year.
15. History of nervous breakdown, unspecified, among blood relatives.
16. While at Medical Center reported for insolence.

The non-recidivist was characterized by the following:
1. History of only one commitment with a sentence of over one year, in other words, a first offender.
2. No adverse behavior reports while at the Medical Center.
3. Good dormitory adjustment at the Medical Center.
4. No disciplinary action taken for violation of institutional rules while at the Medical Center.
5. Parental home intact up to the age of 18.
6. Given a fair prognosis for social rehabilitation upon release from the Medical Center.
7. Made a good work adjustment while at the Medical Center.
8. Not subjected to punitive segregation for violation of institutional rules while at the Medical Center.
9. No history of commitments with sentences of one year or less.
10. Committed to adult penal institution after first arrest.
11. Inmate of adult penal institutions only.
12. Obedient and well-behaved as a child.
13. While at Medical Center was serving a sentence for some offense other than violation of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act.
14. Made a satisfactory work adjustment while at the Medical Center.
15. Married, congenial relationships.
17. Principal antisocial activity, violation of liquor laws.
18. While at Medical Center employed in the industries.
19. Clerical or sales occupation.
20. Member of non-white race.
21. Childhood residence in a town of less than 5,000 population.
22. History of homosexuality in the feminine or passive role.
23. Ignorance of the law or intoxication given as the excuse for committing crime.
24. Has one child.
25. Served 49 to 61 months on the last sentence.

Cason and Pescor concluded that the first offender who made a good institutional adjustment, who had normal family ties, and who had a wife and child was a good prospect for social rehabilitation. On the other hand, the individual with a long criminal record dating back to childhood, who had been an inmate of both juvenile and adult penal and correctional institutions, who had made a poor institutional adjustment, whose parental home was disrupted, and who had no wife or child was a poor prospect for social rehabilitation, especially if, in addition to the above factors, he was a car thief.81

Mannering82 examined statistically the ways in which recidivists differ from first offenders. His examination involved 1,989 persons, men and women, sentenced to the Wisconsin State Prison, Reformatory, and Home for

81 Ibid., p. 236.

women during 1956 and 1957.

He drew the following conclusions based on his findings in the three Wisconsin institutions:

1. Men are unquestionably more recidivistic than women.
2. Recidivists are older than first offenders but recidivism is markedly present in all age groups.
3. Nonwhites tend to be more recidivistic than whites; however, whites appear to have a higher proportion of "hard-core" recidivists.
4. Divorced male prisoners contain a higher percentage of recidivists than do those who have never married or those who are married but never divorced. Among females, however, single and divorced prisoners have the highest proportion of repeaters.
5. Proportionately more recidivists come from urban than from rural areas.
6. There is only slight evidence that recidivists have less education than nonrecidivists.
7. There is little difference between the proportions of recidivists and first offenders having military service; however, recidivists are less likely to be honorably discharged from service.
8. The most recidivistic offenses committed by male prisoners are narcotics law violations, fraud (including forgery), burglary, larceny, and auto theft. The offenses least likely to be repeated are rape, assault, and sex offenses.
9. Recidivists tend to receive somewhat longer sentences than do nonrecidivists, but not startlingly so.83

Metzner and Weil84 conducted a 2½ year follow-up study of all men discharged from the Massachusetts Correctional Institution Concord during 1959. They found

83 Ibid., p. 217.
that the overall return rate was fifty-six per cent, with one-half being returned on technical parole violation and one-half for new offenses. It was also concluded that most returns occur between six months and one year.\footnote{85}

DeStephens\footnote{86} studied persons who had been inmates at the Ohio State Reformatory. The study encompassed 12.5 years of history and the records of 16,965 former inmates. The period of study was from January of 1940 through June of 1952.

On the basis of his findings, DeStephens concluded that about 5,246 (thirty-one per cent) of the 16,965 who left the institution and were included in this study could be conceived as having failed to mature sufficiently to profit from their incarceration at the Ohio State Reformatory.\footnote{87}

Zuckerman, Barron and Whittier\footnote{88} conducted a study

\begin{itemize}
\item\footnote{85}{Ibid., p. 311.}
\item\footnote{86}{William P. DeStephens, "Initial Failures in Rehabilitation Among 16,965 Ohio State Reformatory Inmates," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 44:596-603, January-February, 1954.}
\item\footnote{87}{Ibid., p. 602.}
\end{itemize}
to determine the rate of recidivism at the Minnesota State Reformatory for Men at St. Cloud. They studied 345 men who had been released between July 1, 1944 and June 30, 1945. The five year follow-up study of the criminal behavior of those subjects revealed that recidivism for the 345 men was 52.8 per cent. 89

Other studies in recidivism have been conducted, 90

89 Ibid., p. 634.

but this review was intended to consider previous investigations that most closely parallel the purposes of the present study.

Recidivism is, most assuredly, the major concern of rehabilitation. This contention is supported by Sol Rubin:

Recidivism is one of the crucial phenomena in criminal behavior. Crime, the product of the total social existence, is difficult to prevent, whereas recidivism should be within administrative control, since by definition a recidivist is a person who, having been convicted and subject to correctional treatment, again commits a crime. . . . Nevertheless the problem of recidivism is the hub of the whole treatment machinery; the purpose of treatment is basically to prevent recidivism. Thus we would consider a treatment technique completely successful if no treated offenders recidivated.91

From this review of the literature on rehabilitation, adjustment, and recidivism, the existing paradoxical situation inherent within the correctional process is made explicit. The correctional institution of contemporary society has been established for the basis purpose of preparing men for return to conventional social life, willing to abide by the cultural definitions of the majority group. The lack of a rehabilitative philosophy, the reluctance to institute social change, and functional

---
indecision, have hampered the formulation of an effective rehabilitation program. Stating the purpose of the correctional institution and its operational processes in another way, one may say that the main goal of modern penological techniques is to prevent recidivism. However, the literature points out that the rate of return is disturbingly high. (See page 10).

As a result of this confusion, little progress has been made in most penal institutions and it is readily observed that the majority of correctional institutions, although they professionally advocate rehabilitation, are, in practice, security conscious. As a result of the emphasis on strict conformity to institutional norms, prisonization takes place. Adjustment to institutional routine makes for an acceptable inmate and a "quiet" institution, but because the values are diametrically opposed to those of the larger society, little, if anything, is accomplished through treatment.
CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This chapter will present a brief history of the Iowa State Penitentiary from 1839 to the present. This sketch is by no means complete, but it will give the reader a basic understanding of the institution's development to 1965, and the social setting in which this study took place.

In January of 1839 the First Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Iowa convened in Burlington. A bill was introduced which provided for a territorial penitentiary "of sufficient capacity to receive, secure and employ one hundred thirty six convicts, to be confined in separate cells at night."

The citizens of Fort Madison donated ten acres of land near the Mississippi River to the Territory and construction officially began on July 9, 1839. The building program was well under way by 1840 and was finally completed in 1841. It housed the warden's mansion and 138 cells—two more than was originally specified—and was built for an estimated cost of $55,933.90. Actual construction dates for the first prison were July 9, 1839 to October 5, 1841, and for all practical purposes, the prison as it stood in 1841
continued to serve the Territory and later the State of Iowa without change for the next thirty years.

Prisoner treatment was in the form of pure corporal punishment, and, as might be expected, little sympathy was given to those individuals who failed to conform to the expectations of the institution. Treatment of the day dictated that these men would be unmercifully beaten with the lash, a broad leather instrument which was sometimes studded with steel.

The years after the turn of the century were ones of construction and progress in all phases of the prison operation. Unfortunately many methods were still practiced which caused extreme discomfort to the victim, but there was little comparison to the years previous.

During this period many innovations which would have shocked the disciplinarian attitudes of the earlier wardens, began to enter into the prison picture. Motion pictures were shown for the first time and convicts were allowed to organize and play in a prison orchestra. In 1934 an all-convict show was first presented with the public invited.

Cellhouses and individual cells, for the first time, included a lavatory and stool as well as a table and chair. Regular religious programs were begun and full-time religious personnel became available as men of
all faiths were allowed to participate in the services of their choice.

A school system was even founded and was augmented by the facilities of the prison library, which in the early thirties contained over 70,000 volumes. Clothing was exchanged from the coarse, semi-finished ticking to a more acceptable blue and white striped uniform made of denim.

In 1933 Glenn C. Haynes was appointed warden of the penitentiary. Under his guidance an academic school was established. A vocational training program was also formed under his direction, as was a classification committee which first met at the prison in 1940.

Prison athletics also played a major role in Haynes' over-all progressive policies. He encouraged visits from nationally famous personalities, and in 1941 Dizzy Dean spoke to the general population.

After the death of Warden Haynes in 1942, Percy A. Lainson was appointed warden. His policies during the next sixteen years were to bring many changes into the Iowa Penal System.

In the early fifties the first of many programs which would eventually develop into an entirely new prison philosophy, began to take shape with the establishment of the Iowa State Industries.
Although outside industries were forbidden by law to participate in prisoner labor programs for profit, these industries nevertheless began to look more and more at the labor potential of the released convict. It was seen in many organizations that a well-trained ex-convict was just as valuable an employee as a well-trained man who had never been to prison. One of the first large companies to actively engage in a prison program of preparatory education was the Ford Motor Company.

Warden John Bennett stepped into his position in 1958 when Warden Lainson retired.

Warden Bennett came to his post with more experience in the correctional field than any other warden in the history of the prison. He served originally under Warden Hallowell when first starting his career and later under Warden Lainson as the Deputy Warden. Bennett was the first to work his way from the bottom to the Executive position, as he served as a custodial officer 1931-1934; a Shift Captain, 1934-1939; Assistant Deputy Warden, 1939-1940; and Deputy Warden, 1940-1958.

Under his direction have come many changes:

The Treatment Concept which emerged from all that had gone before was expanded in 1959.

A braille program was instituted in 1959, and the first convict to become a certified braille transcriber was awarded his certificate by the Library of
In 1960 a new prison hospital was dedicated for the care and treatment of the prisoner population.

In 1961 the newly created post of Associate Warden of Treatment was filled, and the new officer assumed direction of the entire program of treatment.

In 1961 also, a Director of Vocational Education was appointed and a renewed emphasis on this phase of the prison program was begun with the hiring of additional instructors for many departments.

In 1961 the academic school which had grown far beyond expectations, added instructors from local Fort Madison who were in charge of evening classes for remedial and elementary work.

In 1965 the Iowa General Assembly once again acted to abolish the death penalty within the state. The bill which passed both houses with an overwhelming majority, went into effect on July 4, 1965. Nineteen sixty-five has thus proven to be an important year for the Iowa Penal System as the sixty-first General Assembly has seriously considered many new bills and amendments which, if passed, would have far-reaching effects on the various prison programs.

The Iowa State Penitentiary, located in the outskirts of Fort Madison, bears little resemblance to the
institution established in 1839. True, the primary function remains the same since all prisons are designed to segregate the criminal from the free society. Here, however, all comparison must end.\textsuperscript{92}

CHAPTER IV

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CRIMINALITY THEORY

The prevention and control of crime and criminal behavior, as the goal of criminology, cannot be realized without scientific knowledge of its causes. In order to achieve this end, numerous theoretical explanations have been formulated. Such explanations involve the genetic, glandular, and constitutional approach to the causes of crime; the ethnic and racial theories of crime; the psychological approach to the etiology of crime, and the sociologically-oriented theories of crime.

This chapter will deal with the theoretical approaches that serve to establish the historical significance of attempts to explain criminal behavior. Because this investigation is directed toward inmate adjustment to the institutional routine of a penal institution, it will be necessary to consider the Classical School of Criminology, founded by Cesare Beccaria, and the Positive School of Criminology, associated with the name of Cesare Lombroso. These criminological theories, the former showing major concern for the criminal act and its punishment and the latter with emphasis on the individual offender, were eighteenth and nineteenth century formulations, and have largely determined modern criminal law and contemporary punitive policies pertaining to the offender.
Also, because this is a sociological study, it is mandatory that consideration be given the major sociological interpretations of crime and criminal behavior. This discussion of sociological theory will include the contributions of: (1) Emile Durkheim, (2) Robert K. Merton, (3) Gabriel Tarde, and (4) Edwin H. Sutherland.

The writer realizes that such a consideration is non-conclusive and that an interdisciplinary approach would be more desirable, but explanations other than sociological ones are not within the scope of this study, and must be excluded.

CLASSICAL SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY

The name associated with the classical school is that of the Italian mathematician and economist, Cesare Bonesana, Marchese de Beccaria, whose wide range of interests led him to examine and offer suggestions for the reformation of penology of his day. 93

Beccaria knew nothing of penology when he undertook to deal with the subject. 94 Fortunately, however, Alessandro Verri, who held the office of Protector of


prisoners in Milan, was able to give Beccaria the help and suggestions he needed. This association led to the publication of his most famous book in 1764, under the title Essay on Crimes and Punishments.

Beccaria protested the inconsistencies in government and in the management of public affairs. He objected most violently to the existing practices in connection with criminal justice, especially to the personal justice that the judges were applying and to the severe and barbaric punishments of the time.

The practice of discretionary penalties was a commonplace. Judges did what the law could not do, differentiate on a personal basis between the circumstances and the criminal act. Thus, judges exercised the power to add to the punishments prescribed by law in keeping with their personal views.

The existent criminal law of eighteenth-century Europe was, in general, repressive, uncertain and barbaric. Its administration permitted and encouraged incredibly arbitrary and abusive practices. The agents of the criminal law, prosecutors and judges, were allowed tremendous latitude in dealing with persons accused and convicted of crime, and corruption was rampant throughout continental Europe.

The criminal law of eighteenth-century Europe

95 Ibid. 96 Vold, op. cit., p. 19.

97 Monachesi, loc. cit.
vested in public officials the power to deprive persons of their freedom, property and life without regard for any of the principles which are now contained in the phrase "due process of law." \(^98\) The sentences imposed were arbitrary, inconsistent and depended upon the status and power of the convicted. In practice, no distinction was made between the accused and the convicted. Both were detained in the same institution and subjected to the same horrors of incarceration. \(^99\)

This tyrannical situation in criminal law was the basis for much protest and it served as the main impetus for the classical viewpoint based on the thoughts of Beccaria.

The Classical School of Criminology was based on hedonistic psychology. According to this doctrine, man governed his behavior by considering pleasures and pains. The individual was assumed to have a free will and to make a choice with reference to the hedonistic calculation alone. \(^100\)

Beccaria in 1764 applied this doctrine to penology. \(^101\)

---
\(^98\)Ibid., p. 39. \(^99\)Ibid.  
\(^100\)Sutherland and Cressey, *op. cit.*, p. 52.  
His objective was to make punishment less arbitrary and severe than it had been. He contended that all persons who violated a specific law should receive identical punishment.

This was justified on the basis that the rights of individuals could be preserved only by treating all individuals alike, and also on the assumption that the punishment must be definitely determined in advance in order that it might be taken into account in the calculation of pains and pleasures that would result from violation of the law.102.

The classical school may be characterized as "administrative and legal criminology."103 Its great advantage was that it set up a scheme of procedure easy to administer. It made the judge only an instrument to apply the law, and the law undertook to prescribe an exact penalty for every crime.

Questions about the causes of deviant behavior were ignored for the sake of uniformity of the law. This was the classical conception of justice—an exact scale of punishments for equal acts without reference to the nature of the individual involved and with no attention to the question of special circumstances under which the

102 Sutherland and Cressey, op. cit., p. 53.

103 Vold, op. cit., p. 23.
The classical viewpoint with regard to criminal law was instituted before the modern development of the biological sciences and was not influenced by them. It was therefore left to a more recent school of criminology to utilize their methods and the results of their investigations. This school, usually called the "positive school," because of its emphasis on scientific method, was founded in 1872 by Cesare Lombroso.  

Lombroso's theory in its earlier form contained the following points:

1. Criminals constitute a distinct born type.
2. This type can be identified by certain stigmata or anomalies, such as protruding jaws, asymmetrical skull, retreating forehead, large outstanding ears, low sensitivity to pain, etc.
3. The stigmata are not the causes of crime, but rather the symptoms of atavism (reversion to a more primitive type) or degeneracy, especially that characterized by epileptic tendencies. Thus, according to Lombroso, atavism and degeneracy were the causes of crime.
4. The person who is the criminal type cannot refrain from committing crime unless he lives under exceptionally favorable circumstances.

As Lombroso continued to study the criminal, he modified his theory, eventually admitting that the "born criminal" classification as a general explanation for
all criminals was not applicable in all cases, and, therefore, should be utilized to a lesser degree.\textsuperscript{107}

It becomes clear, therefore, that Lombroso's later thought included factors other than those physical or anthropological. The discoveries made in the biological sciences were not directly applicable to human behavior as Lombroso had suggested previously. He maintained that there were three major classes of criminals: (1) born criminals, to be understood as atavistic reversions to a lower or more primitive evolutionary form of development, and thought to constitute about one-third of the total number of offenders; (2) insane criminals, that is, idiots, imbeciles, paranoiacs, sufferers from melancholia; those afflicted with general paralysis, dementia, alcoholism, epilepsy, or hysteria; and (3) criminaloids, a large general class of those without physical stigmata, who are not afflicted with recognizable mental disorders, but whose mental and emotional make-up are such that under certain circumstances they indulge in vicious and criminal behavior (a concept much like "psychopathic personality" of later psychiatric and psychological theories). Lombroso conceded that well over half of all criminals were not "born criminals," nor were they insane.

or epileptic, but their defects were more subtle and involved—these he called "criminaloids."\textsuperscript{108}

The most widely known of Lombroso's pupils was probably Enrico Ferri.\textsuperscript{109} In his \textit{Criminal Sociology}, he expounded his thought on the whole problem of crime. His original thesis was that crime is caused by a great number of factors, classified as (1) physical (race, climate, geographic location, seasonal effects, temperature etc.); (2) anthropological (age, sex, organic, and psychological conditions etc.); and (3) social (density of population, customs, religion, organization of government, economic and industrial conditions etc.). In his more developed theory he discussed a large number of preventive measures. Among these measures were free trade, abolition of monopolies, inexpensive workmen's dwellings, public savings banks, better street lighting, birth control, freedom of marriage and divorce, state control of the manufacture of weapons, provision for marriage of the clergy, and so on, through a long list of solutions for social betterment. His preventive measures were in keeping with his political theory, socialist in nature, that the state is the principal instrument through which social conditions may be attained.\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{108}Vold, op. cit., p. 30. \textsuperscript{109}Ibid., p. 32. \textsuperscript{110}Ibid., p. 34.
A third name associated with the positive approach whose ideas have contributed significantly to the background of present-day thinking in criminology is Raffaele Garofalo.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 36.}

Garofalo was concerned with the elimination of those who show by criminal behavior that they are not adapted to civilized life. He suggested three means of elimination: (1) death for those whose acts grow out of a 'permanent psychologic anomaly which renders the subject forever incapable of social life'; (2) partial elimination, including long-time or life imprisonment and transportation for those 'fit only for the life of nomadic hordes or primitive tribes', as well as the relatively mild isolation of agricultural colonies for young and more hopeful offenders; (3) enforced reparation for those lacking in altruistic sentiments who have committed their crimes under pressure of exceptional circumstances not likely to occur again.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p. 38.}

Garofalo was convinced that his theory of punishment met three essential conditions to make it an effective instrument: (1) it fit in well with the deep-seated public demand for punishment of the offender simply because he had committed a crime; (2) that its general principle of elimination was sufficiently intimidating to
contribute to deterrence; and (3) that the social selection resulting from its operation offered hope for the future by slow eradication of the criminals.

The basic ideas of the positive approach in criminology have been presented through a discussion of its three major thinkers, Lombroso, Ferri, and Garofalo. The writer must point out, however, that the mistake must not be made of identifying positivism in criminology too closely with the specific theories of any past or present writers in the field. The essential point in positivism is the application of the scientific method to the study of crime and it must not be confused with particular emphasis, such as Lombroso's stress on biological factors in crime, of one investigator or another.

All contemporary scientific criminology is positivistic in method and in basic formulations. It is this very positivism that has made possible the demonstration, by means of data and the use of accurate comparisons, of facts and relationships that often have disproved earlier claims. Positivism means the utilization of the point of view and methodology of natural science in the study of the crime problem. Non-positivistic theories, formulated in terms of spirit-power, free will, or other vague generalities not susceptible of investigation or proof, are in no way superior merely because it has been impossible to disprove them. Failure to disprove a theory does not establish its validity; rather, it more often points to the fact that such theories often are outside of the scientific system of thought. 113

113Ibid., pp. 39-40.
In reiteration, the classical approach to crime was concerned with the criminal act and the legally inflicted punishment that went with the act. The positive approach was concerned with the individual criminal and attempted to explain criminality. These two approaches have determined today's criminal law and its position in relation to the convicted offender. These approaches are applicable to this investigation. The property offender who was convicted of a specific property crime that required his isolation from free society was committed to the Iowa State Penitentiary as punishment for a specified period of time. The amount of time deemed sufficient by law for the particular offense committed was determined prior to the commitment of the deviant act. Although punishment is believed by some to be useful for purposes of rehabilitation and deterrence, it has been decided by leading authorities in the penology field that, in application of the positivistic approach, the major role of imprisonment should be to attempt to scientifically understand the contributing circumstances that may play a significant part in the individual inmate's criminality.

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

Sociologists have approached the problem of crime from two distinct frames of reference. The first approach
views crime as a social phenomenon related to other social phenomena in the social structure. Individuals who have utilized this approach, namely Durkheim and Merton for example, are concerned with answering the question: How does crime come about—how does society acquire crime?

The second approach attempts to explain how individuals acquire criminal behavior patterns. Individuals who have utilized this approach, Tarde and Sutherland for example, are concerned with answering the question: How does the individual acquire criminality—how does the person become a criminal?

Both of these explanations are essential to criminology, and both are pertinent to this investigation, and will, therefore, be given consideration in this chapter. Other theoretical explanations may be equally as important, but as has already been explicitly pointed out, those theories that are not primarily sociological and lack direct application to this study must be excluded.

EMILE DURKHEIM

Of the many contributions which Durkheim has made to the field of criminology his advancement of the theory of "Anomie" stands out above all others. Social

---

114 The word "Anomie" comes from the Greek, Anomia, which originally meant lawlessness. The present use implies lawlessness or lack of conformity. Durkheim first used the term in 1895 in his Division of Labor.
scientists have found this theory a valuable means of explaining the etiology of crime. The theory of "Anomie" is the one principle which follows consistently from the entire structure of society. For Durkheim the factors which unite society are exteriority and individual constraint arising from the force of common meanings and values. The individual has an inner compulsion to conform which arises from a number of social factors such as, authority, respect, fear and the sacred. All this brings about a certain moral discipline in a population. Under this condition crime is at a minimum.¹¹⁵

In the process of social change in society the unifying forces, according to Durkheim, tend to weaken. The norms which had regulated society in the past become obsolete or meaningless. When this occurs the restraints on passions no longer hold and the result is disorder and social chaos. The end result is that society becomes fragmented and disorganized.¹¹⁶

Another serious condition arises in society as a result of anomie—social isolation which brings about a decrease in social participation. In such a formless and


¹¹⁶Ibid.
fragmented society there is no solidarity, no sharing of life or experiences, no obligations to any one or any thing. This is the milieu which produces crime and anti-social disorders. There are no constraints and the cult of individualism cuts away all inhibitions. As a result, social control is no longer institutionalized, and each individual satisfies his own desires.\textsuperscript{117}

ROBERT K. MERTON

Merton is concerned with the way in which some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in nonconforming rather than conforming conduct.\textsuperscript{118}

In understanding the etiology of crime, Merton suggests that among the several elements of social and cultural structures, two are of immediate importance, and must be fully comprehended. The first element is that of cultural goals, purposes and interests, held out as legitimate objectives to be sought after. They are the things "worth striving for."\textsuperscript{119}

A second element of the structure defines the

\textsuperscript{117}Ibid.
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culturally acceptable means of attaining the desirable goals. These means are enforced through institutionalized norms which serve as a method of social control. Sociologists speak of such control as being "in the mores."\textsuperscript{120}

Taking into consideration the two cultural elements of institutionalized goals and institutionalized methods for realizing the goals, Merton hypothesizes that deviant behavior is the result of dissociation between goals and means for goal attainment. He states:

It is, indeed, my central hypothesis that aberrant behavior may be regarded sociologically as a symptom of dissociation between culturally prescribed aspirations and socially structured avenues for realizing these aspirations.\textsuperscript{121}

According to Merton there are five modes of individual adaptation, or ways in which the individual may adjust to the culturally prescribed goals and the methods for realizing these goals. The modes of adaptation are: (1) conformity, (2) innovation, (3) ritualism, (4) retreatism, and (5) rebellion.

Conformity. To the extent that a society is stable, conformity to both cultural goals and institutionalized means is the most common and widely diffused.

\textsuperscript{120}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{121}Ibid., p. 134.
It is only when people share common meanings and values, and when role behavior can be predicted on the basis of role expectations that we may speak of a human aggregate as composing a society.

**Innovation.** This response, according to Merton, occurs when an individual has assimilated the cultural emphasis upon the goal but has failed to equally internalize the legitimate methods for its attainment. This particular mode of adaptation is relevant to this study. Criminal behavior, especially those crimes against property, may be the result of the offender having internalized the desire for wealth and power, which is a characteristic goal of American society, but having not conformed to the accepted means for reaching the goals.

**Ritualism.** This mode of adaptation can be readily identified as rejecting cultural goals of success and social mobility, but at the same time continually conforming to institutional norms.

**Retreatism.** Merton points out that just as conformity remains the most frequent adaptation mode, retreatism is probably the least common method of adapting to cultural demands. In this category may be generally found psychotics, outcasts, vagrants, tramps, chronic drunkards, and drug addicts. This list is not conclusive but only suggests the type of individual that may rely on
retreatism. Retreatism can be identified as rejection of both cultural goals and institutional means.

Rebellion. This mode of adaptation is characterized by a rejection of both the goals and the means, as in retreatism. In addition to this rejection, however, is an attempt by the individuals in this adaptation category to greatly modify the existing social structure. There is complete alienation of the individuals from the cultural expectations.\textsuperscript{122}

Merton utilizes Durkheim's concept of anomie in pointing out how a social structure with the various types of adaptation that have been discussed produces a strain toward deviant behavior. Merton sees the source of deviant behavior as a relationship between goal-means and individual competition.\textsuperscript{123} Concerning competition he states:

So long as the sentiments supporting this competitive system are distributed throughout the entire range of activities and are not confined to the final result of "success," the choice of means will remain largely within the ambit of institutional control. When, however, the cultural emphasis shifts from the satisfactions deriving from competition itself to almost exclusive concern with the outcome, the resultant stress makes for the breakdown of the regulatory structure.\textsuperscript{124}

\textsuperscript{122}Ibid., pp. 141-156.  
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The two theoretical contributions presented thus far, Durkheim's and Merton's, have been concerned with the attempt to explain crime in the social structure—in short, the cause of crime and how society acquires it. Durkheim attributed it to anomie, or normlessness in society. Merton also utilized the concept anomie, but in relation to various responses to culturally prescribed goals and means. The basis for normlessness for Merton is to be found in extreme individual competition, where the means for attaining goals are not within institutional control.

GABRIEL TARDE

After rejecting the biological and physical theories of crime causation, Tarde arrived at a social psychological theory. Crime, he concluded, has predominantly social origins. To express it in Tarde's own words:

The majority of murderers and notorious thieves began as children who have been abandoned, and the true seminary of crime must be sought for upon each public square or each crossroad of our towns, whether they be small or large, in those flocks of pillaging street urchins, who, like bands of sparrows, associate together, at first for marauding, and then for theft, because of a lack of education and food in their homes.125

Tarde conceded that biological and physical factors might play a role in the creation of a criminal, but he contended that the influence of the social environment was most significant in creating a criminal.

Tarde's conception of the professional criminal is based on his contention that murderers, pickpockets, swindlers and thieves are individuals who have gone through a long period of apprenticeship, just as doctors, lawyers, farmers or skilled workmen. These individuals at birth were introduced into a structure dominated by criminal value systems. "Without any natural predisposition on their part, their fate was often decided by the influence of their comrades."  

Basic to Tarde's theories are the laws of imitation which are applicable to crime as well as to all other aspects of social life. Tarde formulated three laws of imitation.

The first and most obvious law is that men imitate one another in proportion as they are in close contact. In crowds or cities where contact is close and life is active and exciting, imitation is most frequent and changes often. Tarde defined this phenomenon as fashion.

---

In stable groups, family and country, where contact is less close and activity is less, there is less limitation and it seldom changes. This phenomenon was defined as custom. The two forms of imitation, fashion and custom, operate in every society and in irregular patterns. Fashion spreads a certain action, which eventually becomes rooted as a custom; but custom is subsequently uprooted by a new fashion which in its turn becomes a custom.  

The second law concerns the direction in which imitations are spread. Usually the superior is imitated by the inferior. Tarde traced such crimes as vagabondage, drunkenness, death by poisoning and murder. These crimes originally were the prerogative only of French royalty, but by the latter part of the nineteenth century, they occurred in all social levels. After the royalty disappeared, capital cities became the innovators of crimes. Indecent assault on children, for example, was first found only in large cities, but later occurred in surrounding areas.

The last law of imitation Tarde called the law of insertion. When two mutually exclusive fashions come together, one can be substituted for the other. When this

---
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happens, there is a decline in the older method and an increase in the newer method. An example of this would be murder by knifing and murder by the gun. Tarde found that the former method had decreased while the latter did the opposite. 129

Crime, like any other social phenomenon, starts as a fashion and becomes a custom. Its intensity varies directly in proportion to the contacts of persons. Its spread is in the direction of the superior to the inferior. When two mutually exclusive fashions come together, one tends to be substituted for the other. When two fashions which are not mutually exclusive come together, the imitations combine or complement each other, and are organized into a larger scheme. 130

Tarde's recognition of the importance of social factors in the causation of crime and his conception of the professional criminal are his two most important contributions to criminological theory. Other parts of his theory are in disrepute today. His laws of imitation have been largely discredited because they represent an over-simplification of social causation. 131

In another respect, however, Tarde's imitation

129Ibid. 130Ibid., p. 232.
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theory was a monumental achievement. It must be remembered that he, like all of the other scientists of the times, was working with the best conceptual tools available, and even though his conclusions were not exhaustive, they provided a point of departure and a frame of reference concerning criminal behavior.

EDWIN H. SUTHERLAND

Based largely on the work of Gabriel Tarde, Edwin H. Sutherland formulated his theory of differential association—an account of the criminalization process. Though Sutherland continually modified his theory, it is perhaps most clearly stated in its original formulation:

1. The processes which result in systematic criminal behavior are fundamentally the same in form as the processes which result in systematic lawful behavior.

2. Systematic criminal behavior is determined in a process of association with those who commit crimes, just as systematic lawful behavior is determined in a process of association with those who are law-abiding.

3. Differential association is the specific causal process in the development of systematic criminal behavior.

4. The chance that a person will participate in systematic criminal behavior is determined roughly by the frequency and consistency of contacts with criminal patterns.

5. Individual differences among people in respect to personal characteristics or social situations cause crime only as they affect differential association or frequency and consistency of contacts with criminal patterns.

6. Cultural conflict is the underlying cause of differential association and therefore of systematic criminal behavior.
7. Social disorganization is the basic cause of systematic criminal behavior.\textsuperscript{132}

Caldwell criticizes the foregoing statement of the differential association theory as follows:

1. The differential association theory does not attempt to explain all criminal behavior but only "systematic criminal behavior," by which Sutherland apparently means criminal behavior that has become a way of life for the individual and is supported by a philosophy in terms of which it is justified. However, regardless of the type of criminal behavior it seeks to explain, it is dealing with human behavior and so cannot rise higher than our understanding of human behavior. Since so much of human behavior remains a mystery, an attempted explanation of any particular type of human behavior, such as systematic criminal behavior, cannot free itself entirely from the limitations of our knowledge regarding human behavior.

2. But the differential association theory is a completely deterministic and closed system of thought. It finds the complete answer to the problem of systematic criminal behavior in differential association. In doing so, it fails to recognize that there may be an element of free will in human behavior (science as yet has not eliminated this possibility) and leaves little, if any, room for the introduction of new knowledge. Every scientific theory of human behavior must frankly recognize the element of "the unknown," which intrudes into every aspect of life, since nowhere do scientific truth and reality coincide.

3. The differential association theory sets up a dichotomy of systematic criminal behavior and systematic lawful behavior. This tends to oversimplify the problem of crime, for human behavior cannot be so sharply divided. All human behavior, including criminal behavior, consists of gradations that blend into one another.

4. The differential association theory does not

attach sufficient importance to the biological and psychological factors. To the extent that such factors are recognized, they are relegated to an entirely subordinate position. Individual differences, says Sutherland in his fifth proposition, "cause crime only as they affect differential association." But the individual, as a unique combination of heredity and environment, has a reality apart from the group, and no personality organization is ever the same as the social organization in which it functions. Therefore, in opposition to Sutherland's contention, one may argue that differential association causes crime only as it gives expression to individual differences.

5. The differential association theory oversimplifies the process of learning. In the fourth proposition, in which he emphasizes the factors of frequency and consistency, Sutherland fails to recognize the complexity of the process of learning.

6. The differential association theory does not clearly define "systematic criminal behavior" and "social disorganization," which are its basic terms. And yet, "systematic criminal behavior" has no generally accepted meaning, and sociologists have so abused the term "social disorganization" that it may have to be discarded. Under the circumstances, failure to give clear definitions of these terms casts a shadow of uncertainty over the entire theory.133

Although there is considerable criticism of differential association theory, it must be agreed that the approach is distinct from the question of criminal types on the one hand and criminal motivations on the other. As a unique viewpoint, first grasped by sociologists, it is one of the major contributions of the discipline.134
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Adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary, which in this study is determined by overt conformity to institutional norms in relation to the recidivism rate, is somewhat indicative of the impact of prisonization on the inmate. Prisonization, imitation, and differential association, based on the socialization process, are concepts which designate an approach to understanding how the individual's criminal behavior patterns are reinforced within the penal setting. This approach forms the theoretical foundation of this study.

One must be cognizant of the fact, however, that this theory by itself is inadequate. Although it can account for the way in which criminality is acquired, it cannot explain the existence of criminality in the social structure. The etiological approach of Emile Durkheim and Robert K. Merton, which is based on the concept "Anomie," fails to explain how criminality is acquired; however, it does provide a theoretical system of explaining the existence of criminal behavior patterns.

This study is exploratory in nature and does not seek to test the validity of theoretical generalizations. The existence of criminality patterns is theoretically probable even though not definitely established by empirical data.
CHAPTER V

METHODOLOGY

The methodological procedure in this investigation will be considered in five parts: (1) sample, (2) statement of hypotheses, (3) collection of data, (4) statistical methods, and (5) limitations of the study.

SAMPLE

During the year of 1964, 265 male felons each convicted of a crime against property, were admitted to the Iowa State Penitentiary. Of the total number committed, 106 were included in this investigation. The selection of the subjects for study was based on certain criteria. Each subject in this study possessed the following characteristics:

(1) Each subject in the study entered the Iowa State Penitentiary on or after December 31, 1963. Any subject admitted after January 1, 1965 was excluded from the investigation. The time period of this study, then, was the calendar year 1964.

(2) Each subject at the time of this investigation was permanently confined within the walls of the Iowa State Penitentiary. Trusties were excluded because
they are not representative of the typical inmate. It is apparent that the inmate trusted beyond the immediate penal structure has felt the impact of some forces of free society that the typical inmate does not feel.

(3) Each subject studied has been convicted of and committed to the Iowa State Penitentiary for one or more of four categories of property crimes: (1) larceny, (2) robbery, (3) burglary, and (4) forgery. All inmates convicted of crimes against the person are thus excluded.

This boundary was imposed for three major reasons. First, crimes against persons are usually crimes of passion. The individuals who commit such offenses are generally not habitual offenders, but have deviated in unplanned ways. The property offender, however, tends to become habitual in his deviant behavior. Second, those individuals convicted of property crimes compose the largest proportion of the prison population,\(^{135}\) and it was decided that by limiting this study to property crimes, the universe would be more homogeneous. Third, only the specific crime indicated by the official records of the Iowa State Penitentiary was utilized in this study.

---

\(^{135}\)During 1964, 618 individuals were admitted to the Iowa State Penitentiary (for all offenses). Of the total admitted, 265 were convicted for crimes against property.
There is a possibility that the crime for which an individual was sentenced is not the crime that was originally committed. This is most prevalent, however, in crimes against the person. At any rate, this situation dictates the exclusion of non-property offenses.

STATEMENT OF HYPOTHESES

This study is directed toward inmate adjustment of first time property offenders and property crime recidivists to the institutional routine of Iowa's maximum security penitentiary.

Two hypotheses have been formulated with respect to inmate adjustment. The first hypothesis, in null form, is that there is no significant difference in institutional adjustment to the Iowa State Penitentiary's routine between first time property offenders and property crime recidivists.

The second hypothesis to be tested in this study comes directly from the literature and was formulated by Donald Clemmer in *The Prison Community*. Clemmer states the following concerning inmate adjustment:

Individuals who get in trouble in prison are usually the inexperienced and relatively non-criminal inmates. This point is well known among criminologists.136

136 Clemmer, op. cit., p. 195.
Clemmer tested this hypothesis with the population studied in his classic, *The Prison Community*. He investigated, for six months, the conduct records of two hundred men, one hundred being recidivists, and one hundred being first offenders. Clemmer found that members of neither group received many misbehavior reports: two offenses for the recidivists, and six offenses for the first offenders.

The writer's purpose for stating Clemmer's formulation as a hypothesis for this study is not to disprove the contention but merely to test its validity on a somewhat delimited and homogeneous sample population.

It must be pointed out that this study is sociologically oriented, and is concerned with inmate adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary. Two indicators of adjustment, both based largely on overt behavior patterns, comprised the research tool, and were utilized in this study for testing the previously stated hypotheses.

The writer utilized first of all the number of misconduct citations received by first offenders, in contrast to the number received by recidivists. A second part of the research tool consisted of an informal survey of selected Iowa State Penitentiary personnel, who ranked each inmate's adjustment to the normative structure of the Iowa State Penitentiary.

It becomes apparent that the measurement of inmate
adjustment was necessarily limited to those observable inmate behavioral patterns that could be readily categorized. Thus, this study could not include an investigation of the underlying psychological processes which might have led to inmate non-conformity in the institutional situation, but had to rely on the measurement of inmate adjustment, and hence, of prisonization, as indicated by the research tool.

COLLECTION OF DATA

This section will be subdivided into a consideration of the data collected for purposes of comparison and contrast of first offenders and recidivists, and data collected for the purpose of testing the hypotheses stated in the previous section.

The official records of the Iowa State Penitentiary were the major source for obtaining pertinent comparison data on first offenders and recidivists. The data compiled on each subject consisted of the inmate code, inmate number, name, offense for which presently convicted, term of sentence, occupation, race, educational attainment, marital status, and age at the time of commitment for the sentence being presently served (See Appendix).

Inmate Code. For purposes of clarity, and in order to progress in an organized manner, the study sample was arbitrarily codified according to inmate status. The
"first offender," as the concept signifies, pertained to the inmate that was serving his first sentence in a penal institution, such as the Iowa State Penitentiary. The "recidivist 1," was the inmate that was serving his second sentence, that is, he had had one prior commitment. "Recidivist 100," designated those individuals that had served two or more sentences prior to the most recent one.

**Offense.** The offense for which committed was taken as recorded in the official records of the Iowa State Penitentiary. Codification was also used in recording the information pertaining to this variable. Larceny was indicated by the symbol A. B signified the property crime of robbery without aggravation. Robbery with aggravation was denoted by the letter C. D was indicative of burglary, E represented forgery of all types, and F stood for motor vehicle larceny.

**Term of Sentence.** This information was listed in the official records of the Iowa State Penitentiary by the total number of years to which the inmate had been sentenced by the court.

**Occupation.** For purposes of this study, the categories of occupation were five in number. The five possible categories, one of which pertained to each inmate, were: (1) none, (2) unskilled, (3) semi-skilled,
skilled, and (5) professional. The classification of occupations prepared by Alba Edwards was used as a point of departure in setting up a rating scale for occupations among these inmates. Edward's classification, however, was somewhat involved to be practical in the penal setting, and, thus, was modified. Specific occupations were listed, and it was the writer's responsibility to arbitrarily assign certain occupations to the appropriate categories.

Race. For purposes of this study, race was divided into white, Negro, and other. This classification is not scientific, as Lewis points out:

Although today we tend to divide man into three major races—the Caucoid, the Negroid, and the Mongoloid—and several minor ones, these are not the original races of man nor are they the final or ultimate races.

The writer was aware of the foregoing; however, it must be pointed out again that the only source of information available was the official records, and although they are assumed to be accurate, they are not intended to represent the scientific viewpoint.

---


Education. The information pertaining to education was taken as recorded in the institution's records. Because it is recorded largely as the inmate gives it upon entry to the penitentiary, the information may not be totally accurate.

Marital Status. Each inmate was recorded as being single, married, separated, divorced, or widowed.

Age. This variable was recorded for each subject in the study as it appeared on record at the Iowa State Penitentiary. The age recorded, for purposes of this study, was the one listed at the time of commitment to the institution for the sentence presently being served.

The research tool for collecting the data used in the testing of hypotheses, was comprised of two parts. The first part involved an investigation of the record jackets for each subject included in the study. The writer was concerned with ascertaining the number of misconduct citations received by each inmate. Misconduct reports attached to the institutional behavior record of 139 Inmates deemed not in conformity with the norms of the institution are given misconduct reports. These reports are given by the custodial force of the Iowa State Penitentiary. Such reports result in disciplinary action against the holder. Reports may be given for such things as stepping out of line on the way to dinner, snoring in the theater, taking extra food, but not eating it, etc.
the subject serves as an indicator of overt conformity, or lack of conformity, to the norms of the institution, and, thus, are representative indicators of inmate adjustment to the institutional routine.

The second part of the research tool consisted of an informal ranking of each of the 106 subjects by Iowa State Penitentiary personnel. The personnel that participated in the survey included the Associate Warden of Custody, the Assistant Associate Warden of Custody, the Associate Warden of Treatment, two institutional psychologists, four counselors, the Director of Classification, the Educational Director, a school instructor, the Associate Manager of Industries, and four captains from the custodial force. These individuals were considered to be most familiar with the general population, and it was assumed that their indication of inmate adjustment would be relatively accurate.

Each of these eighteen individuals were given a survey form which contained the name and number of each subject in the study. (See Appendix). For each subject, the survey participants were directed to check one of five responses. The five possible responses were: (1) cooperates and contributes to the smooth operation of the institution, (2) causes no trouble; gets along well, (3) causes no trouble; however, I don't trust him, (4) is an
The results of each section of the research tool were analyzed in an attempt to determine any existing relationships between them.

This study, as has been mentioned previously, is concerned with inmate adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary. The number of misconduct reports received by each inmate in relation to his institutional status and the survey, which reflects adjustment as a group, are based largely on overt conformity. Taken together, these methods provide an index of institutional adjustment and become a useful measurement of prisonization as defined earlier.

STATISTICAL METHODS

The statistical methods employed in the analysis of data consisted, in the main, of the "mean" and "chi-square test."

Finding the mean involved two steps: (1) summing

\[ \text{140} \text{ The prison definition of "agitator" is an individual who continually creates conflict within the general population, and who never, or rarely, gets into trouble himself.} \]

\[ \text{141} \text{ Trouble-maker, as defined in prison argot, is an individual that cannot control his emotion, and who releases his tensions in manners unacceptable in prison society. This individual habitually gets into trouble, and must be reprimanded frequently.} \]
the number of individual items, and (2) dividing the result by the number of items in the set. The formula is as follows: \( \bar{X} = \frac{E}{N} (X) \). The symbols used in this formula are: \( \bar{X} \) = arithmetic mean; \( E \) = "the sum of"; \( X \) = data expressed as individual items; and \( N \) = number of items.

The chi-square test was utilized to determine if the expected frequencies in a sample distribution varied significantly from the observed frequencies. Arkin and Colton point out that the chi-square test is a test "to determine the goodness of fit of the actual data to the theoretical distribution."\(^{142}\)

The formula for chi-square is as follows:

\[ X^2 = X \frac{(O-E)^2}{E} \]

The symbols used in this formula are: \( X^2 \) = chi-square; \( X \) = "the sum of"; \( O \) = observed frequencies; and, \( E \) = expected frequencies.

The expected frequencies were computed by multiplying the total of a column in the sample distribution by the total of a row, and then by dividing the product obtained by the total number of observed frequencies. The same procedure was followed for each cell in the table. The expected frequencies were then subtracted from the

---

observed frequencies in each cell. The resulting differences were squared and were then divided by the expected frequency in each cell. The sum of the resulting ratio is representative of the value $X^2$ (chi-square). The value of chi-square was interpreted by referring to Peatman's\textsuperscript{143} table of critical values for chi-square. In using the table of critical values, the degrees of freedom must first be calculated. This was accomplished by utilizing the following formula: d. f. = (k-1) (r-1). The symbols used in this formula are: d. f. = degrees of freedom; k = column; and r = row.

When the critical value of chi-square was found to be .05 or less, which indicated that only in five times out of one-hundred would the result be due to chance, it was considered significant. Significance demonstrates that the "disparity between the observed and expected frequencies is too large to be ascribable to chance."\textsuperscript{144}

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is directed toward inmate adjustment as an index of prisonization. The tools utilized in this


\textsuperscript{144}Arkin and Colton, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 112.
investigation for measuring inmate adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary were two in number: (1) the number of misconduct reports received by each subject, and (2) an unofficial ranking of each subject by selected Iowa State Penitentiary personnel. The major limitation of this study is that the tools used for measurement are based on overt behavior, and do not explain the causes of the behavior, whether it be conformist or deviant in nature.

Another weakness is that many variables, due to the lack of operational definition of conceptual tools, are uncontrollable and tend to be a source for invalidation of any significant findings that may be made. For example, because an individual does not receive misconduct reports does not necessarily indicate adjustment to the normative structure, but it could very well indicate, among other things, that the individual has learned to avoid getting caught. By the same token, because an individual receives misconduct citations does not necessarily indicate that he is out of adjustment, for perhaps the misconduct reports were issued by a biased custodial officer. Recidivism does not necessarily indicate failure on the part of the correctional institution, for perhaps an individual has a concept-of-self that prevents his rehabilitation.
CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS

The findings will be discussed in a frame of reference that utilizes the concepts "first offender," "recidivist 1" and "recidivist 100." These concepts have been defined previously, but in order to prevent confusion, the definitions are now repeated. First offender will designate an individual that is serving his first sentence in an institution such as the Iowa State Penitentiary. "Recidivist 1" will refer to inmates that have served one previous sentence. "Recidivist 100" will designate those inmates who have served at least two sentences prior to the one being served at the time of this study.

The findings in this research have been divided into ten sections. The sections, in the order of presentation, are: (1) general consideration of the sample, (2) crime for which convicted, (3) length of sentence, (4) age, (5) education, (6) occupation, (7) marital status, (8) race, (9) misconduct citations, and (10) informal survey results.
GENERAL CONSIDERATION OF THE SAMPLE

During the year 1964, a total of 265 property crime offenders were committed to the Iowa State Penitentiary at Fort Madison. The sample for study was comprised of 106 of the total commitment. The remaining convicted offenders, numbering 159, were excluded from the investigation. The reasons for this selection were explained in Chapter Five.

However, pertinent information concerning the non-study group was collected for purposes of comparison and contrast with the sample for investigation. Some of the findings are presented at this point in conjunction with a general consideration of the sample for analysis. A comprehensive understanding of the entire population will enhance the findings pertaining to the sample.

Table I represents the distribution of the total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-study group</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Offenders</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivist 1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivist 100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
property offender commitment for 1964. In the first offender category of the non-study group there were thirty-eight subjects as compared to thirty subjects in the sample. In the "recidivist 1" classification for the non-study group there was a total of fifty-five inmates, whereas in the sample there were twenty-six inmates. The "recidivist 100" category was comprised of individuals numbering sixty-six in the non-study group and fifty in the sample.

A basic purpose of this study was to ascertain the recidivism rate for the population studies. Table II points out the rate of return for the non-study group and for the sample.

TABLE II

RATES OF RECIDIVISM FOR THE NON-STUDY GROUP AND THE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-study group</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivist 1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivist 100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of recidivism</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the non-study group it was found that a total of fifty-five subjects were in the "recidivist 1" category. This represents a percentage of thirty-five, based on
a total number of 159. It was found that in the "recidi-
vist 100" classification for the non-study group, the
number of individuals so categorized was sixty-six, or
forty-two per cent. In the sample the findings indicated
that there were twenty-six subjects in the "recidivist 1"
category, or a percentage of twenty-five, based on a total
number of 106. Nearly one-half (47 per cent) of the sam-
ple was located in the "recidivist 100" category.

The rate of recidivism of the non-study group was
seventy-seven per cent. The recidivism rate of the sample
was found to be seventy-two per cent. In other words, of
the 106 subjects in this study, 76 were recidivists. Of
this number, 50 had served at least two penal sentences
prior to the one being presently served.

Of the total of 106 subjects incorporated in this
study, 26 individuals had served prior sentences at the
Iowa State Penitentiary. Eight of the twenty-six were in
the classification "recidivist 1," while the remaining
eighteen must be categorized as belonging to the "recidi-
vist 100" group. Fifty per cent of the twenty-six off-
fenders started their penal careers as first offenders at
the Iowa State Penitentiary. Of the thirteen that were
originally first-termers at the Iowa State Penitentiary,
eight are now serving their second sentence, and five
have to date served two or more sentences exclusive of the
one being presently served.
CRIME FOR WHICH CONVICTED

In this study six property offenses were considered. The offenses were: (1) forgery, (2) larceny, (3) larceny of a motor vehicle, (4) robbery without aggravation, (5) robbery with aggravation, and (6) burglary.

Table III represents these six classifications of property crime and the number of subjects in each category.

**TABLE III**

CATEGORIES OF PROPERTY OFFENSES AND THE NUMBER OF SUBJECTS IN EACH IN RELATION TO INMATE STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny of motor vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery without aggravation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with aggravation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forgery. This category of property crime, including such offenses as uttering a forged instrument, false check, or false pretense, composes the largest crime category in this investigation. Offenders convicted of
forgery numbered twenty-one, out of a possible thirty, in the first offender category. The total number of subjects convicted for the property crime of forgery in the "recidivist 1" category was fifteen, out of a possible twenty-six, and in the "recidivist 100" category numbering fifty, the total number of forgers was thirty-two. Over one-half (sixty-four per cent) of the total of 106, or sixty-eight offenders were convicted of forgery.

**Larceny.** Of those offenders convicted of larceny, four were in the first offender category, seven comprised the "recidivist 1" group, and twelve were in the "recidivist 100" group. Of the 106 subjects in the study, twenty-three, or twenty-two per cent, were convicted for larceny. In the first offender group, four out of thirty were incarcerated for the property crime of larceny; in the "recidivist 1" group seven out of twenty-six received sentences for larceny; and in the "recidivist 100" category twelve of fifty were convicted for a larceny offense.

**Larceny of a motor vehicle.** Of the total of 106 subjects in the investigation, five were incarcerated at the Iowa State Penitentiary for larceny of a motor vehicle. In percentage, this would be representative of nearly five per cent of the sample studied. In the first offender category one subject of thirty was convicted of this offense. Two individuals of a possible twenty-six from the
"recidivist 1" category, and two, of a total of fifty, from the "recidivist 100" group were imprisoned for the larceny of a motor vehicle.

Robbery without aggravation. Of the total sample, five subjects, or nearly five per cent, were convicted for the crime of robbery without aggravation. Of a total of thirty in the category of first offender, two were incarcerated for this offense; none of the twenty-six offenders in the "recidivist 1" group were sentenced for this crime; and three in the "recidivist 100" classification were incarcerated for the offense of robbery without aggravation.

Robbery with aggravation. Approximately four per cent of the total studied sample were sentenced to the Iowa State Penitentiary for the offense of robbery with aggravation. Of the thirty first offenders, two subjects had been institutionalized for this specific offense. One individual of the twenty-six in the classification of "recidivist 1" had committed robbery with aggravation, and one of the fifty inmates in the "recidivist 100" category had committed this offense.

Burglary. Of the total sample, less than one per cent was comprised of subjects who had been committed to the Iowa State Penitentiary during 1964 for burglary. One offender, representing the "recidivist 1" classification, was institutionalized for this specific offense.
A comparison and contrast of the sample with the non-study group is presented in Table IV. The category of "other" on the table designates such offenses as arson and embezzlement which were excluded from the sample because even though they are categorized as property offenses in the institutional setting, they were considered not to be representative of the average property offense, and were excluded. Furthermore, since the purpose of the study was to investigate a homogeneous population, their infrequency of occurrence rendered them insignificant. However, when pointing out the total commitment for 1964, they must be included.

**TABLE IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Property Offenses</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny of motor vehicle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery without aggravation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with aggravation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an attempt to determine the existence of a significant relationship between inmate status and the crime for which convicted, the findings of the sample were put to the test of chi-square. The value of $X^2$ was found to be 4.82, and the degrees of freedom were six. The critical value indicated that $X^2$ was not significant at the .05 level.

**LENGTH OF SENTENCE**

Table V presents length of sentence in specific years, in relation to the number of subjects classified.

**TABLE V**

LENGTH OF SENTENCES BY SPECIFIC YEARS, IN RELATION TO INMATE STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence in years</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the categories of first offender, "recidivist 1," and "recidivist 100."

First offenders. Using the data in Table V, the mean length of sentence was calculated for each category. The mean length of sentence among first offenders was found to be 8.8 years. The length of sentence observed most often in this category was seven years, for which eleven subjects had been convicted.

"Recidivist 1" group. The length of sentence observed most often in the "recidivist 1" group was seven years, as in the first offender classification. The mean length of sentence among those individuals serving their second sentence (those in the "recidivist 1" category) was 8.5 years.

"Recidivist 100" group. The average length of sentence for the subjects that had served at least two prior sentences (those in the "recidivist 100" category) was 9.1 years. The length of sentence observed most frequently was represented by twenty-five subjects, and was for ten years.

Table VI illustrates the relationship between the various property crimes and the length of sentence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Committed</th>
<th>Length of sentence in years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny of motor vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery without aggravation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with aggravation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forgery.** A total of sixty-eight subjects, as is pointed out in Table VI, were sentenced for forgery. Five subjects were sentenced for one year each; thirty-one received a sentence of seven years each; twenty-nine individuals were sentenced to ten years apiece; and the sentences of eleven, fifteen, and twenty years were imposed on three inmates, each receiving one sentence. The total number of years imposed on the sixty-eight offenders as a group amounted to 558 years.

**Larceny.** A total of twenty-three inmates were
sentenced to the Iowa State Penitentiary during 1964 for the crime of larceny. Nineteen individuals received sentences of five years each; one individual was convicted for six years; two others were incarcerated for ten years; and one offender received a sentence of twenty-one years. The total number of years of imprisonment imposed on this group of twenty-three amounted to 142 years.

Larceny of a motor vehicle. A total of fifty years imprisonment for this particular offense was given to a group of five individuals, each receiving a sentence of ten years.

Robbery without aggravation. Five individuals convicted of this offense received a group sentence of eighty years. Four of the subjects received ten years each, and the other one was given a sentence of forty years.

Robbery with aggravation. Four subjects, each receiving a sentence of twenty-five years, compiled a group sentence of one-hundred years.

Burglary. One individual was convicted of this property crime, and as a result received a sentence of fifteen years at the Iowa State Penitentiary.

Table VII categorizes the number receiving specific sentences into their respective classifications of first offender, "recidivist 1," or "recidivist 100."
TABLE VII  
LENGTH OF SENTENCE IN YEARS, AND THE NUMBER OF SUBJECTS RECEIVING THE SENTENCES, IN RELATION TO THEIR RESPECTIVE STATUS CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of sentence</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Offenders. Of the sample total of thirty first offenders, two subjects, convicted of forgery, received a sentence of one year each. Three individuals, incarcerated for larceny, received a sentence of five years each. One person, also imprisoned on a larceny charge, received a six-year sentence. Eleven first offenders, all convicted of forgery, received as a group, seventy-seven years, with each person responsible for
one-eleventh. Nine first-termers received sentences of ten years each. Six of the nine were convicted of forgery, one for motor vehicle larceny, and the other two for robbery without aggravation. One individual, convicted of forgery, was given a sentence of eleven years. An inmate, incarcerated for forgery, was sentenced to fifteen years in the Iowa State Penitentiary. Two first offenders, imprisoned for robbery with aggravation, received twenty-five year sentences each.

"Recidivist 1" group. One subject, convicted of forgery, received a sentence of one year in the Iowa State Penitentiary. Six individuals, receiving sentences of five years each, were institutionalized for committing the property offense of larceny. Each of ten offenders were given, as a result of forgery in each case, a sentence of seven years. Six subjects, four of whom were convicted of forgery and the remaining two who were sentenced as a result of motor vehicle larceny, were given sentences of ten years each.

The sentences of fifteen, twenty-one, and twenty-five years, had one subject each. The fifteen year sentence was imposed on an individual, in fact the only individual in the study sample, convicted of burglary. The twenty-one year penalty belonged to an offender found guilty by law of the property offense of larceny, and the person that received the sentence of twenty-five
years was convicted for the crime of robbery with aggravation.

"Recidivist 100" group. Two prisoners in this status category were convicted of forgery, and received sentences of one year each. Ten persons, convicted of larceny, in combination compiled a total of fifty years. Each individual was committed to the care of the Iowa State Penitentiary for a period of five years. Ten of the "recidivist 100" group, as a result of the offense of forgery in each case, were sentenced to the Iowa State Penitentiary for seven years each. Of the inmates sentenced to the institution for ten years each, nineteen had committed forgery, two had been found guilty of larceny, two were incarcerated for the larceny of a motor vehicle, and two were institutionalized for robbery without aggravation. One person, convicted of forgery, received a twenty-year sentence. Another found guilty of robbery with aggravation, was sent to the Iowa State Penitentiary for a period of twenty-five years. An individual convicted of the property crime of robbery without aggravation was sentenced to forty years.

The chi-square test was employed in an attempt to ascertain whether the data collected pertaining to the length of sentence, in relation to inmate status, was significant. It was found that the value of $X^2$ was 6.11.
There were eight degrees of freedom. The critical value indicated that $X^2$ was insignificant at the .05 level.

**AGE**

Table VIII shows the sample distribution by age in relation to inmate status.

**TABLE VIII**
**DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION BY AGE, IN RELATION TO INMATE STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Offenders. It was found that the mean age for first offenders in the sample was 37.5. Calculated by ten year intervals (See Table IX, page 103) three first offenders were in their twenties (two others were eighteen years old, but are included in the twenties group, making a total of five); nine were in their thirties; sixteen were in the category of the forties; and there were no first offenders in either the fifty or sixty year categories.

"Recidivist 1" group. The findings indicated that the mean age for this status group was 38.9. Categorized by ten year intervals, as shown in Table IX, four subjects in the "recidivist 1" category were in their twenties; ten were in their thirties, and seven were at least forty. In the fifty and sixty age bracket, four were in their fifties and one subject was in his sixties.

"Recidivist 100" group. The mean age for this group of property offenders was 37.2. In ten year categorizations, represented by Table IX, it was found that eight persons were in their twenties; twenty-three represented the thirties in this group; sixteen were at least forty, and the remaining three were in the fifties and sixties. Two were in their fifties, and one was in his sixties.

Of the total sample population, including all three status groups, seventeen subjects were in their
twenties, forty-two were in the thirties; thirty-nine represented the forties; six were in the fifties, and two were at least sixty (See the column totals in Table IX).

**TABLE IX**

**AGE BY TEN-YEAR CATEGORIZATION, IN RELATION TO GROUP STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Twenties</th>
<th>Thirties</th>
<th>Forties</th>
<th>Fifties</th>
<th>Sixties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Offenders</td>
<td>5 4.7</td>
<td>9 8.5</td>
<td>16 15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivist 1</td>
<td>4 3.8</td>
<td>10 9.4</td>
<td>7 6.6</td>
<td>4 3.8</td>
<td>1 .943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivist 100</td>
<td>8 7.5</td>
<td>23 21.7</td>
<td>16 15.1</td>
<td>2 1.9</td>
<td>1 .943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17 16.0</td>
<td>42 39.6</td>
<td>39 36.8</td>
<td>6 5.7</td>
<td>2 1.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For purposes of comparison, the distribution of the non-study group by age, in relation to inmate status will be given. This data will be presented in Table X, page 104.

First Offenders. It was found that the mean age for first offenders in the non-study sample was 31.4, as compared to 37.5 in the sample studied. Calculated by ten year intervals (See Table XI), page 105), eighteen first offenders were in their twenties (two others nineteen years of age are included in the twenties group, making a total of twenty); ten were in their thirties; five were at least forty years old; two individuals represented the fifty year
### Table X

**DISTRIBUTION OF THE NON-STUDY POPULATION BY AGE, IN RELATION TO INMATE STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


category, and one individual was in his sixties.

"Recidivist 1" group. The mean age for this status group in the non-study population was indicated to be 28.4 years, whereas the average of the "recidivist 1" group in the sample studied was 38.9 years. As is shown in Table XI, there were thirty-six subjects in the twenty year class; fifteen were found to be in their thirties; four represented the classification of forty, and the fifty and sixty year categories were not represented.

"Recidivist 100" group. The average age for this group was found to be 37.7 years. Table XI shows that seventeen inmates were in their twenties; twenty-one were in their thirties; sixteen were in their forties; twelve were at a minimum fifty years in age, and there were no subjects in this group over fifty-nine years of age.

**TABLE XI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Twenties</th>
<th>Thirties</th>
<th>Forties</th>
<th>Fifties</th>
<th>Sixties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Offenders</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivists 1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recidivists 100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The observed sample data was subjected to the test of chi-square, in order to determine if a significant relationship between age and inmate status prevailed. Chi-square was found to be 10.38, with ten degrees of freedom. It was indicated in Peatman's table of critical values\textsuperscript{145} that $X^2$ at the .05 level did not produce evidence a significant relationship between these two variables existed.

**EDUCATION**

Table XII presents the sample distribution pertaining to education. The data in the table were taken as recorded in the official files of the Iowa State Penitentiary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years completed</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{145}Peatman, \textit{loc. cit.}
First Offenders. The mean educational attainment in years for this group was 10. The lowest level of education among the first offenders was four years, while the highest was fifteen years. The levels of educational attainment with the greater number of inmates (six in each) were nine years and twelve years.

"Recidivist 1" group. The average level of education in this group was revealed to be 10.3 years. The lowest level of educational attainment for persons in the "recidivist 1" category was five years, whereas the highest category was fourteen years. Seven subjects had attained twelve years of education, and, thus, represented the mode.

"Recidivist 100" group. The mean educational attainment of this group was found to be 9.9 years. The lowest educational level represented was six years; the highest, sixteen years. The educational level of eight years incorporated sixteen subjects from the "recidivist 100" group. This category was the largest in this status classification.

Table XIII, page 108, presents educational attainment in years, in relation to the offenses of forgery, larceny, larceny of a motor vehicle, robbery without aggravation, robbery with aggravation, and burglary.
TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION BY EDUCATION, IN RELATION TO THE OFFENSE FOR WHICH CONVICTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years education completed</th>
<th>Forgery</th>
<th>Larceny without motor vehicle</th>
<th>Larceny with motor vehicle</th>
<th>Robbery without aggravation</th>
<th>Robbery with aggravation</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vehicle. Sixteen of the "recidivist 100" group, nine of whom were imprisoned for forgery; five for larceny; one for motor vehicle larceny; and one for robbery without aggravation, were included in the eight-year educational category.

Nine years education. Fourteen individuals comprised the nine-year level. Six of the fourteen were first offenders and five were convicted for the offense of forgery. The other subject was sentenced for larceny. Among the fourteen, two were from the "recidivist 1" group. One was incarcerated for forgery, while the other was convicted of larceny. Six "recidivist 100" representatives comprised the remainder of the nine-year level. Four were convicted of forgery, whereas two received sentences for larceny.

Ten years education. Eleven individuals comprised this level of education. Two were first offenders; one was convicted of forgery; and the other of larceny. The "recidivist 1" group was represented by four subjects. Two were sentenced for forgery; one for larceny; and one for burglary. Five were from the "recidivist 100" group, with four being incarcerated for forgery and one being imprisoned for larceny.

Eleven years education. Eleven individuals had attained at least eleven years of education. Two first offenders were included, with one being convicted for
forgery and the other for larceny. Two "recidivist 1" people, both convicted for forgery, were also included. Seven persons from the status group of "recidivist 100" were in this educational category, with four being convicted of forgery, two of larceny, and one for robbery without aggravation.

Twelve years education. Twenty-one persons comprised this category. Among the twenty-one were six first offenders; five were imprisoned for forgery; and the other for robbery without aggravation. Seven of the "recidivist 1" group were included. Five had been penalized for forgery; one for larceny; and the other for robbery with aggravation. This group included eight of the group "recidivist 100." Seven were forgers, while one was convicted of larceny.

Thirteen years education. Two first offenders, one convicted of forgery and one for robbery without aggravation, were included in this educational level. Two of the "recidivist 1" group were also included. Both were serving sentences at the Iowa State Penitentiary for forgery. Of the "recidivist 100" group, two individuals, one convicted of forgery and the other for robbery with aggravation, were included.

Fourteen years education. In this group two first offenders were included, as were two of the "recidivist 1" group and two of the group of "recidivist 100." All six
were imprisoned for forgery.

**Fifteen years education.** One individual, a first offender, was incarcerated for forgery.

**Sixteen years education.** One subject had attained sixteen years of education. This individual was in the "recidivist 100" status group, and was sentenced to the Iowa institution for the offense of larceny.

Table XIV represents educational attainment in years, in relation to length of sentence.

### TABLE XIV

**DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION BY EDUCATION, IN RELATION TO THE LENGTH OF SENTENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of sentence in years</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four years education. One individual was in this education category and was serving a sentence of ten years. He was a first offender. (See Table XIV, page 112).

Five years education. One first offender, in this educational level, received a sentence of five years at the Iowa State Penitentiary.

Six years education. One each in each status group in relation to length of sentence composed this category. The first offender was sentenced for twenty-five years, the "recidivist 1" for five years, and the "recidivist 100" for one year.

Seven years education. Four subjects composed this educational class. Two first offenders, one with a five-year sentence and the other receiving a twenty-five year sentence, and two members of the "recidivist 100" group, both receiving sentences of ten years, comprised inmate representation from two of the three status groups.

Eight years education. A total of twenty-six subjects in the sample composed this level of education. First offenders numbered five, with four of them receiving sentences of seven years each, and the other a sentence of ten years. There were five of the "recidivist 1" group. One received five years, another seven, two of the remaining three were convicted for ten years,
and the last subject received a sentence of twenty-one years. The "recidivist 100" group was represented by sixteen persons. Four were sentenced to five years, two received seven-year sentences, and the remaining ten were incarcerated for a period of ten years each.

Nine years education. A total of fourteen inmates comprised the nine-year bracket of education. Six of the total were first offenders. One first offender received a sentence of six years; another a sentence of seven years; three other subjects were convicted for ten years; and a final first offender received fifteen years. Two of the fourteen were from the group "recidivist 1." One second-time-loser was sentenced to five years at the Iowa State Penitentiary, while the other received a seven-year sentence. The remaining six were from the "recidivist 100" group. One subject received a one-year sentence; two received sentences of five years each; one received a seven-year penalty; and the remaining two offenders were each incarcerated for a period of ten years.

Ten years education. This category was composed of eleven inmates. There were two first offenders. One was institutionalized for five years, and the other for a period of seven years. A total of four represented the "recidivist 1" group. One received a sentence of one year; another a sentence of five years; still another
was incarcerated for ten years; and finally, the fourth individual was sentenced to fifteen years at the Iowa State Penitentiary. Five "recidivist 100" representatives were included. One received a five-year sentence; three received sentences of ten years each; and a final individual was imprisoned for twenty years.

Eleven years education. This educational category was also comprised of eleven persons. There were two first offenders. One received a sentence of one year, while the other received a five-year sentence. There were two in the "recidivist 1" group. Both of those individuals received sentences of seven years. The remaining seven represented the third status category. One was imprisoned for five years; two others were convicted for seven years; three received ten-year sentences; and the seventh individual was sentenced to forty years in the Iowa State Penitentiary.

Twelve years education. Twenty-one inmates of the total sample were included in this education category in relation to the length of sentence. Six of the subjects were first offenders. One was convicted for one year; two were imprisoned for seven years; two more received ten-year sentences each; and the final first offender received eleven years at the Iowa State Penitentiary. Seven of the subjects belonged to the "recidivist 1" status group. One individual received a sentence
of five years; three received seven-year imprisonments; two were incarcerated for ten years, and one other person was sentenced to the penitentiary for twenty-five years. Eight were serving at least their third sentence. One received a sentence of five years; five were imprisoned for seven years each; and two were given ten-year sentences.

Thirteen years education. Six persons composed this education level. Two first offenders received sentences of ten years each; two members of the "recidivist 1" group received sentences of seven years each, and two members of the remaining status group were included. One individual received a sentence of ten years, whereas the other was convicted for twenty-five years.

Fourteen years education. Six individuals were included in this educational category. Two first offenders received penal sentences of seven years each. There were two inmates from the "recidivist 1" group; one received a sentence of seven years, while the other was given a ten-year sentence. The latter group was represented by two inmates. Both were given sentences of ten years.

Fifteen years education. One individual, a first offender, was sentenced to seven years at the Iowa State Penitentiary.

Sixteen years education. One subject from the
Group "recidivist 100" was in this category, and was sentenced to the Iowa State Penitentiary for a period of five years.

In an attempt to understand the relationship between the observed and expected frequencies in the data pertaining to education and inmate status, the findings were tested by chi-square. Chi-square, with twelve degrees of freedom was 6.66. The critical value of $X^2$ indicated a lack of significance at the .05 level.

OCCUPATION

Table XV presents the distribution of the sample according to occupation. Occupations of the inmate body were categorized into: (1) none, (2) unskilled, (3) semi-skilled, (4) skilled, and (5) professional.

TABLE XV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First offenders. A total of eighteen first offenders were in the unskilled category. This was a
percentage of sixty, based on thirty subjects in the category of first offender. Thirty-seven per cent, or eleven of a total of thirty first offenders were found in the occupational category of semi-skilled. One individual was categorized as professional, comprising three per cent of the total first offender population.

"Recidivist 1" group. Based on a total of twenty-six individuals in this group, sixty-two per cent were classified as unskilled. Ten subjects, or thirty-eight per cent of this group, were in the semi-skilled category.

"Recidivist 100" group. Sixty per cent, or a total of thirty out of fifty in this status group, were in the occupational classification of unskilled. The remaining twenty individuals that comprised this group, were in the occupational category of semi-skilled. In percentage, this would be forty per cent.

The composite picture. Based on a total sample population of 106 subjects, sixty-four inmates, or sixty per cent, were in the occupational category of unskilled workers. Forty-one of the total studied, or thirty-nine per cent, represented the semi-skilled category. One per cent of the total population was categorized as professional.

In an attempt to determine whether a significant relationship existed, the observed data pertaining to
unskilled and semi-skilled workers, in relation to their status group, were tested by chi-square. The value of chi-square was found to be .037. The critical value of \( \chi^2 \), based on two degrees of freedom, rendered the \( \chi^2 \) value insignificant.

**MARITAL STATUS**

Table XVI represents the distribution of the sample according to marital status. Each subject was categorized as: (1) single, (2) married, (3) separated, (4) divorced, or (5) widowed.

**TABLE XVI**

**DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE ACCORDING TO MARITAL STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First offenders.** Four subjects, or thirteen per cent of the total population of first offenders (thirty), were single. In the married category, there were eight individuals for a percentage of twenty-seven. One person was separated. This was three per cent of the total population. Over one-half of the first offenders were
divorced. Expressed in per cent, fifty-seven per cent, or seventeen of a possible thirty were divorced.

"Recidivist 1" group. Four individuals in this group, totaling twenty-six, were single. This was fifteen per cent of the "recidivist 1" sample. Thirty-five per cent of the individuals in this group were married; eight per cent were separated; thirty-eight per cent were divorced, and the remaining four per cent were widowed.

"Recidivist 100" group. Thirteen subjects in this particular status group were single. This was twenty-six per cent of a total of fifty. Sixteen persons, or thirty-two per cent were married; nineteen individuals, or thirty-eight per cent were divorced, and the remaining four per cent were widowed.

The composite picture. Of a total sample population of 106 subjects, twenty-one, or twenty per cent, were single. Thirty-three persons, making up thirty-one per cent of the total, were married; three per cent were separated; three per cent were widowed; and the remaining inmates were divorced. Forty-six subjects, or forty-three per cent of the total population investigated, were in the divorced category.

Chi-square was computed for the categories of single, married, and divorced, in relation to inmate status. The value of $X^2$ was found to be 3.69. The
critical value, in this case based on four degrees of freedom, indicated that $X^2$ was not significant at the .05 level.

RACE

Table XVII points out the distribution of the sample population according to race. Race was divided into three categories: (1) white, (2) Negro, or (3) other.

**TABLE XVII**

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE ACCORDING TO RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race category</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First offenders and "recidivist 1" group were one-hundred per cent within the white group, while forty-eight of the fifty persons, or ninety-six per cent, were white. Four per cent of the "recidivist 100" group, or two individuals, were Negro.

MISCONDUCT CITATIONS

Table XVIII, page 122, presents the total number of misconduct reports received by each status group, and
the number of individuals in a specific group that received the reports.

**TABLE XVIII**

DISTRIBUTION OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION ACCORDING TO THE NUMBER OF MISCONDUCT CITATIONS RECEIVED AS A GROUP, AND THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS IN A SPECIFIC STATUS GROUP THAT RECEIVED THE MISCONDUCT REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivist 1</th>
<th>Recidivist 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of misconduct reports received as a status group</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of individuals in each status group receiving the misconduct reports</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First offenders, as a group, received eleven misconduct citations. The number of individuals in the group receiving the citations was ten. In the "recidivist 1" group six individuals received a total of thirteen misconduct citations. Forty misconduct reports were received by twenty-one members of the "recidivist 100" status group.

Based on a group total of thirty, one-third, or ten, first offenders had been reported for misconduct. Nine of the ten had received one report, and the tenth individual received two reports.

When combining the two recidivist groups, it was
found that twenty-seven persons, of a total of seventy-six in the two groups, had received fifty-three misconduct reports. One-third of the recidivists\textsuperscript{146} had received reports, but where the average number of reports per person for the first offenders was 1.1, the average or mean number of misconduct citations for recidivist offenders was noted to be nearly two (1.9) per person. Using misconduct reports as an indicator of adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary, it would appear from the findings, that one-third of the population studied (thirty-seven)\textsuperscript{147} was not in strict overt conformity to the immediate social structure. On the other hand, it would seem that the remaining two-thirds of the population had successfully assimilated the culture of the prison, and had become re-socialized in the accepted behavior patterns of the prison community. The writer is aware, as was pointed out in the limitations of study, that the conclusions

\textsuperscript{146}An exact one-third of seventy-six is twenty-five and one-third. However, because the difference between twenty-seven and twenty-five and one-third is not of statistical significance, twenty-seven will be reported as one-third of seventy-six.

\textsuperscript{147}An exact one-third of the population is thirty-five and one-third. However, because the difference between thirty-seven and thirty-five and one-third is statistically insignificant, thirty-seven will be referred to as one-third of the sample.
drawn from the findings in this study may not be com-
pletely accurate or totally representative of the popula-
tion of property offenders, and that more studies are
needed in the area of inmate adjustment to substantiate
such conclusions. However, the findings of this study
serve as an indicator of adjustment, and, hence, of
prisonization; and while it cannot be definitely concluded
that misconduct citations reflect lack of adjustment to
the institution's routine, because of those factors
mentioned previously that cannot be controlled, such an
attempt may be helpful in the future for developing more
sophisticated research in the prison community. The lack
of a well-integrated theory and the inability at this
time to control all pertinent factors, even though they
serve to hamper sociological research in the prison com-
munity, is no reason to disregard this area of human be-
behavior. In fact it seems to the writer that the prevail-
ing situation necessitates more conscientious investi-
gation.

A test of significance between the "observed" and
"expected" values pertaining to the total number of mis-
conduct citations received as a group, the total number
of individuals in the group receiving reports, and the
total number of individuals in each status category was
obtained by subjecting the data to the chi-square test
of significance. The value of $X^2$, with four degrees of
freedom, was found to be 4.89. The critical value of \( \chi^2 \) indicated that the value obtained was not significant at the .05 level.

**INFORMAL SURVEY RESULTS**

Table XIX presents the results of the informal survey of Iowa State Penitentiary personnel. This section is divided into the status categories of first offenders and recidivists, combining the groups "recidivist 1" and "recidivist 100." The numbers indicated for each cell represent the total number of votes by the eighteen personnel asked to participate in the survey.

**TABLE XIX**

RESULTS OF THE INFORMAL SURVEY OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION BY IOWA STATE PENITENTIARY PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Responses</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperates and contributes to the smooth operation of the institution</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes no trouble; gets along well</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes no trouble; however, I don't trust him</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an agitator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a trouble-maker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The observed frequencies that appear in Table XIX, page 125, were put to the test of chi-square. Table XX presents the "observed" and "expected" frequencies, and the value of $X^2$, which was found to be significant at the .05 level.

### TABLE XX

THE OBSERVED AND EXPECTED VALUES OF THE RESULTS OF THE INFORMAL SURVEY OF IOWA STATE PENITENTIARY PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible responses</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed-Expected</td>
<td>Observed-Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperates and contributes to the smooth operation of the institution</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.70</td>
<td>146.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes no trouble; gets along well</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159.23</td>
<td>410.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes no trouble; however, I don't trust him</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68.44</td>
<td>176.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an agitator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>30.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a trouble-maker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>46.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 1,124 \quad X^2 = 26.74 \quad d.f. = 4 \quad P = .05$

The value of $X^2$ was found to be 26.74. The critical value indicated that the value of $X^2$ was significant at the .05 level. Significance at the .05 level indicates a cause-effect relationship, and rules out a chance only relationship. It appears from the findings
that this method of measuring inmate adjustment is both adequate and accurate. In most cases, the responses were well thought out and apparently the survey, on an individual, subjective basis, delved into the social psychological aspects of inmate behavior, as well as considering overt conformity. In order to understand the etiology of the prisonization process, research within the prison community must be directed toward the social psychological processes that affect the individual inmate's acceptance or rejection of these patterns of behavior.

Table XXI indicates the number of individuals receiving the votes in relation to the category of first offender or the category of recidivist.

**TABLE XXI**

**THE NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS IN THE CATEGORIES OF FIRST OFFENDER AND RECIDIVIST, RECEIVING THE VOTES OF SELECTED IOWA STATE PENITENTIARY PERSONNEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible responses</th>
<th>First Offenders</th>
<th>Recidivists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperates and contributes to the smooth operation of the institution</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes no trouble; gets along well</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causes no trouble; however, I don't trust him</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is an agitator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a trouble-maker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of research tool. The research tool, for the purpose of testing the two hypotheses, was divided into two major parts. The first part was concerned with misconduct citations as an indicator of inmate adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary. The second part was comprised of an informal survey of selected Iowa State Penitentiary personnel who categorized each individual according to inmate adjustment.

The categories of response which interest us most in the survey portion of the research tool are the last two, for the major concern is with those individuals that seem not to have assimilated the norms of the prison community. As is pointed out in Table XXI, page 127, the total number of first offenders judged as "agitators" and "trouble-makers," was ten, whereas the total number of recidivists in the same categories was thirty-five. It must be pointed out that these totals do not represent the exact number of individuals indicated in each category, because in some cases, an individual was classed as both an "agitator" and a "trouble-maker." There is a possibility that, in relation to overt behavior, an individual could conceivably belong to each response category simultaneously. However, in order to compare the results of the informal survey with the number of subjects in each status group receiving misconduct citations, the writer decided to place each first offender and each recidivist
in only one response category; either "is an agitator" or "is a trouble-maker." Since the category "is an agitator" was shown on the survey form before the "trouble-maker" response, it was analyzed first. If a subject received one or more votes in the "agitator" category, he was classed as an agitator and did not appear in the number total of the trouble-maker class.

In the category of "agitator" it was revealed that six first offenders were included. Seven subjects, representing the "recidivist 1" group were indicated as agitators, while twelve of the group "recidivist 100" were designated as belonging to the "agitator" response category.

The "trouble-maker" response category was comprised of two first offenders, two "recidivist 1" representatives, and six subjects from the "recidivist 100" group.

After totaling the two response categories, it was found that eight first offenders had been designated as belonging to the categorical responses of "is an agitator" and "is a trouble-maker." In the same categories, the number of subjects included from the "recidivist 1" group was nine, whereas the "recidivist 100" group was represented by eighteen members. In totaling the number of individuals indicated as not completely in accord with the Iowa State Penitentiary's routine, it was found that thirty-five subjects were included.
It must be pointed out that the findings resulting from the survey technique nearly paralleled the findings resulting from the measurement of adjustment based on the number of subjects receiving misconduct citations. Of the total sample of 106 subjects, thirty-seven received one or more misconduct citations, whereas it was indicated by the informal survey technique that thirty-five inmates were not in complete adjustment to institutional routine.

Obviously, because this research tool was based largely on overt conformity to institutional norms, and because the evaluation of inmate behavior was subjective on the part of the custodial and professional staff, not every individual who received one or more misconduct citations was also designated as an "agitator" or as a "trouble-maker." The same holds that all of the "agitators" and "trouble-makers" were not necessarily given misconduct reports.

The reason for a two-part research tool of this nature, in fact, was to avoid biasing the measurement in either direction. It must be stated, however, that the purpose of such a tool was not to check the uniformity of responses of the custodial staff with those of the professional staff, but to employ these two diverse methods of measurement in an attempt to understand inmate adjustment as a measure of prisonization. It would appear
from the findings that the research tool has adequately served that purpose.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a brief summary of the investigation and a discussion of the conclusions.

SUMMARY

The literature on rehabilitation, inmate adjustment, and recidivism indicates gross inconsistency in the correctional process. The lack of a rehabilitative philosophy, reluctance to institute social change, and functional indecision have habitually hampered the development of a rehabilitation program that would accomplish the major task of preventing recidivism by returning individuals to free society as contributing citizens.

It is believed by many that rehabilitation is impossible in the maximum security penal setting of today. Rehabilitation is the desired goal, but when the social setting is directly opposed to that of the larger society, it appears that re-socialization is directed toward life in the immediate environment. Donald Clemmer coined the term "prisonization" to describe the social process whereby men learn the culture of the prison community, and in so doing, become characteristic of the
prison population. Prisonization is the basis for this study. By studying inmate adjustment, the writer has attempted to grasp a better understanding of the process of prisonization in a maximum security penal institution.

During the year 1964, a total of 265 property crime offenders were committed to the care of the Iowa State Penitentiary. The sample population investigated in this study was comprised of 106 of the total commitment. Of the total of 106 subjects, thirty were first offenders, twenty-six held membership in the "recidivist 1" group, and the remaining fifty were in the status group of "recidivist 100."

Of the total sample, twenty-six individuals had served prior sentences at the Iowa State Penitentiary. At present, eight of the twenty-six are in the "recidivist 1" group, while the remaining eighteen have been incarcerated at least two times prior to their present incarceration. Fifty per cent, or thirteen, of the subjects that have served prior sentences at the Iowa State Penitentiary started their penal careers in the same institution.

In relation to the above sample, this study had four major objectives. Those objectives were:

(1) to study inmate adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary, in an attempt to determine if there were any significant adjustment
differences between first time property offenders and property crime recidivists admitted to the institution during 1964;

(2) to compare and contrast first time property offenders on carefully selected variables: education, occupation, marital status, race, age, crime for which convicted, and length of sentence;

(3) to ascertain the recidivism rate for the sample in the study, and

(4) to test the validity of a hypothesis advanced by Donald Clemmer in *The Prison Community*.

Pertinent comparison data were collected on each inmate in the study through a thorough investigation of the official records of the Iowa State Penitentiary. The data were analyzed both descriptively and statistically, in an attempt to differentiate, on the basis of the variables indicated in the second basic objective of the study, between first offenders and recidivists.

Two hypotheses, incorporated in objectives one and four, were posed in this study. The null hypothesis was that there is no significant difference in institutional adjustment to the Iowa State Penitentiary's routine between first time property offenders and property crime recidivists. The second hypothesis came directly from the literature. Donald Clemmer, in *The Prison Community*, hypothesized that the individuals that become involved
in trouble within the prison are usually "the inexperienced and relatively non-criminal inmates."\textsuperscript{148}

In testing the hypotheses, a two-part research tool was utilized. The first part was concerned with an indication of inmate adjustment based on the number of misconduct reports received by first offenders in contrast to the number of reports received by recidivist offenders. Since reports are only given for overt behavior which is deemed deviant to the norms of the institution, it was assumed that those individuals not receiving misconduct citations were in adjustment to the institutional routine. As was pointed out in the limitations of the study, this assumption cannot be considered completely accurate. However, because in this sociological study the emphasis was on determining institutional adjustment based on overt behavior, it was necessary to assume that the custodial staff at the Iowa State Penitentiary, which is responsible for issuing misconduct citations, would impose penal sanctions on those inmates not in conformity to institutional expectations.

The second part of the research tool was comprised of an informal survey of eighteen selected Iowa State Penitentiary personnel. Each of the eighteen personnel were given a survey form which contained the name and

\textsuperscript{148}\textsuperscript{148}Clemmer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 195.
number of each subject in the study (See Appendix). The survey participants were directed to indicate one of five responses for each inmate that best described the inmate's adjustment to the rules of the penitentiary. The five possible responses were: (1) cooperates and contributes to the smooth operation of the institution; (2) causes no trouble; gets along well; (3) causes no trouble; however, I don't trust him; (4) is an agitator; and (5) is a trouble-maker. The results of the research tool were analyzed both descriptively and statistically to determine any significant differences between first offender adjustment and the adjustment of recidivists.

The research tool, even though it is based on observable behavior patterns and does not delve into the social psychological aspects of deviant behavior in the prison community, is a valuable indicator of inmate adjustment. Such seemingly insignificant research techniques will help develop a theoretical model that will provide understanding of the social processes in the prison community that seem to make a man characteristic of the institutional way of life.

CONCLUSIONS

Of the 265 property offenders committed to the Iowa State Penitentiary during 1964, 159 were excluded
from the study for the reasons given in Chapter V. However, pertinent information on the non-study group was collected for purposes of comparison and contrast with the sample for investigation.

A basic purpose of this study, as has already been pointed out, was to ascertain the recidivism rate for the population studied. It was found that, in the non-study group, of 159 subjects, 121 comprised the status groups of "recidivist 1"* and "recidivist 100"**. Of the 121 recidivists in the non-study population, fifty-five were classified as belonging to the "recidivist 1" group, while the remaining sixty-six were of the status category "recidivist 100".

In the sample population composed of 106 subjects, seventy-six comprised the status categories of "recidivist 1" and "recidivist 100." Of the seventy-six recidivists in the sample, twenty-six represented the "recidivist 1" classification, while the remaining fifty subjects were members of the group "recidivist 100."

The overall recidivism rate for the non-study population was seventy-seven per cent, while the overall rate of recidivism for the sample investigated was found to be seventy-two per cent (See Table II, page 88). In other

*Have served one previous sentence
**Have served at least two previous sentences.
words, of the 106 subjects in this study admitted to the Iowa State Penitentiary during the year 1964, seventy-six were recidivists. Of this number (seventy-six), fifty had served at least two penal sentences prior to the one being presently served.

Crime for which convicted. In this study six property offenses were considered. The offenses were: (1) forgery, (2) larceny, (3) larceny of a motor vehicle, (4) robbery without aggravation, (5) robbery with aggravation, and (6) burglary. The category of forgery composed the largest crime category in this investigation. Sixty-eight offenders, or sixty-four per cent of the total sample, were convicted of forgery. Twenty-two per cent of the subjects, or twenty-three inmates, were sentenced to the Iowa State Penitentiary for the offense of larceny. Five per cent of the sample were sentenced for motor vehicle larceny; five per cent were institutionalized for robbery without aggravation; four per cent were incarcerated for robbery with aggravation, and one per cent was sentenced for burglary.

Length of sentence. The mean length of sentence among first offenders was found to be 8.8 years. The length of sentence that was given to the largest number of first offenders was the sentence of seven years. Eleven first offenders received sentences of seven years each.
The length of sentence observed most often in the "recidivist 1" group was also seven years. The mean length of sentence among those individuals serving their second sentence (those in the "recidivist 1" group) was 8.5 years.

The average length of sentence of individuals in the "recidivist 100" group was 9.1 years, and the length of sentence given to the largest number of these subjects was the sentence of ten years.

**Age.** The mean age for first offenders in the sample was 37.5 years. Calculated by ten-year intervals (See Table IX, page 103), 4.7 per cent were in their twenties; 8.5 per cent were in their thirties; and 15.1 per cent were in their forties.

The mean age for the "recidivist 1" group was 38.9 years. Calculated by ten-year intervals, 3.8 per cent of this status group were in their twenties; 9.4 per cent were in their thirties; 6.6 per cent were in their forties; 3.8 per cent were in their fifties; and .943 per cent were in their sixties.

The mean age of the "recidivist 100" people was found to be 37.2 years. Calculated by ten-year intervals, 7.5 per cent were in their twenties; 21.7 per cent were in their thirties; 15.1 per cent were in their forties; 1.9 per cent were in their fifties; and .943 per cent were in their sixties.
Of the total sample population, sixteen per cent were in their twenties; 39.6 per cent were in their thirties; 36.8 per cent were in their forties; 5.7 per cent were in their fifties, and 1.886 per cent were in their sixties. For a comparison of the sample with the non-study population see Table XI, page 105.

Education. The mean educational attainment in years for first offenders was 10. The lowest level of education (See Table XII, page 106) among first offenders was four years, while the highest was fifteen years.

The average level of education was 10.3 years in the "recidivist 1" group. The lowest level of educational attainment for persons in this group was five years, whereas the highest category was fourteen years.

The mean educational level of the "recidivist 100" group was discovered to be 9.9 years. The lowest educational category represented was six years; the highest, sixteen years.

Occupation. Table XV, page 117, presents the sample distribution according to occupation. Occupations of the inmate body were categorized into: (1) none, (2) unskilled, (3) semi-skilled, (4) skilled, and (5) professional.

Based on a total sample population of 106 subjects, sixty-four inmates, or sixty per cent, were in the occupational category of unskilled workers. Forty-one of
the total studied, or thirty-nine per cent, represented the semi-skilled category. The professional category included one per cent of the total population investigated.

**Marital status.** Table XVI, page 119, represents the sample distribution according to marital status. Each subject was categorized as (1) single, (2) married, (3) separated, (4) divorced, or (5) widowed.

Of a total sample of 106 subjects, twenty-one, or twenty per cent, were single. Thirty-three persons, making up thirty-one per cent of the total, were married; three per cent were separated; three per cent were widowed; and the remaining forty-three per cent of the total investigated were in the divorced category.

**Race.** The distribution of the sample population according to race is shown in Table XVII, page 121. Race was divided into three categories: (1) white, (2) Negro, or (3) other.

The investigation indicated that, of the total sample, ninety-six per cent of the subjects were classified as belonging to the white category, and four per cent of the subjects were classified as Negro.

Each of the variables discussed thus far, with the exception of race, were subjected to the chi-square test.\(^{149}\) Race data was not subjected to the \(X^2\) test because of the lack of differential frequencies (See Table XVII) in the cells.
test of significance, in an attempt to ascertain the existence of a cause-effect relationship. The fiducial point, or the limit at which the value of $X^2$ would be accepted as significant, was set at .05. The findings indicated that none of the variables were significant at the .05 level, and, therefore, the fit of the actual data to the theoretical distribution was a result of chance fluctuations.

Misconduct citations and the results of the informal survey provided the necessary data for testing the two hypotheses. The part of the research tool dealing with misconduct citations will be discussed first.

Table XVIII, page 122, presents the total number of misconduct citations received by each status group and the number of individuals in a specific group (first offenders, "recidivist 1" or "recidivist 100") that received the reports.

First offenders, as a group, received eleven misconduct citations. The number in the first offender status group receiving the misconduct reports was ten.

In the "recidivist 1" group, six individuals received a total of thirteen misconduct citations, whereas forty misconduct reports had been filed against twenty-one members of the "recidivist 100" group.

Based on a total of thirty first offenders, one third, or ten, first offenders had been reported for mis-
conduct. When combining the two recidivist groups, it was found that twenty-seven, or one third, 150 of the total of seventy-six recidivists, had also been given misconduct citations. The mean number of misconduct reports for first offenders was found to be 1.1, while the average number of reports in the recidivist category was nearly two (1.9).

Using misconduct citations as an indicator of adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary, it was found that one-third 151 of the sample studied had been given misconduct citations. As measured by overt behavior, the remaining two-thirds seemed to have assimilated the culture of the prison community, and had become adjusted to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary.

A test of significance between the "observed" and "expected" values pertaining to the total number of misconduct citations received as a group, the total number of individuals in the group receiving reports, and the total

150 An exact one-third of seventy-six is twenty-five and one-third. However, because the difference between twenty-seven and twenty-five and one-third is not of statistical significance, twenty-seven will be reported as one-third of seventy-six.

151 An exact one-third of the population is thirty-five and one-third. However, because the difference between thirty-seven and thirty-five and one-third is statistically insignificant, thirty-seven will be referred to as one-third of the sample.
umber of individuals in each status category was ob-
ained by subjecting the data to the chi-square test of
ignificance. The value of $X^2$, with four degrees of
reedom, was found to be 4.89. The critical value of
$X^2$ indicated that the value obtained was not significant
at the .05 level.

Table XIX, page 125, shows the results of the in-
formal survey of Iowa State Penitentiary personnel. The
data presented in Table XIX were put to the test of chi-
square. Table XX, page 126, presents the "observed" and
expected" values of the survey data, and also presents
the value of $X^2$ which was 26.74 (4 d.f.), and which was
found to be significant at the .05 level.

Analysis of the research tool. The research tool,
for the purpose of testing the two hypotheses, was
divided into two major parts. The first part was con-
cerned with misconduct citations as an indicator of in-
mate adjustment to the institutional routine of the Iowa
state Penitentiary. The second part of the research tool
was comprised of an informal survey of selected Iowa State
penitentiary personnel who categorized each individual
according to inmate adjustment.

The categories or responses which are of most
significance in this study are the last two, for the major
concern is with those individuals that do not seem to have
assimilated the norms of the prison community. As is
...itted out in Table XXI, page 127, in the response
categories of "is an agitator," and "is a trouble-maker,"
total of ten first offenders and a total of thirty-five
recidivists were cited as belonging to these categories.
Must be noted, however, that these totals do not re-
represent the exact number of individuals indicated in each
category, because in some cases an individual was classed
both an "agitator" and a "trouble-maker." In order to
compare the findings of the survey technique with the
results of the misconduct citation method, the writer
decided to place each first offender and each recidivist
only one response category—either "is an agitator" or
a trouble-maker." Since the category "is an agitator"
was shown on the survey form before the "trouble-maker"
response, it was analyzed first. If a subject received
or more votes in the "agitator" category, he was
essed as such, and did not appear in the number total
in the "trouble-maker" class.

In the category of "agitator" it was revealed that
first offenders were included. Seven subjects, re-
resenting the "recidivist 1" group were indicated as
itators," while twelve of the group, "recidivist 100"
-designated as belonging to the "agitator" response
category.

The "trouble-maker" category was comprised of two
offenders, two "recidivist 1" representatives, and
six subjects from the "recidivist 100" status group.

After totaling the two response categories, it was found that eight first offenders had been designated as belonging to the categorical responses of "is an agitator," and "is a trouble-maker." In the same categories, the number of subjects included from the "recidivist 1" group was nine, whereas the "recidivist 100" group was represented by eighteen members. In totaling the number of individuals indicated as not completely in accord with the Iowa State Penitentiary's routine, it was found that thirty-five subjects were included.

It must be pointed out that the findings resulting from the survey technique nearly paralleled the findings resulting from the measurement of adjustment based on the number of subjects receiving misconduct citations. Of the total sample of 106 subjects, thirty-seven received one or more misconduct citations, whereas it was indicated by the informal survey technique, that thirty-five inmates were not in complete adjustment to institutional routine.

Obviously, because this research tool was based largely on overt conformity to institutional norms, and because the evaluation of inmate behavior was subjective on the part of the custodial and professional staff, not every individual who received one or more misconduct citations was also designated as an "agitator" or as a "trouble-maker." The same holds that all of the
"agitators" and "trouble-makers" were not necessarily given misconduct reports.

It must be stressed that the purpose of the two-part research tool was to avoid biasing the measurement in either direction and to grasp, through the utilization of two unique methods, a more comprehensive understanding of inmate adjustment as an indicator of prisonization. The purpose was not to check the uniformity of custodial staff responses with those of the professional staff.

It would appear from the findings in this investigation that the research tool has adequately served its purpose. It becomes apparent that overt behavior is a relatively accurate basis for determining inmate adjustment to institutional routine. Approximately one-third of the population studied (See page 123) was given one or more misconduct reports. A survey analysis, based on overt behavior, found an identical proportion of the subjects to be somewhat out of adjustment to the penitentiary's normative structure.

The remaining two-thirds, those not receiving misconduct citations hence not indicated as deviant in the institutional setting, were apparently well adjusted to the existing institutional organization.

As has been pointed out previously, uncontrollable variables serve to hamper scientific investigation in the prison community. The measures of adjustment used in
this study are by no means exhaustive of the possible indicators of inmate adjustment. However, they do serve to give some indication of individual adjustment to institutional expectations.

This study has been concerned only with inmate behavior patterns which present a threat to the organization of the Iowa State Penitentiary. Through an understanding of adjustment, as measured by the research tool provided, the writer sought to gain insight into the social processes of prisonization.

In conclusion, the four major findings in this investigation must be made explicit. First, the recidivism rate for the sample was found to be seventy-two percent. Of the 106 subjects in the study, seventy-six were recidivists.

Second, there was statistical evidence provided by the survey technique to allow rejection of the null hypothesis. The findings of the informal survey indicated that thirty-five inmates were not in complete conformity to the institutional routine of the Iowa State Penitentiary. This finding was further supported by the misconduct citation findings, although these were not of statistical significance. Of the 106 subjects studied, thirty-seven had received misconduct reports.

Third, Clemmer's hypothesis was not substantiated by this study; however, this is not to be construed as a
denial of his findings because of the possibility that the methodological tool used in this endeavor could not encompass all of the existing factors that affect the writing of misconduct reports.

Fourth, there were no statistically significant differences, based on the variables of education, occupation, marital status, race, age, crime for which convicted, and length of sentence, between first offenders and recidivists.

This study has been directed toward inmate adjustment as an indicator of prisonization. As is characteristic of studies in this general area, many uncontrollable factors tend to be a constant source of trouble for the investigator. This study was, in fact, hampered by such inconsistencies, but it is believed that the findings of this investigation are valid to the extent that they might serve as a point of departure for other students of the behavioral sciences who find such scientific endeavors of intellectual and practical interest.
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**B. PERIODICALS**
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GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS


UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crime**

- **Admitted**: 19
- **Term of Sentence**: Court
- **Former Imprisonments**: 19

**Who to notify in case of serious illness or death:**

**Relationship**

- **Address**

**Color**

- **Sex**

- **Age**

- **Weight lbs.**

- **Height ft. in.**

**Date of Birth**: 19

**Place**

**Complexion**

- **Eyes**

- **Hair**

- **Size of boot**

- **Hat**

**Special Marks, Scars, etc.**

**Physique**

- **Physical Condition**

**Occupation**

**Education**

- **Religion**

**Habits**

**Use of Alcohol, Tobacco or Drugs**

**Relatives or Ancestors Delinquent or Deficient**

**Time Expires by Commutation**

**Amount of Commutation Earned**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28537</td>
<td>Fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28538</td>
<td>Rouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20547</td>
<td>Kerr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28555</td>
<td>Lowder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28558</td>
<td>Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28565</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28574</td>
<td>Buchnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28577</td>
<td>Bywater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28581</td>
<td>Kester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28587</td>
<td>Londrie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28592</td>
<td>Hendrickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28623</td>
<td>Prado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28634</td>
<td>Bildstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28635</td>
<td>Lamb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28636</td>
<td>Pickerell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>