

10-1970

Attitudes & Orientation of Criminals Toward Crime & Law Enforcement

Ralph Tish

Western Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tish, Ralph, "Attitudes & Orientation of Criminals Toward Crime & Law Enforcement" (1970). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 2924.

<https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/2924>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

Tish,

Ralph E.

1970

ATTITUDES AND ORIENTATION OF CRIMINALS
TOWARD CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Sociology

Western Kentucky University

Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by

Ralph E. Tish

October 1970

ATTITUDES AND ORIENTATION OF CRIMINALS
TOWARD CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

APPROVED May 14 1971 :
(Date)

Robert R. ...
Director of Thesis

Ludwig R. Jackson

H. Kirk ...

John ...
Dean of the Graduate School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. DESCRIPTION OF THREE KENTUCKY STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS	15
III. RESEARCH METHODS	23
IV. DATA AND FINDINGS	31
V. INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS AND INFERENCES	43
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	52
APPENDIX	55
BIBLIOGRAPHY	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Distribution of Criminals Attitudes Toward Crime By Number of Sentences Served	35
2.	Distribution of Inmates' Attitudes Toward Crime By Sex and Marital Status	36
3.	Distribution of Inmates' Attitudes Toward Crime By Place of Residence	37
4.	Individual Item Comparisons: Marital Status to Crime and Law Enforcement Variables	38
5.	Individual Item Comparison: Number of Sentences Served to Crime and Law Enforcement Variables	40
6.	Individual Item Comparison: Education and Sex to Crime and Law Enforcement Variables	41

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was twofold, first to focus on and to measure quantitatively three groups of adult prisoners' attitudes and orientations toward crime and law enforcement. Secondly, the study was to determine the relationship between background characteristics of prisoners and the attitudinal variables. The analysis included data concerning the relationship of eight separate background factors - (age, marital status, church membership, education, school drop-out reason, occupation, place of residence, and criminal record) - to the crime and law enforcement variables.

Attitudes represent a valuable source of understanding inmates in local, state, or federal penal institutions. Many sociologists agree that there is a significant relationship between attitudes and behavior. By studying the attitudes of a particular group of people with a common identity (i.e., criminals), behavioral scientists may be able to determine why people commit crimes or turn to crime as a way of life.

Sociological literature pertaining to the research topic reveals that the theme "criminals' attitudes toward crime" has been neglected almost entirely. To ascertain the perspective necessary to understand criminal attitude formation, one does not see how this theme could have been neglected. In actuality, who as a group has had more

experience in law violation and an understanding of the "hows" and "whys" of crime than criminals? Research on this topic was also needed to "bridge the gap" between the theoretical propositions and the actual nature of criminal attitude formation. This research could conceivably have relevance in explaining the processes of socialization and rehabilitation of inmates within the prison community.

Several theories have given support to the proposition that anti-social attitudes and resulting criminal behavior are learned as a result of experience with delinquent groups. Edwin H. Sutherland's (1939)¹ "differential association" theory of criminal behavior was posited in terms of the life experiences of a person. Sutherland's theory is based on the assumption that a criminal act occurs when a situation appropriate for it, as defined by a person, is present. Listed below is Sutherland's nine-point theory of "differential association":

1. Criminal behavior is learned.
2. Criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication.
3. The principal part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups.
4. When criminal behavior is learned, the learning includes: a) techniques of committing the crime, b) the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations and attitudes.²
5. The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of legal codes as favorable and unfavorable.
6. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violation of law.
7. Differential association may vary in frequency, duration, priority and intensity.
8. The process of learning criminal behavior by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns involves all of the mechanisms that are in any other learning.

9. Though criminal behavior is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by those general needs and values since non-criminal behavior is an expression of the same needs and values.³

A relatively large body of literature has accumulated around differential association and criminal behavior. Due to time and space, however, the literature pertaining to each of the nine propositions cannot be reviewed. Only those pertinent to the thesis will be discussed; among these is proposition number four. This proposition as revised by the behavioral theorists, Burgess and Akers⁴ (1966) reads as follows:

The learning of criminal behavior, including specific techniques, attitudes⁵ and avoidance procedures, is a function of the effective and available reinforcers and the existing reinforcement contingencies.⁶

To operationalize this proposition we can examine the example given by Burgess and Akers and extract a parallel that relates to this study's hypotheses.

. . . when a prisoner is deprived of contact with members of the opposite sex, such sex reinforcers will become much more powerful. Thus, those sexual reinforcers that are available, such as homosexual contact, would come to exert a great deal of influence and would shape behaviors that would be unlikely to occur without such deprivation.⁷

A parallel that can be drawn from this example is, . . . when a prisoner is deprived of contacts with non-conventional behavior, his only contacts being criminals, the reinforcement agencies are those which uphold a different code of values that oppose conventional behavior. These reinforcement agents exert a significant influence upon the individual in regard to attitudes and

subsequent behavior. Resulting attitudes would be expected to be in a non-conventional direction.⁸ Burgess and Akers have stated:

. . . much, therefore, can be learned about the distinctive characteristics of a group by knowing what the available and effective reinforcers are and the behavior (the attitudes)⁹ upon which they are contingent. . . .¹⁰

Other studies pertinent to this thesis were made by: Ball (1957),¹¹ Glaser (1956),¹² Stratton (1967),¹³ Short (1957),¹⁴ Mylonas and Reckless (1963),¹⁵ Mylonas and Reckless (1968),¹⁶ and Cleaver, Mylonas and Reckless (1968).¹⁷

In Ball's (1957)¹⁸ study, a comparison was made between groups of delinquents and non-delinquents with respect to attitudes toward stealing. Ball constructed an attitude scale in the content-area of stealing. His findings revealed that:

1. Males have more positive attitudes toward stealing than do females.
2. Adolescents hold more extreme attitudes, either positive or negative, in the content-area, than older more educated persons.
3. The delinquents hold markedly more positive attitudes toward stealing than do any of the other groups.¹⁹

Ball's findings suggest that the data offer substantiation for considering stealing as a result of differential assimilation of a cultural pattern and in part may be regarded as a corollary of Sutherland's theory of differential association.

Glaser (1956)²⁰ recast Sutherland's differential association theory into the language of social psychology, introducing the concepts of "role taking" and "reference group" in order to make the process by which "criminalization" takes place more explicit.

He labelled this process "differential identification." The essence of Glaser's theory is summarized as follows:

A person pursues criminal behavior to the extent that he identifies himself with real or imaginary persons from whose perspective his criminal behavior seems acceptable.²¹

Stratton (1957)²² explained Glaser's process of "identification" as:

. . . persons commit crimes when they identify with individuals or groups who approve of this behavior, is to say that persons commit crime when they are oriented to reference groups that condone this behavior. . . .²³

Stratton's hypothesis, . . . attitudes favoring violation of the law will be positively associated with criminal reference group orientation . . .²⁴ and subsequent findings were supportive of Glaser's proposition. This study was applicable to this thesis because Stratton's examination of Glaser's proposition revealed that criminal attitudes and behavior result from identification with reference groups condoning criminal behavior, i.e., prison inmates.²⁵

Short's (1957)²⁶ subject, "differential association and delinquency" represents a "systematic study" of Sutherland's theory. He concerned himself with differential association as it varies in frequency, duration, priority, and intensity of interaction with delinquent peers, in molding behavior and attitudes. The most significant finding from Short's study is a consistently positive relationship between the variables delinquent behavior and delinquent association. Short's factorial approach was supportive of Sutherland's theory.²⁷ His findings gave support to the proposition that delinquent peers and criminal peers are influential in molding the

attitudes and behavior of group members, and influenced the formulation of the three hypotheses on criminal attitudes used in this study.

According to Mylonas and Reckless (1963),²⁸

. . . it is reasonable to expect an unfavorable attitude of American prisoners toward law [favorable attitude toward crime]²⁹ in general and legal institutions . . . we are aware that adult offenders have anti-social grudges and hostile attitudes toward society. Many of these attitudes develop early in life, while some develop later as a result of experience with police, courts, and prisons. Certainly a favorable attitude toward law and legal institutions is an indication of conformity as well as good adjustment to society.³⁰

The purpose of their study was to measure adult prisoners' attitudes toward law and legal institutions. The hypotheses were stated in terms of expected significant differences in the mean scores on a scale which purported to measure favorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions of the samples. The subgroups included controls for education, occupation, marital status, amount of criminal history, etc. Subsequent findings revealed that,

1. Attitudes toward law and legal institutions vary somewhat with criminal record, i.e., the number of felonies committed. First offenders have more favorable attitudes than do recidivists.³¹
2. Prisoners' attitudes toward law and legal institutions vary somewhat with the length of time they have been in correctional and penal institutions. The longer the correctional experience, the less favorable the attitude.³²

These findings gave support to Sutherland's theory and were also used in this study for purposes of conceptual and structural design of the hypotheses.

Mylonas and Reckless (1968)³³ suggest that attitudes toward the law and legal institutions may indicate a level of criminality.³⁴

comparison was made between prisoners' attitudes toward law enforcement in Greece and prisoners' attitudes toward law enforcement in the United States. The study suggests that,

. . . despite the differences in history and culture of Greece and the United States, internalization (residual) of attitudes toward the law and law enforcement agencies are discernible among discriminate samples of the population, such as prisoners, laborers, and a highly ethnic group. An attitudinal gradient would appear to exist which, in turn, seems related to the potentiality for involvement in criminal behavior. . . .³⁴

The criminality-level scale, consisting of 89 law item statements, did not have a high degree of sensitivity; and Mylonas and Reckless suggested that a more sensitive scale would have to be constructed to measure precisely the criminality level of the individual adult.

Cleaver, Mylonas and Reckless (1968)³⁵ later constructed a more sensitive instrument to measure criminality levels of adults. In this study nine different samples were used ranging from several incarcerated offender groups, assumed to exhibit highly unfavorable attitudes toward the law, to a sample of male Mormons who were expected to have highly favorable attitudes toward law. According to Cleaver, Mylonas and Reckless, . . . "on the basis of statistics computed for a wide range of both offender and non-offender samples, it seems reasonable to conclude that the scale possesses a dependable degree of reliability and validity."³⁶ An unexpected finding revealed that the womens' reformatory sample possessed a considerably more unfavorable attitude toward law than did the male penitentiary inmates. Kay and Schultz (1964)³⁷ who made the original study of the reformatory inmates offered this explanation concerning the findings:

. . . the women offenders who finally get to prison are more adversely affected than male prisoners in the legal process. Women have very much less chance to be reported, to be arrested, to be convicted and to be committed than men. Those who are ultimately sent to prison are the very worst of the total, and hence it should be expected that their attitudes toward courts, judges, police, and prosecutors should be anti-law. Secondly, women personalize arrest, jail detention, court trial, and commitment to prison. Such experiences are more anti-social than those which men prisoners develop. The first possible explanation follows the line of thought, "when she is bad she is very, very bad," . . . and she must exude progressive badness to get processed through arrest, detention, trial, and commitment. The second explanation follows the line of thought that wrath in women is more readily engendered than in men; they have longer memories for inequities than men; they are more sensitive to concern for personal status than men. We might call this the feline syndrome.³⁸

These two studies, Mylonas and Reckless (1968) and Cleaver, Mylonas and Reckless (1968) were instrumental in the formation of these thesis hypotheses and procedures for the measurement of attitudes toward crime and law enforcement.

Since this study in many respects was not a replication of past research, no single study served as an exact model. However, as evidenced by the reviewed literature, several have been conducted which in combination ultimately became the model for this study.

In the light of the above considerations three hypothesis were formulated for testing.

Hypothesis I Since attitudes toward crime and law enforcement vary significantly with the criminal record, i.e., the number of felonies committed followed by a prison term, the single (first) offenders should have significantly less favorable attitudes toward crime and more favorable attitudes toward law and law enforcement than do recidivists.³⁹

Hypothesis II Incarcerated female criminals are significantly more favorable in their attitudes toward crime and less favorable in their attitudes toward law enforcement than male criminals.⁴⁰

Hypothesis III Those criminals who have a favorable attitude toward crime vary significantly from those who do not in terms of their background characteristics, i.e., age, marital status, church membership, education, occupation and place of residence.⁴¹

Before operationalization of the three hypotheses in terms of methodological considerations, it is imperative that the major concepts employed in each be defined. Operationalization will be handled in Chapter III.

The measurement of attitudes and their impact upon behavior was the major focus of this study. In this respect it is of necessity that attitude be defined:

. . . an attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations to which it is related . . . characteristically, attitude provokes behavior that is . . . favorable or unfavorable . . . toward the object or class of objects with which it is related . . . this double polarity in the direction of attitudes is often regarded as their most distinctive feature.⁴²

Bogardus defined an attitude as, ". . . a tendency to act toward or against some environmental factors which become thereby a positive or negative value."⁴³ Employed in the hypotheses are additional key terms that must be defined in order to gain the necessary perspective for the operationalization of the hypotheses. Listed below are these key terms and their definitions:

Crime	Any act or omission prohibited by public law for the protection of the public, and made punishable by the state in a judicial proceeding in its' own name. It is a public wrong, as distinguished from a mere private wrong or civil injury to an individual. ⁴⁴
Criminal	A person legally convicted of a criminal act.
Offender	A person convicted of a criminal act, sentenced to a state or federal penal institution and served time on that sentence.
Favorable	That which is distinctively helpful or advantageous in gaining an end. ⁴⁵ (Positive)
Unfavorable	Not favorable; not propitious; adverse, contrary or disadvantageous. ⁴⁶ (Negative)
Recidivist	A person convicted of a criminal act, sentenced to a state or federal penal institution as a result of that conviction, served the prescribed time on that sentence within the institution and/or parole time; convicted a second time for another criminal act and is sentenced to one of the above institutions, this person is termed a recidivist or a recidive criminal.
Law Enforcement	Persons employed on the local, state or federal level to interpret the law and apply it as they see fit, i.e., police, judges, etc.
Incarcerees	A person serving a criminal sentence in a state or federal penal institution.
Orientation	Familiarization with and adaptation to a situation or environment with interpretation of the environment as to time, objects, and persons. ⁴⁷

In Chapter I this researcher has attempted to specify the research problem under scrutiny and justify its study, after which the theoretical propositions and related empirical literature were presented. Last, the hypotheses were stated with their operational

definitions. Taking these basic research procedures into consideration, we are now ready to examine the setting in Chapter II and research methods in Chapter III employed in this study.

NOTES

¹Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology, (Philadelphia: J. P. Lippincott and Company, 1939); pp. 4-8.

²attitudes was underlined by this author for emphasis, in addition the fourth proposition was the main theoretical foundation for this study.

³Op. cit., Sutherland.

⁴Robert L. Burgess and Ronald L. Akers, "A Differential Association - Reinforcement Theory of Criminal Behavior," Social Problems, (Fall, 1966), 128-147.

⁵attitudes was underlined by this author for emphasis.

⁶Op. cit., Burgess and Akers.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Major ideas for this parallel were taken from Burgess and Akers' paper, 140.

⁹(the attitudes) was added by this author.

¹⁰Op. cit., Burgess and Akers, 140.

¹¹John C. Ball, "Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Attitudes Toward The Prevalence of Stealing," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 48 (1957-1958), 259-274.

¹²Daniel Glaser, "Criminality Theories and Behavioral Images," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 61 (March, 1956), 433-444.

¹³John R. Stratton, "Differential Identification and Attitudes Toward the Law," Social Forces, Vol. 46 (December, 1967), 256-262.

¹⁴James F. Short, Jr., "Differential Association and Delinquency," Social Problems, Vol. 4 (January 1957), 233-239.

¹⁵A. D. Mylonas and Walter C. Reckless, "Prisoners' Attitudes Toward Law and Legal Institutions," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 54, No. 4 (December, 1963), 479-484.

¹⁶A. D. Mylonas and Walter C. Reckless, "Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement in Greece and the United States," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 5, No. 1 (January, 1968), 81-88.

¹⁷Patrick T. Cleaver, A. D. Mylonas and Walter C. Reckless, "Gradients in Attitudes Toward Law, Courts, and Police," Sociological Focus, Vol. II, No. 2 (Winter, 1968), 29-40.

¹⁸Op. cit., Ball.

¹⁹Ibid., 274.

²⁰Op. cit., Glaser.

²¹Ibid.

²²Op. cit., Stratton.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid.

²⁶Op. cit., Short.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Op. cit., Mylonas and Reckless (1963).

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Ibid., 481.

³¹Ibid., 483.

³²Ibid.

³³Op. cit., Mylonas and Reckless (1968).

³⁴Ibid., 81.

³⁵Op. cit., Cleaver, Mylonas and Reckless (1968).

³⁶Ibid., 38.

³⁷Barbara A. Kay and Christine G. Schultz, "Divergence of Attitudes Toward Constituted Authority Between Male and Female Felony Inmates," Interdisciplinary Problem in Criminology: Papers of the American Society of Criminology, 1964, edited by Walter C. Reckless and Charles L. Newman, The Ohio State University, 1967, 209-216.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Op. cit., Mylonas and Reckless (1963).

⁴⁰Op. cit., Cleaver, Mylonas and Reckless (1968).

⁴¹Op. cit., Mylonas and Reckless (1968).

⁴²Martin Fishbein, Reading in Attitude Theory and Measurement, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 81.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴William L. Marshall and William L. Clark, "The Legal Definition of Crime and Criminology," A Treatise on the Law of Crimes, (Chicago: Callaghan, Callaghan and Company, 1952), editorial adaptations by M. E. Wolfgang, L. Savitz and Norman Johnston, The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency, (2nd Ed.; New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970) pp. 15-21.

⁴⁵Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, College Edition, (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1964), p. 530.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 1589.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 1102.

CHAPTER II

DESCRIPTION OF THREE KENTUCKY STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The data used in this thesis were obtained from three different samples of incarcerated criminals. One sample was drawn from each of the three Kentucky State Correctional Institutions, Kentucky State Penitentiary, Kentucky State Reformatory, and Kentucky Correctional Institute for Women.

Recently, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency conducted a detailed study of the Adult Correctional Program of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.¹ The study and recommendations that evolved from that research were used in describing the three state correctional institutions and characterizing each institution's population.²

Kentucky State Penitentiary

The Kentucky State Penitentiary, located near the small town of Eddyville, in Lyon County, overlooks Barkley Lake. The town of Eddyville was moved several years ago to allow Barkley Lake to permanently flood the area just below the penitentiary. Kentucky State Penitentiary (K.S.P.) is a walled institution, originally built between the years 1883 and 1886. The walls and original buildings were constructed of grey limestone.

The prison is located in an area of approximately 87 acres--far short of the original minimum of 200 acres recommended by the state legislature. The prison compound is surrounded on three sides by an 18-foot wall, topped by a 2-foot coping. The administration building and cell blocks provide external security on the front of the institution.

The institution has five cell blocks containing 1,086 cells. There are no dormitories. Three of the cell blocks were constructed in 1904, and the fourth was constructed in the late 1930's. The last cell block constructed is a modern type structure, properly equipped with cells of suitable size for decent habitation.

The institution was built at the time when the controlling philosophy was primarily isolation and punishment for offenders sent to prison. Accordingly, it was not constructed with a view to meeting the needs of a modern correctional program nor to provide the facilities now recognized as essential for the care and treatment of inmates. An example of this is to be found in the inmate groupings. Inmates newly committed from the courts are kept in the same cell block with inmates, including mental patients, who are segregated for custodial and other security reasons. There is regular intermingling of these men with other inmates which can seriously impair the possibility of rehabilitation.

Inmate Population at Kentucky State Penitentiary.--The inmate population at the time of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency study was 1,300. This population was made up of practically every type of offender as far as age group, crime, length of sentence, and degree of criminality was concerned.

notwithstanding the fact that the prison is the maximum security unit to which the more serious offenders are supposed to go. Commitments are made directly by the courts, with provision for the Department of Corrections transfer between LaGrange, Kentucky State Reformatory, and Eddyville.

Along with 332 prisoners serving life, there were 119 men serving lesser sentences from six months to one year. One hundred and eighty-seven inmates were 21 years of age or younger, and of these thirty-three were 18 years of age or younger. Five hundred and seventy-nine of the inmates were first offenders.

A review of the available statistics on the inmate population at K.S.P. leads to the inevitable fact that there are many youthful offenders; first offenders and other reformable men intermingled with the larger population of morally corrupted individuals; habitual criminals. This serves to point up the consequences of such a situation upon the individual who is salvageable and who is not criminal by nature, as well as the consequences of the neglect of Kentucky's prison system in terms of opportunity for human salvage.

In an average of two years and three months, all of these men except those serving life terms will be returning to their communities, either to lead law abiding lives or to commit further depredations on life and property. On the basis of the present system and the lack of realistic treatment facilities and personnel, it can be reasonably predicted that many men will come out of prison embittered and more likely to commit more serious crimes than before.

Kentucky State Reformatory

The Kentucky State Reformatory is located in a rural, agricultural community on Highway No. 146, a short distance west of the city of LaGrange and approximately twenty-six miles from Louisville, Kentucky. Many of the employees of the institution, including key custodial and maintenance personnel, live long distances from the institution. However, the institution is located near the center of population for the state. For example, Louisville is the largest city in the state, and Jefferson County, in which it is located, contributes approximately forty percent of all convictions for felony-type offenders.

The institution, the fenced enclosure of which occupies forty acres, is located on the east corner of the reformatory reservation consisting of approximately 3,400 acres of pasture and farm land. A spur line from the L&N Railroad serves the institution.

The reformatory is essentially a medium security facility, originally intended for the more reformable and tractable type of prisoners. Under present usage it has a maximum safe inmate housing capacity of approximately 1,750 men, consisting of nine dormitory buildings (seven open-dormitory type and two with individual rooms, having a total capacity of 1,616 inmates) and four small cell blocks with a total capacity of 124 inmates.

Inmate Population at Kentucky State Reformatory.--The Kentucky State Reformatory had an inmate population of 2,491 at the time of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency study. This compared with a maximum safe capacity of 1,750 inmates representing a serious

over-crowded situation. From 1951 to 1960 the population of the prison had increased approximately thirty-one percent.

The inmate population was made up of offenders of all ages from 14 up and persons convicted of practically every type of offense under the statutes. Types of crime range from the first offender sentenced for non-violent crime to the habitual, psychopathic criminal. The commitments of youths under 16 years of age is authorized only on the charges of murder and rape.

It should be noted that 1,083 or approximately forty-three percent of the total population were first offenders, and 582 of the inmates were 21 years of age and under. The present situation at the reformatory not only provides little opportunity for youthful offenders' rehabilitation, but their intermingling with the criminal population makes it inevitable that they be contaminated and that many of them may be converted to criminal ways.

Approximately thirty-seven percent of the population was confined for murder, rape, armed robbery, and other major offenses involving violence. Five hundred and ninety inmates were serving sentences of from ten years to life, including 249 life-term sentences.

Kentucky Correctional Institute for Women

The Kentucky Correctional Institute for Women is located in Shelby county, seventeen miles from Shelbyville (the county seat), twenty miles from Louisville, and twelve miles from the Kentucky State Reformatory (at LaGrange), of which the women's prison is a satellite.

The prison is isolated from immediate population centers but at the same time is in reasonably close proximity to the major population centers of the state. It is also close enough to its parent institution, K.S.R. at LaGrange, to enable it to make use of certain facilities and personnel in that institution. At the same time it is far enough removed from LaGrange to enable it to have its own identity.

The prison was built in 1938 and occupied that same year. The plant is situated on a 273 acre farm which had formerly been operated as a dairy by the central State Hospital. The main building contains office space, a kitchen and two dining rooms, an infirmary, a library, and a general purpose room which is used essentially as a class room but which also serves as an auditorium and chapel. There are also two large dormitories, ten single cells, and four sleeping rooms.

Inmate Population at Kentucky Correctional Institute for Women.--

The inmate population at the time of the National Council of Crime and Delinquency survey was 65. The average population over the last ten years has fluctuated between 59 and 76 women. There were no inmates under the age of 21 years, and 42 of the 65 were over 30 years of age.

Offenses for which the inmates were incarcerated covered a cross section of felon-type offenses, but it is noteworthy that approximately half had been convicted of murder and manslaughter.

According to institutional statistics, the educational level of the inmate population extends from illiterate to twelfth grade, with the average grade level being 6.7.

Maximum sentences for women presently in confinement ran from one year to life, with two-thirds having maximum sentences under 5 years. During the fiscal year 1960-1961, the average time served was one year and eight months. During the same year approximately two-thirds of the releases were by parole with the rest being by conditional release.

In Chapter II this writer has attempted to describe the three prison settings and to characterize the inmate populations from whence the samples were drawn. Although these data were collected in 1961 by the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, many of the same basic characteristics prevail today.

NOTES

¹National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "A Study of the Adult Correctional Program of Kentucky," (Washington, D. C.: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Reprint, 1969).

²The material presented in this chapter was taken, for the most part, directly from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency's study of the Adult Correctional Program of Kentucky. This material was collected during the years 1961 and 1962, and was the most recent available.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

The data used in this thesis were collected during the time period November, 1969, through May, 1970 and as stated earlier were from three Kentucky Correctional Institutions; Kentucky State Penitentiary, Kentucky State Reformatory, and Kentucky Correctional Institute for Women. One sample was drawn from each of the penal institution populations. The two men's sample were matched by race and type of offense. The total volunteer population at the women's prison, 37 inmates, composed the third sample.

Sample Selection

Due to the relatively large population size at Kentucky State Reformatory and the structure of the hypotheses, a stratified random sampling technique was selected. To maintain a high degree of homogeneity, the criteria for the stratified sample were designated as follows: first sentence served in a state or federal penal institution as an adult, Caucasian, and property offenders. By taking advantage of the method of dealing with recently sentenced offenders and the current offender population, randomization of the sample was assured by three means. First, prison identification numbers were assigned in a sequential order at the date of entrance to the prison, thus an unalphabetized classification file was available. Second, entrance to the institution varied according to

the local authorities. Many local sheriffs, due to distance to the prison, would wait several months before finally arriving at the prison with a sufficient number of new inmates. The occurrence of many arrivals at one time was thought to minimize possible bias in the selection of the sample. Third, a total list of all inmates by prison identification number was compiled, taking into consideration the aforementioned stratum. The total number of inmates falling into these strata, approximately 500, were then divided by sixty with the resulting dividend being the interval size for the selection of the sample.

The nature of the hypotheses made it necessary to draw a stratified random sample from the prison population at the Kentucky State Penitentiary. The criteria for stratifying the sample, as explained previously, were, recidivists (two or more times in a state or federal penal institution), Caucasian, and property offenders. The stratified randomization was assured by the same selection means employed at Kentucky State Reformatory. A total of fifty-five interviews were conducted at this institution.

Due to the size of the inmate population at the Kentucky Correctional Institute for Women, a stratified sample was impossible. There were only 55 women in prison. The deputy warden put the interviews on a voluntary basis, and thirty-seven interviews were secured.

The Samples

Property offenders alone were included in the two men's sample, since they represent the largest single category of offenders. The

property offenders are regarded as the group in which criminal careers are concentrated. Inmates that are convicted of "crimes against the person," i.e., murder, rape, manslaughter, are considered to be non-habitual with chances or opportunity of recidivism almost non-existent.¹

With the samples determined, attitude and background characteristic data were then collected by means of an interview schedule.

The Interview Schedule

Administration of the interview schedules were conducted by fellow graduate students and by the writer. Standards for administering the schedules were maintained for each sample. Consistency was maintained in all three samples by three means. First, each interviewee was given a basic set of oral instructions by the interviewer.² These instructions included the anonymous³ nature of the schedule and basic justification for conducting the interview; second, a maximum time limit of thirty minutes was allocated for each interview; and third, when the interviewee did not understand a particular item, a very brief explanation was given by the interviewer.

The interview schedule contained a total of thirty attitudinal statements which represented seven general areas: criminal identification, associational preference, inmate loyalty, stealing, police, prosecutor, and crime and law enforcement. From these statements, areas of concentration were selected. These areas as indicated were the inmates' attitudes toward crime and law enforcement.

The face sheet contained twenty-three items that were used to characterize the diverse backgrounds of the samples. The entire interview schedule is presented in the appendix.

Attitude Measurement

In the original proposal attitudinal measurements were to some extent to have been confined to specific individual item analysis. However, after the data were collected on attitude scale, using Guttman's⁴ theory and methodology, it was constructed in the content-area of attitudes toward crime and law enforcement.

The scale contained four items but later was reduced to three items based on scalogram criteria and a low inter-item correlation of one item. The three items scaled at the coefficient of reproducibility level of .94. The standard errors associated with each item were, twenty-one, twenty, and fifteen respectively. The standard error of estimate for the observed coefficient of reproducibility was .015. The three item scale provided the means whereby comparisons of first offenders, recidivists, and women's attitudes toward crime and law enforcement were made.

The use of the three-item scale was not without precedence. In discussing scaling and scale theory, Stouffer (1950)⁵, under the auspices of Louis Guttman and others, indicated justification for the use of three or four item scales.⁶ In the measurement of "Receptivity Toward Christian Education," Nelsen (1970)⁷ employed a three item Guttman-type scale. Other researchers that have used three or four item scales as evidenced by the literature were Quinney (1964)⁸ and Tumin (1958).⁹

The scale was judged reliable based on the internal consistency and interrelationship of the three items. All three items employed in the scale had been previously judged reliable, according to Rundquist and Sletto's¹⁰ study of attitudes toward the law. The items used in the construction of the scale were obtained directly from Rundquist and Sletto's extensive law scale and the scale used in the present study is comparable to their scale. Disagreement with a particular item indicated a positive attitude toward crime and a negative attitude toward law. The scale items are listed below.

Attitude Toward Crime¹¹

1. Court decisions are almost always just.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

2. In the court a poor man will receive as fair treatment as a millionaire.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

3. On the whole, policemen are honest.

- (1) Strongly Agree
- (2) Agree
- (3) Disagree
- (4) Strongly Disagree

After an examination of the percentage distribution for each item was made, the responses were dichotomized, agree or

disagree, due to the size of the total number of respondents in each cell.

Individual items in the content-area of crime and law enforcement were also cross-tabulated with the aforementioned background characteristics. Those crime and law enforcement items that related most significantly to the background characteristics will be presented in Chapter IV. However, the attitude toward crime scale was the most empirically efficient means used to measure criminals' attitudes toward crime and law enforcement.

NOTES

¹Julian Roebuck, "A Tentative Criminal Typology of Negro Felons," (Unpublished, typewritten manuscript, 1946). According to Roebuck, . . . crimes against the person are committed by criminal "amateurs," very often as a consequence of circumstantial factors or unusual pressures. Often amateurs' crimes are outbursts of passion, aggression, or pathological distortions of the sexual impulse. They comprise only a small percentage of the prison population. Property offenders are very different in a number of ways. They reflect a more diverse etiology . . . crimes of property offenders derive from social, economic, and cultural circumstances . . . weaknesses of character. . . .

²The basic set of instructions were given to each member of the interview team by this writer. The instructions were committed to memory and employed in the pretesting situation and at the penal institutions.

³The anonymity was established to control dishonesty. See John C. Ball's explanation of this factor in a similar interview situation. John C. Ball, "Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Attitudes Toward the Prevalence of Stealing," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 48 (1957), 262.

⁴Louis Guttman, "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data," American Sociological Review, Vol. 9 (1944), 106.

⁵Samuel Stouffer, "An Overview of the Contributions to Scaling and Scale Theory," Measurement and Prediction, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), Chapter 1, pp. 17-18.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Hart Nelsen, "Attitudes Toward Religious Education in Appalachia," Religious Education, January-February, 1970, pp. 50-55.

⁸Richard Quinney, "Political Conservatism, Alienation, and Fatalism: Contingencies of Social Status and Religious Fundamentalism," Sociometry, Vol. 27 (1964), 372-381.

⁹Melvin Tumin, Paul Barton and Bernie Burrus. "Education, Prejudice and Discrimination: A Study in Readiness for Desegregation," American Sociological Review, Vol. 23 (1958), 41-49.

¹⁰E. A. Rundquist and R. F. Sletto, Personality In The Depression, A Study in the Measurement of Attitudes, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1936), pp. 25-26.

¹¹Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

DATA AND FINDINGS

Before discussing the findings, it is necessary to further describe the basic background characteristics of the respondents.

General Background Characteristics

As to the sex distribution, the two men's samples represented seventy-five percent of the total respondents, thus a three to one ratio between men and women inmates.

Approximately one-half or 45 percent of the respondents were single and had never been married. Thirty-two percent of the inmates were married, with the remaining 20 percent either divorced or widowed.

The age distribution, as was expected, was skewed with approximately 61 percent of the total 29 years of age or younger. The remaining 39 percent of the inmates interviewed were almost evenly distributed between the ages of 30 and 50.

Fifty-five percent of the total number of inmates interviewed were church members. One-half of the church members were Protestant and approximately 38 percent were members of a Catholic church. The remaining 20 percent were either members of the Jewish faith or a church of another type.

The percentage distribution for the 148 inmates' academic achievement level was: thirty-five percent had some elementary

school education (first to seventh grade); fifty-two percent of the inmates had had some high school education (eighth to twelfth grade); eight percent had received their high school diploma; five percent had attended college for at least a short period of time.

The percentage distribution for the types of property offenses by typology¹ are as follows:

Types	Classification	Number	Percent
Theft.....	Auto Cattle Rustling Grand Larceny Stolen Goods	29	19.6
Forgery.....	Credit Cards Uttering a Forged Instrument Accessory to Forgery	39	26.4
Burglary.....	Breaking and Entering Safecracking	55	37.2
Other*.....	Arson Narcotics Armed Robbery	25	16.8
.....Totals.....		148	100.0

*(Other indicated non-typology types, crimes usually involving contact with a victim.)

There seemed to be considerable discrepancy between the inmates' perceptions of the community size, where he or she had lived most of their lives, and the actual census size of the community. Most inmates' perceptions of their community size was approximately twice the actual size. Eighty-seven percent of the inmates listed their

place of residence as Kentucky, and the remaining 30 percent were from border states to the north of Kentucky.

The distribution by types of occupation are as follows:

Occupation	Number	Percent
Farm Laborers or Foremen	8	5.4
Private Household Workers	4	2.7
Laborers, except Farm and Mine	35	23.6
Service Workers, except Private Household Workers	24	16.2
Operatives and Kindred Workers	23	15.5
Clerical or Kindred Workers	6	4.1
Sales Workers	4	2.7
Craftsmen, Foremen or Kindred Workers	24	16.2
Managers, Officials and Proprietors	6	4.1
Professional, Technical or Kindred Workers	6	4.1
Totals	N=140	%=94.6

(Eight or 5.4 percent of the inmates did not respond to the question.)

The general background characteristics and percentage distributions served two purposes: first, to directionalize the generalizations that can be drawn from this study; second, to set in the reader's mind the approximate scope and depth of this study.

The Scale

The attitudes toward crime scale was reliable in that the items were judged to be adequately centered in the content-area, based on their interrelationship as determined by cross-tabulations and the coefficient of reproducibility. The coefficient of reproducibility level was .94 for the three samples. Each sample was not scaled separately due to the total sample size and homogeneity factors. The respondents were given a choice of four answers to each of the scale

statements, strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree. The inmates answers were later dichotomized into two categories, agree or disagree, as a result of the total sample size (148 inmates) and subsequent cell size. Respondents that were in agreement with a statement were given a scale score of zero (0), and those in disagreement were given a scale score of one (1). This procedure was carried out for each of the three statements. Thus, respondents that accumulated total scale score of zero or one possessed a positive attitude toward law and a negative attitude toward crime. The respondents that accumulated scores of two or three possessed a positive attitude toward crime and a negative attitude toward law.

Tabular Analysis

As indicated above, a raw scale score of zero, one, two, or three, was given to each respondent so that cross-tabulations of all hypothesized variables could be made to the attitude toward crime scale. Table 1 shows the extent of attitudinal differences as compared to the number of sentences served in a state or federal penal institution.

As evidenced by Table 1, there is no significant relationship between first offenders, second offenders, and third or more frequent offenders, and the attitude variable. Inmates that had served three or more sentences were slightly higher on the attitude variable (positive attitude toward crime) than were the two other categories of inmates. These differences were 8 percent for second offenders and 11 percent for first offenders.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF CRIMINALS' ATTITUDE TOWARD CRIME BY
NUMBER OF SENTENCES SERVED

	Negative Attitude		Positive Attitude		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
First	25	29.77	59	70.24	84	100.0
Second	9	34.33	18	66.67	27	100.0
Third (+)	8	21.63	29	78.38	37	100.0

Chi square = 1.236, df=2, p= <.50, *V=.0419, N=148 (when one tailed test was used.)²

(To test chi square the columns were collapsed into a forced dichotomy to increase the number of cases in each cell.)

*See footnote for explanation of V.

In Table 2 the inmates' sex and marital status characteristics were contrasted with the variable, attitude toward crime. Scale scores and computed statistical tests indicated a significant relationship between inmates' attitudes toward crime and the two characteristics, sex and marital status. As indicated in Table 2 a larger percentage of males, 78.9 percent, than females, 64.2 percent, are found in the positive attitude toward crime category.

Further examination of Table 2 revealed that marital status and the crime variable were positively associated. A larger percentage of single inmates, N=55 or 83.3 percent, indicated a positive attitude toward crime as compared with inmates in the other three categories. However, upon further examination of the negative attitudes toward crime (positive attitude toward law), the table revealed that more married inmates, N=20 or 42.5 percent, as compared

with inmates in the other three categories, possessed a non-favorable attitude toward crime (positive attitude toward law).

TABLE 2
DISTRIBUTION OF INMATES' ATTITUDE TOWARD CRIME
BY SEX* AND MARITAL STATUS*

	Negative Attitude (0) (1)				Positive Attitude (2) (3)				Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
SEX										
Male	7	6.31	22	19.82	31	27.93	51	45.95	111	100.0
Female	7	18.92	6	16.22	6	16.22	18	48.65	37	100.0
MARITAL STATUS										
Single	4	6.06	7	10.61	16	24.24	39	59.09	66	100.0
Married	5	10.64	15	31.91	12	25.53	15	31.91	47	100.0
Divorced	4	14.81	4	14.81	8	29.63	11	40.74	27	100.0
Separated and Widowed	1	12.50	2	25.00	1	12.50	4	50.00	8	100.0

Sex: Chi square=6.42, df=3, $p < .05$ (When one tailed test was used), $V = .2083$, *(75 percent of the total were male).

Marital Status: Chi square=14.13, df=9, $p < .06$ (When one tailed test was used), $V = .1784$, *44.6 percent of the total were single.

As evidenced in Table 3, there was no significant relationship between the inmate's area of residence and his or her attitude toward crime. About all that could be said is that inmates that have lived in urban areas of 10,000 to 100,000 were somewhat more crime oriented than were others.

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF INMATES' ATTITUDES TOWARD
CRIME BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE

Residence Size	Negative Attitude (0) (1)				Positive Attitude (2) (3)				Totals	
	N		%		N		%		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1. Under 2,500	6	16.67	4	11.11	12	33.33	14	38.89	36	100.0
2. Under 10,000	4	12.50	7	21.88	10	31.25	11	34.38	32	100.0
3. 10,000 to 100,000	2	4.65	9	20.93	8	18.60	24	55.81	43	100.0
4. 100,000 to 1 Million	2	6.67	6	20.00	5	16.67	17	56.67	30	100.0

Chi square=10.7883, df=9, $p < .14$ (When one tailed test was used).

$V = .1587$, $N = 141$ (Seven or 21.9 percent of the inmates did not answer the question).

In Tables 4 and 5 comparisons were made between individual orientation items on the interview schedule in the content-area of crime and law enforcement and various inmate characteristics, i.e., marital status, sex, number of sentences served in a state or federal penal institution, and education.

According to Table 4, within the total inmate samples there was a consistent relationship between individual non-scale crime and law enforcement orientation items (variables) by marital status. Item number three: How many people would steal something if they had a good chance?; and item number four: We would have less crime if our laws were more strict; indicated a significant relationship between the marital status variable and the crime and law enforcement variables. More single inmates indicated a slightly more positive

TABLE 4

INDIVIDUAL ITEM COMPARISONS: BY MARITAL STATUS
TO CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT VARIABLES

	Marital Status	Negative Attitude		Positive Attitude		Totals	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1. (It's all right for a person to break the law if he doesn't get caught)	Single	52	78.79	14	21.21	66	100.0
	Married	39	82.98	8	17.02	47	100.0
	Divorced	19	70.37	8	29.63	27	100.0
	Separated & Widowed	7	95.28	1	4.72	8	100.0
2. (How many people would steal from a store if they had a good chance?)	Single	18	27.27	48	72.73	66	100.0
	Married	26	55.32	21	44.68	47	100.0
	Divorced	7	25.93	20	74.07	27	100.0
	Separated & Widowed	3	37.50	5	62.50	8	100.0
3. (How many people would steal something if they had a good chance?)	Single	7	10.61	59	83.39	66	100.0
	Married	16	34.04	31	65.96	47	100.0
	Divorced	5	18.52	22	81.48	27	100.0
	Separated & Widowed	3	37.50	5	62.50	8	100.0
4. (We would have less crime if our laws were more strict)	Single	27	40.91	39	59.90	66	100.0
	Married	28	59.57	19	40.43	47	100.0
	Divorced	11	40.74	16	59.26	27	100.0
	Separated & Widowed	5	62.50	3	37.50	8	100.0
5. (On the whole, policemen are honest)	Single	10	15.15	56	84.85	66	100.0
	Married	24	51.06	23	48.94	47	100.0
	Divorced	10	37.04	17	62.96	27	100.0
	Separated & Widowed	3	37.50	5	62.50	8	100.0

1. Chi square=17.2447, df=3, $p < .001$ (When one tailed test was used). $V = .2859$, $N = 148$.

2. Chi square=10.9139, df=3, $p < .07$ (When one tailed test was used). $V = .2716$, $N = 148$.

3. Chi square=10.5499, df=3, $p < .008$ (When one tailed test was used). $V = .2670$, $N = 148$.

4. Chi square=5.0963, df=3, $p < .09$ (When one tailed test was used). $V=.1856$, $N=148$.

5. Chi square=16.9500, df=3, $p < .001$ (When one tailed test was used). $V=.3384$, $N=148$.

orientation toward crime than did other status categories of inmates. Items number one, two, and five were also consistent with the positive orientation toward crime as expressed by the single and divorced inmates. (1) It's all right for a person to break the law if he doesn't get caught; (2) How many people would steal from a store if they had a good chance? (5) On the whole policemen are honest. Of the four categories, those least oriented toward crime (orientation toward law) were either married, and separated or widowed inmates.

In Table 5 individual items in the content-area of crime and law enforcement were compared to the number of sentences served in a state or federal penal institution. Items (1) A man should always obey the law, no matter how much it interferes with his personal desire; and item (2) Court decisions are almost always just; indicated that the number of sentences served in a state or federal penal institution, two or more, were positively associated with these two crime and law enforcement items. In both cases more recidivists were shown to possess positive orientations toward crime than were first offenders. Item (3) We would have less crime if our laws were more strict; and item (4) A hungry man has the right to steal; were also significantly related to the numbers of sentences served. More recidivists indicated positive orientations toward crime than first offenders. The table also illustrates that first offenders possessed the highest negative orientation toward crime (positive orientation toward law) compared to recidivists.

TABLE 5

 INDIVIDUAL ITEM COMPARISON: NUMBER OF SENTENCES
 SERVED TO CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT VARIABLES

	Number of Sentences Served	Negative Attitude		Positive Attitude		Totals	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1. (A man should always obey the law, no matter how much it interferes with his personal desire)	First	73	86.90	11	13.10	84	100.0
	Second	22	81.48	5	18.52	27	100.0
	Third (+)	24	64.86	13	35.14	37	100.0
2. (Court decisions are almost always just)	First	37	44.05	47	55.95	84	100.0
	Second	13	48.15	14	51.85	27	100.0
	Third (+)	9	24.32	28	75.68	37	100.0
3. (We would have less crime if our laws were more strict)	First	47	55.95	37	44.05	84	100.0
	Second	10	37.04	17	62.96	27	100.0
	Third (+)	14	37.84	23	62.16	37	100.0
4. (A hungry man has the right to steal)	First	63	75.00	21	25.00	84	100.0
	Second	17	62.96	10	37.04	27	100.0
	Third (+)	21	56.76	16	43.24	37	100.0

1. Chi square=7.9437, df=2, $p < .01$ (When one tailed test was used.) $V = .2317$, $N = 148$.

2. Chi square=5.1133, df=2, $p < .04$ (When one tailed test was used.) $V = .1859$, $N = 148$.

3. Chi square=4.9594, df=2, $p < .05$ (When one tailed test was used.) $V = .1831$, $N = 148$.

4. Chi square=4.3695, df=2, $p < .06$ (When one tailed test was used.) $V = .1718$, $N = 148$.

Table 6 indicates that within the inmate samples there was a significant relationship between the variable education and the orientation toward crime item (1) Court decisions are almost always just. More inmates who had achieved some high school education or

more expressed a positive orientation toward crime than did the inmates who had received less formal education. Item (2) How many people would steal something if they had a good chance? indicated that more males than females were positively orientated toward crime.

TABLE 6
INDIVIDUAL ITEM COMPARISON: EDUCATION AND SEX
TO CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT VARIABLES

	Negative Attitude		Positive Attitude		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Inmates Education						
No formal education to completion of 6th grade. . . .	28	47.46	31	52.54	59	100.0
Seventh grade to some college education.	28	31.46	61	68.54	89	100.0
2. Sex of the Inmate						
Male	20	18.02	91	81.98	111	100.0
Female	11	29.73	26	70.27	37	100.0

1. (Court decisions are almost always just)
Chi square=3.2100, df=1, $p < .04$ (When one tailed test was used.) $V=.1473$, $N=148$.

2. (How many people would steal something if they had a good chance?)
Chi square=3.06, df=1, $p < .04$ (When one tailed test was used.) $V=.1438$, $N=148$.

In Chapter IV this writer has attempted to present the most significant findings with reference to the research topic. In Chapter V these findings are discussed with inferences and interpretations that relate to previous research findings.

NOTES

¹Julian Roebuck, "A Tentative Criminal Typology of Negro Felons." The purpose of Roebuck's typology was to categorize different types of property offenders in a simple manner so that differences could be shown between these types of criminals.

²Although chi square is a nondirectional test, there may be cases when it can be used in making a one tailed test. In this case, the p value is doubled, i.e., 5 percent point becomes 2.706. N. M. Dennie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods, (2nd ed; New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1965), p. 169.

³In order to measure the relative importance of the various background characteristics, i.e., sex, marital status, church membership, etc., on the attitude and orientation variables, a chi square based measure of the degree of association was used. Although not widely used in the social science literature, Cramer's V has several advantages over traditional measurements of association. Cramer's V (denoted as V) compensates for differences in both sample size and the number of categories in each variable, and since it lies between 0 and 1, it affords a rough index of predictive association between two variables. A value of 0 reflects complete independence, and 1, reflects complete dependence, of the attributes being measured. See Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Social Statistics, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), pp. 228-231; Richard Quinney, Sociometry, Vol. 27 (1964), 372-381; and William L. Hays, Statistics for Psychologists, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963), pp. 606-609.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS AND INFERENCES

The interpretations and inferences that are discussed in this chapter are based on the premise that the processes of socialization of "prisonization"¹ that take place within the "prison community" have an effect upon incarcerated inmates' attitudes and subsequent criminal behavior.

Analysis of these data, both scale and individual items, supported a significant relationship between the inmates' marital status and attitudes and orientations toward crime and law enforcement variables. More single and divorced inmates indicated favorable attitudes and orientations toward crime and less favorable attitudes and orientations toward law and law enforcement than did either married, separated, or widowed inmates. Tappan (1960)² offered an explanation of how marital status affects attitudes and behavior:

. . . many prisoners have had too little time and opportunity before their imprisonment to marry or, if married, to divorce or separate. Thus, the relatively high proportion of single males who are convicted of burglary and car theft, and to a lesser extent, of ordinary larceny and robbery, probably reflect the predominant youthfulness of offenders of those types rather than an indisposition to marital life . . . it is certain that those who live with a wife are less frequently convicted than those who are single, separated or divorced.³

. . . It is apparent that stable and satisfying marriages tend to prevent or reduce criminality and in many instances they may be largely responsible for terminating criminal careers. Marriage thus has a

greater impact of attitudes,⁴ emotions, self-esteem, and regard for others than do most life experiences and associations.⁵

. . . Conversely, where the individual cannot attain an acceptable mate or cannot find compatibility in marriage the chances of his criminality are enhanced. . . .⁶

Thus it may be concluded from Tappan's explanation that the social factor of marital status has an effect upon attitudes and behavior patterns of the marital partner.

There was a significant relationship between the crime and law enforcement variables and the sex variable. However, as hypothesized, females were expected to indicate a significantly more favorable attitude toward crime than males; this situation did not prevail. In terms of the percentage distribution, there was almost an exact one to one ratio between males and females, when positive attitudes toward crime and law enforcement were analyzed. The only evidence that would substantiate this finding would reflect upon the female sample. Evidently, the women's sample was biased to a lesser degree by the non-property offenders included in the 37 interviews conducted. The women's sample, as indicated in Chapter III, included several first offenders incarcerated for crimes against the person such as murder and child abuse.

According to many criminologists, there is a statistically significant difference between the rate of crime among young adults and the rate of crime among other age groups. Although it may be true that there are more youthful offenders involved in crime, the probability of youth crime being detected is much greater than the probability of detection of more "experienced," criminal offenders.

Within the three samples, 61 percent of the inmates interviewed were semi-youthful offenders, ages 18 to 29. Many of these youthful offenders were serving their first sentence in a state or federal penal institution, and they were not expected to evidence positive attitudes and orientations toward crime, or negative attitudes and orientations toward law and law enforcement. These assumptions were based on short duration and minimal amount of experience in a state institution. It was apparent that not enough time had elapsed for the processes of "prisonization" to have had an adverse effect upon these inmates' attitudes and behavior. Although frequency and duration of experience, based on the number of sentences served in a state or federal penal institution, were not significantly related to the attitudes toward crime variable, individual item analysis revealed the following results. More first offenders tended to have favorable orientations toward law and law enforcement, while more recidivists showed positive orientations toward crime, and negative orientations toward law and law enforcement. These findings, although limited in depth, are supportive of Sutherland's⁷ contentions that duration, priority, and experience with delinquent groups have an adverse effect upon normative orientations and attitudes and resulting criminal behavior.

According to these data, church membership and church attendance had little or no effect upon the inmates' attitudes and orientations toward crime and law enforcement. Church membership in most cases exerts religious control over its members. As indicated in Chapter III, over 55 percent of the inmates included in the total sample were church members. However, it can be assumed that the

church was unable to communicate with or have an effective control over those members who were involved in criminal behavior and as a result were incarcerated.

The bureaucratic structure of the formal education system also exerts institutional pressures upon its students to conform to the normative behavior pattern of society. The dependent variables, academic achievement level, and the reason for having dropped out of school, were not related to the crime and law enforcement variables. Only one item indicated a relationship between the two variables. More inmates who had attended high school or were high school graduates indicated favorable orientations toward crime than other inmates with less formal education. Taking into consideration the samples, this occurrence was expected but to a greater extent, because many of the property offenses for which these inmates were convicted involve a quasi-high degree of skill and intelligence, i.e., forgery and breaking and entering.

The legal occupation⁸ variable was not related either to any of the individual items in the content-area of crime and law enforcement or to the crime scale. These findings are supportive of many criminologists' investigations in that economic conditions per se are of minor importance when social determinants of criminal behavior and attitudes are concerned. Although the majority of the incarcerated came from working class⁹ environments, crime is by no means a working class phenomenon. Most studies have indicated that high ratios of working class persons have concentrated on crime against property such as larceny or burglary. Thus we would expect to find a small percentage of working class persons involved in crimes such

as embezzlement or fraud, because the availability and opportunity of this middle class situation, appropriate for criminal behavior, would be almost non-existent for the working class person.

Many criminologists point to the fact that urban areas have predominantly higher crime rates than rural areas. In this thesis, the place of residence was not significantly related to the crime and law enforcement variables. However, based on the percentage distributions for rural and urban areas of residence, positive orientations toward crime were greater among the inmates from an urban setting. Two factors may influence this behavior pattern. First, family conformity pressures upon its members are far greater in the rural setting than in the urban; and many minor activities that are in violation of the law are handled within the family. The same situation in the urban setting probably would be handled by legal authorities, because family conformity pressures are less evident in the urban areas. Second, situations appropriate for the learning of criminal attitudes and behavior, i.e., association with delinquent gangs, etc., are far greater in the urban setting than in the rural.

The Hypotheses

The hypothesis: Since attitudes toward crime and law enforcement will vary significantly with the criminal record, i.e., the number of felonies committed followed by a prison term, the single (first) offenders should have significantly less favorable attitudes toward crime and more favorable attitudes toward law and law enforcement than recidivists,

was considered to be the primary test of the theoretical propositions on which this thesis is based. In this hypothesis, positive attitudes toward crime and negative attitudes toward law and law enforcement were dependent upon the appropriate situation in which these attitudes and subsequent behavior could be learned. This learning situation, according to Sutherland, takes place within intimate personal groups, i.e., the prison community. Within this learning situation, techniques of committing crimes and the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes are acquired. These learning situations are also dependent upon frequency (number of sentences served in a given period of time); upon the intensity of learning (increasing as recidive sentences are incurred); upon duration (length of time for each sentence); upon priority (preference for learning criminal behavior over non-criminal behavior patterns); and upon intensity (the degree of effect upon the inmate in the appropriate situation for criminal behavior to be learned.) This hypothesis in many ways was a corollary of Sutherland's theoretical propositions employed in the differential association theory of criminal behavior. In this respect the findings, although to a limited degree, were considered to support Sutherland's theory. These findings were also supporting of Mylonas and Reckless' (1963)¹⁰ findings that first offenders expressed more favorable attitudes toward law and legal institutions than recidivists. This supportive factor is based on the premise that a negative attitude toward law indicates a positive attitude toward crime and resulting behavior.

Hypothesis number two: Incarcerated female criminals are significantly more favorable in their attitudes toward crime and less favorable in their attitudes toward law enforcement than incarcerated male criminals,

which evolved from the combined studies of Kay and Schultz (1964)¹¹ and Cleaver, Mylonas and Reckless (1968)¹² was significantly related to the attitude variable but did not substantiate their findings. This thesis was based on scale analysis and individual items in the content-area of the variables, crime and law enforcement.

In hypothesis number three: Those criminals who have a favorable (positive) attitude toward crime vary significantly from those who do not in terms of their background characteristics, i.e., age, marital status, church membership, education, reason for dropping out of school, occupation, and place of residence,

the background characteristic marital status was the variable most significantly related to the variables attitudes and orientations toward crime and law enforcement. Both scale analysis and individual item analysis in the content area supported this finding. The other background characteristics that were related, based on individual item analysis, included the inmates' level of formal education and the inmates' place of residence. The remaining background variables, church membership, reason for dropping out of school, and occupation, were not related to the criminal attitude scale or the individual items in the content area of attitudes and orientations toward crime and law enforcement.

While the findings in this thesis were associated with several propositions that were posited by Sutherland in his differential association theory of criminal behavior, they cannot represent a valid test of the theory. However, it can be concluded that this study was a corollary of Sutherland's theory, and in this "frame of reference" represents a quasi-valid test of the theory.

NOTES

¹Donald Clemmer, The Prison Community, (New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1966), pp. 298-299. According to Clemmer, prisonization is the process of assimilation of the prison culture by inmates as they become acquainted with the prison world.

²Paul W. Tappan, Crime, Justice, and Correction, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960), pp. 215-234.

³Ibid.

⁴A line was drawn under the word attitudes in Tappan's quotation by this writer for emphasis only.

⁵Op. cit., Tappan.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Edwin H. Sutherland, Principles of Criminology, (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1947), pp. 5-7.

⁸Several inmates indicated that they had never held a legal job and were eliminated from the occupation types. Several indicated that crime had been their sole means of income and listed their occupation as professional criminal.

⁹Social class and/or socio-economic-status were not considered social determinants of criminals' attitudes toward crime and law enforcement, thus were not analyzed in depth.

¹⁰A. D. Mylonas and W. C. Reckless, "Prisoners' Attitudes Toward Law and Legal Institutions," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, Vol. 54, No. 4 (December, 1963), 479-484.

¹¹Barbara A. Kay and Christine G. Schultz, "Divergence of Attitudes Toward Constituted Authority Between Male and Female Felony Inmates," Interdisciplinary Problems in Criminology: Papers of the American Society of Criminology, (1964), 209-216.

¹²Patrick T. Cleaver, A. D. Mylonas, and Walter C. Reckless, "Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement in Greece and the United States," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 5, No. 1 (January, 1968), 81-88.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study indicate crime and law enforcement attitude and orientation differences among the three samples employed. More recidive criminals possessed favorable attitudes and orientations toward crime and less favorable attitudes and orientations toward law and law enforcement than did either first offenders or women inmates. Attitudes and orientations toward crime and law enforcement also varied by three background characteristics, marital status, age, and academic achievement level.

Two measurements of criminals' attitudes and orientations toward crime and law enforcement were utilized in this study: first, a Guttman-type scale was constructed in the content-area; and the computed coefficient of reproducibility level for this scale was .94; second, individual items (statements of the schedule) in the content area of crime and law enforcement were cross-tabulated with all hypothesized inmate background characteristics to determine the significant dependent variables that influenced positive and/or negative orientations toward crime and law enforcement.

These findings were considered to be supportive corollaries of Edwin H. Sutherland's "differential association theory of criminal behavior."

The most significant findings, based on scale and individual item analysis were the variables, marital status and sex which were found to be significantly related to the variables, attitudes and orientations toward crime and law enforcement. More male inmates who were single or divorced were shown to possess positive attitudes and orientations toward crime, and more negative attitudes and orientations toward law and law enforcement, than women inmates.

This thesis suggests that the attitudes and orientations of incarcerated criminals might be used to predict that group's criminal behavior. Future research based on this assumption and tested in a similar situation to that utilized in this study should be undertaken. However, several important factors should be taken into consideration before another study of this nature is pursued. To insure a high degree of empirical validity, future researchers should concern themselves with the development of a highly reliable attitude scale in the content area of crime. Second, the selection of the samples should represent the extreme conditions exemplified in this thesis, i.e., for control purposes, a sample of youthful first offenders (property offenders) should be interviewed at the date of entrance to an adult state or federal penal institution, and the selection of the experimental sample should represent habitual recidive property offenders. These two factors would help to insure the empirical validity of the measurement of criminals' attitudes and orientations toward crime and enable researchers to test Edwin H. Sutherland's theory more adequately.

Despite the limitations of this thesis it is a valuable piece of research for those individuals who are in a position to modify

current prison systems, which constitute the processes of inmate prisonization. With the knowledge of the relationship between criminals' attitudes and orientations toward crime and law enforcement, to the variables: sex, marital status, number of sentences served in a state or federal penal institution, place of residence, and education, prison programs could be adjusted to meet the various rehabilitating needs of the inmates. This is not to say that prisons should attempt to remold each incarcerated into one particular "social type." The inverse application of the differential association of criminal behavior has been attempted in several prison settings with some success. Through association with small anti-criminal inclusive groups in prisons, criminal's attitudes and resulting behavior have been influenced. Until an attempt is made to resocialize each incarcerated into normative "patterns of behavior," recidivism and recidivist crime rates will remain at a high level.

APPENDIX

THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

FACE SHEET

Instructions: Question 1 through 23, check the appropriate answer.

1. Sex: (1) Male _____ (2) Female _____
2. Marital status: (1) Single _____ (2) Married _____
(3) Separated _____ (4) Divorced _____
(5) Widowed _____
- 3-4. Age: (1) _____ 12-14; (2) _____ 15-17; (3) _____ 18-20;
(4) _____ 21-23; (5) _____ 24-26; (6) _____ 27-29;
(7) _____ 30-32; (8) _____ 33-35; (9) _____ 36-39;
(10) _____ 40-49; (11) _____ 50-59; (12) _____ 60-69;
(13) _____ 70-79; (14) _____ 80-89; (15) _____ 90+
5. Are you a member of a church? (1) _____ Yes; (2) _____ No;
6. If so, what church? (1) Protestant _____ (2) Catholic _____
(3) Jewish _____ (4) Other _____
7. Outside prison, what church did you last attend?
8. Race: (1) White _____ (2) Negro _____ (3) Other _____
9. How far did you go in school?
(1) No formal education _____
(2) Elementary school _____
(3) Some high school _____
(4) Finished high school _____
(5) Some college _____
(6) College graduate _____
(7) Vocational school _____
10. Why did you leave school?
(1) Disliked school _____
(2) Discipline problem _____
(3) Flunked out _____
(4) Financial problem _____
(5) Other _____

11. Approximately how much money did you make off crime each month?

- (1) _____ \$ 0-99
- (2) _____ 100-199
- (3) _____ 200-299
- (4) _____ 300-399
- (5) _____ 400-499
- (6) _____ 500-599
- (7) _____ 600-999
- (8) _____ 1000-1399
- (9) _____ 1400 +

12. Approximately what was your total income off crime and other things combined, each month?

- (1) _____
- (2) _____
- (3) _____
- (4) _____
- (5) _____
- (6) _____
- (7) _____
- (8) _____
- (9) _____

13. What size and type of community have you lived in most of your life?

- (1) _____ Rural community (2,500 or less)
- (2) _____ Urban community (under 10,000)
- (3) _____ Urban community (10,000-100,000)
- (4) _____ Urban community (100,000-1,000,000)
- (5) _____ Urban community (1,000,000 and over)

14. What is the name of the community and in what state is it located?

(1) Community _____ (2) State _____

15-
16. What legitimate job did you hold last?

17-
18. What is your occupation?

- | | |
|---|------------|
| _____ (1) Farm Laborers and foremen | _____ (1) |
| _____ (2) Private household workers | _____ (2) |
| _____ (3) Farmers and farm managers | _____ (3) |
| _____ (4) Laborers, except farm and mine | _____ (4) |
| _____ (5) Service workers, except private household | _____ (5) |
| _____ (6) Operatives and kindred workers | _____ (6) |
| _____ (7) Clerical and kindred workers | _____ (7) |
| _____ (8) Sales workers | _____ (8) |
| _____ (9) Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers | _____ (9) |
| _____ (10) Managers, officials, and proprietors, except foremen | _____ (10) |
| _____ (11) Professional, technical, and kindred workers | _____ (11) |

19. Which of the following describes your parents contact with the law?

Father	Mother
_____ 1. Never been arrested	_____ 1.
_____ 2. Arrested	_____ 2.
_____ 3. Criminal Record	_____ 3.
_____ 4. Prison Term	_____ 4.

20. Approximate number of kind of contacts with the law:

(1) Police _____	(4) Jail _____
(2) Lawyers _____	(5) Prison _____
(3) Courts _____	(6) Probation and parole _____

21-

22. How many times have you been arrested? (circle number)

1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13;
14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20+

23. For what offense(s) are you now serving time? (write in)

Instructions: Questions 24 through 53 are to be answered by circling the appropriate statement.

24. People who have been in trouble with the law have the same sort of ideas about life that I have.

(1) strongly agree
(2) agree
(3) disagree
(4) strongly disagree

25. I think more like other inmates than people on the outside.

(1) strongly agree
(2) agree
(3) disagree
(4) strongly disagree

26. People who have been in trouble with the law are more like me than people who don't have trouble with the law.

(1) strongly agree
(2) agree
(3) disagree
(4) strongly disagree

27. I would rather associate with people who obey the law than those who don't.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
28. I don't care to associate with the kind of people that are in prison.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
29. I want to keep in touch with inmates I have met here after I get out.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
30. The people that I usually prefer as friends have little respect for the law.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
31. Prison is too good for draft dodgers. They should be publicly whipped or worse.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
32. I would tell my personal business:
- (1) only to close friends in here
 - (2) only to inmates that I know well
 - (3) to any inmate
 - (4) to no one
33. I would share my food and supplies:
- (1) only with close friends in here
 - (2) only with inmates that I know well
 - (3) any inmate
 - (4) no one

34. When I'm released I would be willing to invite into my home:
- (1) only close friends in here
 - (2) only inmates that I know well
 - (3) any inmate
 - (4) no one
35. A man should always obey the law no matter how much it interferes with his personal desire.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
36. It's all right for a person to break the law if he doesn't get caught.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
37. A hungry man has the right to steal.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
38. A person should obey only those laws which seem reasonable.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
39. How many people would steal something if they had a good chance.
- (1) all of them
 - (2) most of them
 - (3) about half of them
 - (4) few of them
 - (5) none of them
40. How many people would steal from a store if they had a good chance.
- (1) all of them
 - (2) most of them
 - (3) about half of them
 - (4) few of them
 - (5) none of them

41. Violators of the law are nearly always detected and punished.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
42. We would have less crime if our laws were more strict.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
43. Most people have to do something dishonest every day.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
44. Court decisions are almost always just.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
45. In the court a poor man will receive as fair treatment as a millionaire.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
46. On the whole, policemen are honest.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
47. The big-time crooks never get arrested; it is just "the little guy" who gets caught.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree

48. A policeman usually judges you as guilty.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
49. Police work rests mainly on information given by stool-pigeons.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
50. Policemen are more loyal to the police than to the citizens.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
51. Police are careful not to arrest innocent persons.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
52. It is more wrong to get caught than it is to steal.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree
53. No decent lawyer would ever be a prosecutor.
- (1) strongly agree
 - (2) agree
 - (3) disagree
 - (4) strongly disagree

Instructions: Questions 54 through 62 are open-ended, let interviewee talk and if possible tape the answers.

54. In what way do you think crime pays? _____
- _____
- _____

56. Do you think a man can get the things he wants, such as an automobile, a house, etc., through crime?

(1) Yes _____ (2) No _____

Why? _____

57. What do you think is the worse type of crime a person could commit? _____

58. What should not be considered a crime that presently is?

59. When is "luck" important in committing a crime? _____

60. In what way does chance enter into crime? _____

61. What is the difference between female criminals and male criminals? _____

62. Is it better to work alone or with others in committing a crime?

(1) Work alone _____ (2) Work with others _____

Why? _____

63-

64. How many sentences have you served in state institutions?
(circle the number)

1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13;
14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 20 +

- 65-
67. How would you treat the offenders of the following offenses?
(or)
How would you treat people who were arrested for the following crimes?

	65. As Criminals	66. Civil Treatment	67. No concern of the Law
1. Drug addiction			
2. Alcoholism			
3. Prostitution			
4. Bookmaking			
5. Homosexual act by consent			

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

- Blaylock, Hubert M. Jr., and Blalock, Ann B. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968.
- Block, H. A., and Gilbert, Geis. Man, Crime and Society. New York: Random House, 1970.
- Clemmer, Donald. The Prison Community. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1940.
- Cramer, Harald. Mathematical Methods of Statistics. 9th Ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Cressey, Donald. The Prison, Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1961.
- Downie, N. M., and Heath, R. W. Basic Statistical Methods. 2nd Ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.
- Edward, Allen E. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton, Century and Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Eysenck, H. J. Crime and Personality. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.
- Fishbein, Martin. Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurements. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.
- Gillin, John L. The Wisconsin Prisoner Studies in Criminogenesis. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1946.
- Goode, William J., and Hatt, Paul K. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.
- Kerr, Madeline. The People of Ship Street. New York: Humanities Press, 1966.
- Lantz, Herman R. On the Penitentiary System in the United States and Its Application in France. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois Press, 1964.

- Marshall, William L., and Clark, William L. "The Legal Definition of Crime and Criminology," A Treatise on the Law of Crimes. Chicago: Callaghan, Callaghan And Company, 1952. Editorial adaptations by Wolfgang, M. E.; Savitz, L.; and Johnston, Norman. The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Roucek, Joseph S. Sociology of Crime. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1961.
- Rundquist, Edward A., and Sletto, Raymond F. Personality in the Depression: A Study in the Measurement of Attitudes. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1936.
- Sellitiz, Claire; Johoda, Marie; Deutsch, Morton; and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1959.
- Shaw, G. B. The Crime of Imprisonment. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1946.
- _____. The Jack-Roller-A Delinquent Boy's Own Story. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1949.
- Stouffer, S. Measurement and Prediction. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- Sutherland, Edwin H., and Cressey, Donald R. Principles of Criminology. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1966.
- _____. Principles of Criminology. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1947.
- Tappan, Paul W. Crime, Justice and Correction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.
- Turk, Austin. Criminality and Legal Order. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1969.
- Winslow, Robert W. Crime in a Free Society. Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.
- Wilson, Joseph. Are Prisons Necessary? Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company, Inc., 1950.

PERIODICALS

- Akers, Ronald L. "Reformulation of the Differential Association Theory." Social Problems, (Spring, 1965), 128-147.

- Atchley, Tobert C., and McCabe, M. Patrick. "A New Approach to the Treatment of Offenders." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, (May-June, 1967), 37-45.
- Ball, John C. "Delinquent and Non-Delinquent Attitudes Toward the Prevalence of Stealing." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 48 (1957-1958), 259-274.
- Bell, Daniel. "Crime As An American Way of Life." Antioch Review, Vol. XIII, (Summer, 1953), 131-154.
- Burgess, Robert L. and Akers, Ronald L. "A Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory of Criminal Behavior." Social Problems, (Fall, 1966), 128-147.
- Casmussen, Donald. "Prisoner Opinions About Parole." American Sociological Review, Vol. V (1940), 584-595.
- Cleaver, Patrick T.; Mylonas, A. D.; and Reckless, Walter C. "Gradients In Attitudes Toward Law, Courts, and Police." Sociological Focus, Vol. II, No. 2 (Winter, 1968), 29-40.
- Cressey, Donald R. "Application and Verification of the Differential Association Theory." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, (June, 1962), 44-52.
- _____. "Changing Criminals: The Application of the Theory of Differential Association." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 61 (September, 1955), 116-120.
- Funkhouser, G. Ray, and Popoff, David. "Your Thoughts on Crime and Punishment." Psychology Today, (November, 1969), 53-60.
- Giallombardo, Rose. "Social Roles in a Prison for Women." Social Problems, Vol. XIII (Winter, 1966), 268-288.
- Glaser, Daniel. "Criminality Theories and Behavioral Images." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 61 (March, 1956), 433-444.
- Irwin, John. "Thieves, Convicts and the Inmates' Culture." Social Problems, Vol. IX (Fall, 1962), 142-155.
- Kay, Barbara A., and Schultz, Christine G. "Divergence of Attitudes Toward Constituted Authority Between Male and Female Felony Inmates." Interdisciplinary Problem in Criminology: Papers of the American Society of Criminology, (1964), edited by Walter C. Reckless and Charles L. Newman, The Ohio State University, (1967), 209-216.
- McIntyre, Jennie. "Public Attitudes Toward Crime and Law Enforcement." The Annals of American Academy, (November, 1967), 34-46.

- McQuitty, Louis L. "Elementary Linkage Analysis for Isolating Orthogonal and Oblique Types and Typal Relevancies." Educational and Psychological Measurements, Vol. 17 (1957), 207-229.
- Mathiesen, Thomas. "The Sociology of Prisons: Problems for Future Research." British Journal of Sociology, Vol. XVII (December, 1966), 360-379.
- Mylonas, Anastassios D., and Reckless, Walter C. "Attitudes Toward Law Enforcement in Greece and the United States." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 5, No. 1 (January, 1968), 81-88.
- _____. "Prisoner's Attitudes Toward Law and Legal Institutions." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, Vol. 54, No. 4 (December, 1963), 479-484.
- Nelsen, Hart. "Attitudes Toward Religious Education in Appalachia." Religious Education, January-February, 1970, pp. 50-55.
- Nettler, Gwynn. "Anti-social Sentiment and Criminality." American Sociological Review, Vol. 24 (1959), 202-208.
- Quinney, Richard. "Political Conservatism, Alienation and Fatalism: Contingencies of Social Status and Religious Fundamentalism." Sociometry, Vol. 27 (1964), 372-381.
- Seeman, Melvin. "Alienation and Social Learning In A Reformatory." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 69 (November, 1963), 270-284.
- Short, James F., Jr. "Differential Association and Delinquency." Social Problems, Vol. 4 (January, 1957), 233-239.
- Stratton, John R. "Differential Identification and Attitudes Toward the Law." Social Forces, Vol. 46 (December, 1967), 256-262.
- Sykes, G. "Men, Merchant, and Toughs: A Study of Reaction to Imprisonment." Social Problems, Vol. 4 (October, 1957), 339-349.
- Wheeler, Stanton. "Socialization in Correctional Communities." American Sociological Review, Vol. 26 (October, 1961), 697-712.

MANUSCRIPTS

- Roeburk, Julian. "A Tentative Criminal Typology of Negro Felons." Unpublished typewritten manuscript.

RESEARCH REPORT

National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Adult Correctional Program, Commonwealth of Kentucky, A Study and Recommendations for the Kentucky Committee for Correctional Research, April, 1969, 2nd printing.