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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

Various factors may combine to result in maladjustment and become manifest in antisocial behavior. One of the most important of these factors is hostility. The criminal act is one area of antisocial behavior, since these acts are socially disturbing and harmful. Dynamically speaking, the individual who commits a criminal act may be following a pattern of behavior that is motivated by his hostile feelings which are conceivably the results of perceived threats to his sense of adequacy or security (5).

Hostility is seen as a primary factor in the development of neurotic, psychotic, and psychosomatic conditions; it can take many forms and be used for many purposes. The direction in which hostility manifests itself in the adult personality is determined by the intensity and the manner in which the hostility is handled. Saul (1) classifies hostility into three groups: antisocial, private, and social. Symonds (5) indicates that antisocial behavior consists of aggressive acts toward others; private hostile behavior refers to acts that cause others to suffer within the law; and social patterns of hostile behavior involve the sublimation of hostility into acceptable attitudes toward others.
The most damaging expression of hostility is the acting out of feelings by the individual in antisocial behavior. This aggressive rebellion includes a variety of negative, defiant, nonconforming and destructive acts. When the individual acts out his feelings to hurt or injure another person, he may express his hostility directly by committing crimes against persons such as aggravated assault or murder, or indirectly by committing crimes against property such as theft or larceny.

This acting out of hostile feelings is one of society's most serious problems. In the past decade there has been a drastic increase in crimes of destruction and violence (1, 3, 4). Law enforcement agencies try to deal with the individuals who commit these acts by punitive and harsh measures. However, the likelihood exists that these measures only tend to incite the already active hostile feelings within the individual, and he continues to commit antisocial acts.

Thorpe (6) maintains that aggressive and hostile acts can be the outward expression of tensions in the individual brought about by frustrating experiences and interpersonal relationships. Antisocial and criminal acts are often symptoms of underlying emotional conflicts with which the individual is struggling. Thorpe also concludes that the vast majority of persons who commit criminal acts are rather discontented, socially immature, and emotionally unstable individuals. It follows that these individuals would tend
to arrive at places of confinement already disposed to negative behavior.

The prison environment serves to augment feelings of ambivalence, hostility, and contrariness. Due to the complexities of interactions and attitudes, the psychosocial life of the inmate is extremely unstable. The offender entering prison is introduced into a new culture. He is forced to learn new ways of behaving and to unlearn some of his previous behavior patterns. Often the prisoner resents this forced restriction of expression and is unable to suppress his hostility successfully. If he continues to manifest offensive types of behavior, he is retaliated against by the prison officials. Incoming inmates are not readily accepted by other prisoners and they are almost continually confronted with a population which displays varying attitudes of fear, bravado, defiance, and aggression (4).

In the prison situation overt signs of hostility are suppressed by some inmates and outwardly manifested by others. It is possible that some prisoners harbored a great deal of hostility before arrest and this hostility quite likely influenced these individuals to commit criminal acts which led to their commitment.

A series of personality studies was conducted by Kahn (2) with two criminal groups, a murder group of fifteen and a burglar group of twenty-four. All were in a psychiatric hospital undergoing a two year period of evaluation in order
to determine whether or not they were legally insane. He found that groups of individuals which had committed two completely different criminal acts could be distinguished on the basis of certain aspects of social history, patterning of intellectual abilities, and Rorschach test responses. He discovered that the murderers were more likely than the burglars to have personalities that would allow impulsive breakthrough of sadistic hostility which was usually rigidly controlled. Kahn also found that murderers have less personality resources for the expression of their feelings. There was a tendency for the murderers to have greater occupational and marital stability and fewer arrests, indicating a greater social rigidity (2).

Statement of the Problem

Recognizing then that the measurement of such factors in behavior has value, this study is concerned with distinguishing between persons convicted of crimes against persons and those convicted of crimes against property using the hostility factor as a criterion for comparison. As noted above, Kahn (2) has suggested that there is some indication that the crimes against persons group is more likely to express overt hostility than the crimes against property group. This would be a useful distinction since the ability to recognize and separate violent or potentially violent persons from the nonviolent is desirable in order to help provide a healthier society. With better diagnosis and improved prediction of
hostile and antisocial behavior in the prison setting, both types of offenders could be more carefully screened, rehabilitated, and then perhaps more properly integrated into society.

Need for the Study

It is tantamount to recognize the increasing problems and scope of penology and criminology. The classification of prisoners, for instance, needs to be based on more than mere separation of the sexes or categorizing according to types of crime. It needs to be designed to broaden our understanding of attitudes as related to behavior in order to influence these attitudes in the direction of acceptable changes. One of the major attitude determinants seems to be hostility. Any comprehensive classification system should include extensive measurement of this factor. Many circumstances that arise during a term of imprisonment could be understood more fully by the use of a valid diagnostic aid which recognizes the different types and intensities of hostility. Such an aid would be valuable in determining readiness for parole, the appropriateness of various forms of therapy (especially to redirect hostility), trustee risks, and progress in the prisoner's adjustment to the confined situation.

Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that subjects imprisoned for crimes against persons have more hostility than those convicted for
crimes against property. Differences in the degree of hostility between the two groups will be defined by the White Space percept on the Rorschach Ink Blot Test and scores on the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey.
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CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES AND BACKGROUND

Examination of studies related to measurement of behavioral factors reveals that both those which use the projective techniques and those which use the non-projective techniques are relevant to the measurement of hostility. An attempt will be made to relate some of each technique as background in general. Also, an attempt will be made to establish specific value in measuring and comparing hostility in the two respective groups of offenders, those who have committed crimes against persons and those who have committed crimes against property.

Harriman defines hostility as "persistent anger as a result of frustrations, the hostility being directed toward the frustrating situation, being displaced upon some other situation, or being generalized" (13, p. 75). Hostility may be repressed or may be overtly expressed. The inability to express hostility or anger may be equally as significant as overt expression. The implication regarding the crime of felonious vandalism, for instance, is that such a crime is an overt expression of hostile and aggressive impulses. Other types of aggressive crimes such as murder and assault may be precipitated by modalities of jealousy, humiliation, frustration and emotional sensitivity (3, 17). When the
convicted person is imprisoned it is likely that his status and ego are threatened. These are factors essential to his feelings of worth and prestige; his whole personality may be threatened. He does not fear one specific object but suffers a general devaluation. He feels anxious about the events in his immediate future and he finds himself in a situational conflict which may be expected to lead to situational hostility. This hostility can be expressed in many ways such as prison riots or other acts of violence (20). Degrees of anxiety and hostility already existed, now they are augmented and the inmate faces a critical point of re-evaluation of self.

The importance of this self evaluation is well recognized by Veldman (33). Since such an evaluation has conscious and unconscious relativity, numerous studies have been made using both projective and non-projective techniques to determine hostility and aggression.

One of the projective techniques found to be valuable is the use of the Rorschach Ink Blot Test. Walters (34) used this method to test fifty inmates in a maximum security prison. The average age was 29.6 and the average I.Q., as measured by the WAIS, was 100.70. Using the Klopfer method of scoring, an analysis of verbalizations such as "splattered," "blown to pieces," and "smashed" were treated as hostile responses. The technique indicated a lack of maturity and a tendency toward rigidity among prisoners in general.
A Rorschach study was undertaken by Rabin (25) to make a longitudinal analysis of Leighten Ford, who was at one time treated in a psychiatric hospital during which period he received his first Rorschach test. Shortly after release he murdered his wife. He then killed three dogs and tried to commit suicide. The second Rorschach was administered six months later. Prior to the murder the protocol revealed a combination of color and shading shock which was interpreted by the Klopfer technique as being indicative of aggression. The second Rorschach had fewer indications of aggression. A third Rorschach was administered a year later. During the interview period, Leighten made an adequate adjustment to the ward routine, evidenced by a more moderate element of explosiveness. Apparently, therapy helped Leighten develop insight into his acting-out behavior. The result was a reduction in overt hostile and suicidal tendencies.

Most prisons have inmates who were convicted of sex-related crimes. The sex crime is one way to express hostility directly. Evidence would seem to indicate that a person who is sexually adjusted but harbors a great deal of hostility would be more likely to commit a crime against property (11). Elizur (6) was also interested in the measurement of hostility. He used Rorschach Content Analysis and found it to be a valid technique for assessing anxiety and hostility. Moreover, he found that reliability could be improved by increasing the number of inkblots. Similar results were
obtained by Gorlow (8) using Elizur's method of Rorschach Content Analysis. He demonstrated that anxiety and hostility could be measured with respect to delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents. Evidence from both studies indicates that the Rorschach Ink Blot Test can be used to measure hostility.

At this point, it is important to examine the research using non-projective techniques. Sources using this method provide broad samples of behavioral analysis which have useful implications to this particular measurement study.

Wolfgang (36) contended that improper attention is given to the diagnosis and classification of offenders sent to prison. He felt that effort should be made to distinguish violent from nonviolent persons in order to provide more appropriate treatment settings for each. With better diagnosis and prediction of hostile acting out, both types of offenders could be more carefully screened and mixed. The purpose would be to avoid total clusters of violent offenders who would tend to reinforce each other's violent behavior. Proper blending of small numbers of hostile, violent inmates with nonviolent ones could result in the violent inmates' assimilation of nonviolent values through daily interaction, group therapy sessions, work, and other types of social interaction within the prison. Current management of correctional institutions seems to be based primarily on the image as overly hostile and violent. This tends to penalize the less violent prisoner who makes up the prison majority.
One of the major factors in theories of criminology is the diversity of human acts which are labeled criminal but do not have a common behavioral denominator. This may be due primarily to the fact that criminology deals with the interrelation between two phenomena which are not commonly linked together, namely the social phenomenon of behavior and the phenomenon of judicial norms. Shoham (29), studying the criminal law norm as a social reality, capable of being reviewed with behavioral significance, classified crimes into those involving direct personal acts perpetrated upon a victim and those impersonally directed against the victim's property. This classification is useful as a basis for the study of crime on the social level because it considers comparative crime rates in specific periods and in different communities and groups. Additionally, the comparison and examination of crime rates can be studied on the basis of the behavioral manifestations of emotions such as hostility, aggression, and anxiety.

To many people crime suggests violent and heinous acts such as homicide, forcible rape, and robbery. The Uniform Crime Reports of the FBI for the year 1963 reported that crimes against persons composed only 8.1 per cent of all arrests for offenses specifically classified. On the other hand crimes against property represented 16.1 per cent and crimes that suggested personal disorganization, such as drunkenness and vagrancy, constituted 75.8 per cent (16).
For this same year, the major number of crimes against persons was aggravated assault and other assaults. Larceny and burglary were the major property crimes (16).

Although differences are not significant statistically, the Uniform Crime Reports found that urbanized communities have higher rates for all major felonies except homicide, which is more pronounced in rural communities. Also, the rate of crimes against property is greater in the urban community than in the rural community. Aggravated assault rates are also higher in urban than in rural communities, but the difference is not as pronounced as for crimes against property (15).

Age appears to have an important effect, either directly or indirectly, on the frequency and type of crimes committed. The Uniform Crime Reports for the year 1966 categorize total arrests by age groups according to the various crimes committed. Arrests for crimes against persons, such as murder and negligent homicide, on the average fell in the twenty to twenty-nine year age group; about 19 per cent of the arrests were of persons under twenty-one years of age. Arrests for the offense of aggravated assault were more common to the age group twenty to twenty-four years while persons under eighteen years of age represented 14 per cent of the total arrests for this group. The highest arrest rate for the crime of forcible rape was of persons twenty to twenty-four years of age. Persons under eighteen years accounted for 18 per cent of
these arrests while persons under twenty-one constituted 41 per cent, and persons under twenty-five years made up 62 per cent (14).

For crimes against property, such as embezzlement, persons under thirty-five years of age accounted for 66 per cent; the highest rate by age group was twenty to twenty-four years. The highest arrest rate for larceny and auto theft in the year 1966 was for ages fifteen to thirty. For auto theft, 88 per cent of the total arrests were for persons under twenty-five years of age. Youthful offenders commit a great many crimes against property and certain sexual offenses as forcible rape (14). Thus, many of society's major felonies are committed by persons under twenty-five years of age.

Apprehension of criminals is more likely when the offense is clearly visible and arouses strong community reaction. Crimes against persons such as murder, forcible rape and aggravated assault are usually more obvious to the observer and clearly violate social mores. Frequently crimes of this type are the result of emotionally charged situations in which precise planning and cleverness is unlikely. Crimes against property frequently lack these sensational qualities; consequently, it is conceivable that arrest percentages of these offenses are lower (10).

Rilzman and Sanford maintain that crimes against persons and crimes against property are committed, respectively, by individuals who manifest definable personality characteristics.
They describe these individuals on the basis of those manifesting antisocial or asocial, and presocial characteristics (26, 27).

Rilsman (26) emphasizes that the criminal committing personal crimes such as murder and armed robbery, is basically an antisocial or asocial person. The antisocial criminal generally does not experience guilt as a result of his crime, but primarily self-condemnation at allowing himself to be caught. Frequently this type criminal is apprehended only after a struggle with police and when imprisoned opposes the authorities at every possible opportunity. His spirit is not easily broken by punitive measures and he infrequently compromises himself by accepting any of the privileges which the prison authorities might offer him. It is unlikely that this type of inmate will truly be rehabilitated. If he does show improved behavior it is likely that suppression of his hostility is an effort to present a positive image to officials.

The asocial criminal (26) is generally not loyal to any ideals; his primary concern is with himself and his problem at hand. He tends to view social institutions and business enterprises as a racket. This type of inmate may appear as a vain, exhibitionistic, self-assertive person who makes the loudest complaints about the prison system but backs down when threatened with discipline. This offender is able to manipulate fellow inmates and gain recognition as a leader. Another behavior pattern which the asocial criminal may
exhibit is one of proud withdrawal, a brooding type of independence, and considerable spite.

Those who commit impersonal crimes such as burglary, larceny, and auto-theft are described as presocial criminals by Sanford (27). This criminal is characterized by a mild manner and seems to be one who is easily led or influenced by others. He is generally a nonvicious offender and is submissive in his relations both with prison officials and his fellow inmates. He is adept at obtaining the favor of authorities and eager to repent verbally for his crimes. Frequently this type of individual feels that he has reformed and is reasonably contented while in prison to feel that he has been reinstated as a member of society. The presocial criminal points out that he is not nearly so bad as other types of offenders and may openly admit his guilt, maintaining that his punishment will certainly guarantee his not repeating the crime for which he was imprisoned.

Gibbons (7), agreeing that personality characteristics are important in relation to types of crimes committed, continues with an explanation of crime causation. He asserts that specific and highly variable situational elements must be considered. This is particularly true of crimes against persons. It is unlikely that a murderer will kill unless there is a suitable victim; however, the circumstance that provokes the murderer to the point of assault depends upon the individual and is difficult to predict. Sex crimes are
frequently unplanned and explosive in nature, whereas crimes against property frequently involve contemplation, precision, and careful calculation by a person who has at least moderate control over his hostility level.

A great many studies have been undertaken attempting to link intelligence or lack of intelligence with criminality. Also, generalizations have frequently been made concerning intelligence and severity of criminal acts, viz: the worse the criminal the lower his intelligence. One such study involved 948 prisoners categorized according to age, type of crime, and intelligence. After comparisons it was found that there were no connections between intelligence and severity of criminal records. There is no reason to believe that the most likely recidivists will be the least intelligent (19). It follows then that there is no significant relationship between intelligence and hostility.

The Psychological Corporation (5) undertook several studies involving the use of psychological tests in penal institutions. Data collected from five federal prisons using 448 inmates disclosed important information relative to the penal population and various promising psychological tests. The prisoners were divided into four age groups: 16-17, 18-19, 20-24, and 25-35. It was found that for those under 25 years, WAIS I.Q.'s could be estimated from the sum scores on the Verbal Reasoning and Abstract Reasoning tests of the Differential Apptitude Tests. For those over age 25, good
estimates of WAIS I.Q.'s could be made from the Verbal and Numerical Tests used by some personnel in industry. Expectant tables were provided for making estimates. It was also found that literate prisoners did not differ from persons on the outside in general intelligence. However, this study was limited in that no reference was made to illiterate prisoners.

After interviewing 100 illiterate prisoners in a large State Penitentiary, Stanton (30) pointed out that illiterate individuals tend to harbor fear, ambivalence, or even intense feelings of hostility toward others who are perceived as intellectually superior. Thus, no distinction in hostility was implied between literate and illiterate prisoners.

DeStephens (4) tested 300 inmates at an Ohio State Penitentiary with the WAIS, Forms I and II. One hundred were Negro, thus, the results affecting them are not significant, since the WAIS was not properly standardized with Negroes. However, regarding the 200 Caucasians, their mean age was 22.02, with a mean I.Q. of 93.55. DeStephens found that Caucasian criminals in the prison population seemed to be low-average in intellectual ability. Also, they had an unusually marked deficiency when dealing with verbal material as contrasted with their normal ability when dealing with problems in a manual, manipulative sense. Indications such as excessive fidgeting, requests to leave the room for water, and avoidance of eye contact with the examiner, connoted that
the prisoners became extremely frustrated when unable to express themselves verbally. Later, when questioned about feelings of frustration or anger during testing, a majority of the subjects emphatically denied experiencing any such emotions. However, regardless of intelligence, it is conceivable that denial of genuine emotions and inhibition of expression can be correlated with hostility.

Another study involving test performance was conducted by Graham and Kamano (9). This investigation used two groups of criminals; one group could read well, the other could not. The successful readers had a mean I.Q. of 105.1, while the unsuccessful readers' mean I.Q. was 93.93. The unsuccessful readers were found to be inferior both to Wechsler's standardizing group and to the thirty-five successful readers in verbal subtests and Digit Symbol. Their psychogram was similar to that of the typical psychopath. The successful readers did as well on verbal as on performance subtests. Their psychogram did not resemble one of a typical psychopath. Thus, criminals who are inadequate readers may have difficulty expressing themselves verbally. Also, they may produce a misleading psychogram, one typifying a psychopath.

Individuals who find self-expression difficult and those who wish to conceal their emotions are not necessarily dulled nor imperceptive. Shelly (28) contends that perception of violence, like hostile attitudes, are important as predisposing factors of behavior. He undertook a study using eighty
subjects. Half the sample was taken from a prison population and the remaining subjects were selected from a non-confining environment. The age range was seventeen to twenty-one, and 73 per cent had I.Q.'s in the seventy-five to ninety range. Statistical analysis indicated that the prison group perceived violence more readily than the non-prison group. He concluded therefore, that the person who does perceive violence more readily may also be expected to engage in antisocial conduct more readily.

Several studies have been conducted in an attempt to determine whether or not personality traits, such as hostility and anxiety, are more prevalent in certain groups of people. One such group worthy of study is the prison population. Doppelt (5), Marcus (19), and Shelley (28), as well as many criminologists, have indicated an interest in studying personalities of prisoners in order to establish accurate personality profiles which could be used to classify inmates according to personality characteristics. The MMPI is one instrument that is frequently used in such investigations. Pursuing the matter of personality measurement among convicts, Panton tested 1,313 prison inmates with the MMPI. The inmates all had I.Q.'s above 80. There was no marked difference regarding those who had committed personal or impersonal felony crimes, and none of the differentiations between the various crimes had the frequency or magnitude to warrant the use of separate crime classification profiles. In another study,
Panton (23), with use of the MMPI, tested fifty habitual criminals, age forty and above, who had served three felony sentences. The records were compared with other MMPI records of a similar age group of imprisoned first offenders. The habitual criminal group profiles showed a greater degree of sociopathy than the non-habituals.

Attempting to prove that there would be important changes in the MMPI profile code configurations of prison inmates as they increased in intelligence, as measured by the Beta Examination, Panton (24) used 1,097 prison inmates who ranged from defective to superior intelligence. It was found that the profile configuration for the above-average I.Q. groups were significantly different from those of the lower I.Q. groups. The profiles of the two most intelligent groups were indicative of character disorders, and the below-average groups had profiles associated with neuroticism and anxiety.

A study undertaken by Stanton (30) indicated that there were significant differences between inmates and normals, particularly in the areas of psychopathic deviations and masculinity. He ventured to say that criminals perceive violence readily, and continued that the perception could be a reflection of felt hostility. Using the MMPI as a testing instrument, he worked with 298 inmates having a mean age of 40.16. The normal subjects were those used by the author of the MMPI and on which the MMPI was standardized. Intelligence was not considered an important factor. The criminals seemed
to have more psychopathic tendencies and scored lower in the area of masculinity than did the normals. Although criminals generally are not neurotic, psychotic, or psychopathic per se, they may be more inclined in these directions. There is no clear evidence to indicate that they differ significantly from non-criminals in their psychological organization or in their personal discontents. Nevertheless, they may be somewhat more insecure, frustrated, aggressive, hostile, or disturbed than the citizen who has never been imprisoned (31).

The prison community is an unnatural environment in many ways: men and women generally are refused heterosexual contact, choice of attire is usually replaced with uniform, and freedom of mobility is restricted. Numerous pressures, environmental and mental, are brought to bear on the inmate. How these pressures are dealt with depends upon the individual and his ability to use defense mechanisms to alleviate anxiety. The prisoner is instructed to adjust and accept his confinement. However, adjustment is often superficial and for the most part simply means that the convict, fearing retaliation, is compelled to control his turbulent emotions in the best way possible. Among these emotions hostility has paramount importance, for proper control, or lack of control can affect the prisoner situationally and psychologically (33).

Examining the prison pressures to which inmates are exposed, Sanford (27) found that a prisoner's contact with the authorities is not a completely harmonious relationship. The
prisoner is frequently uncomfortable with the physical arrangements that have been made for him, which in many cases leads to the increase of hostile feelings. This hostility often leads to submission based on fear, and the prisoner infrequently handles this hostility by turning it against himself. Particularly among those who commit crimes of a personal nature, an outstanding feature Sanford (27) observed was the relative absence of self-criticism. Rather, convicts often displace their hostility onto minority groups. In many cases the main outlet for aggression and hostility is through ethnocentrism. Those committing crimes against property frequently harbor feelings of cynicism (27). In this cynicism, a great deal of hostility and destructiveness is directed against the self as well as against the world. In these cases, aggressiveness is not simply projected onto other people, but this contempt for other people seems to be closely synonymous with contempt for himself. Self-contempt is felt to result from his weakness within the prison environment and being forced to submit to the prison rules. The prisoner who cannot permit himself to feel hatred toward those who are in control or actually stronger than he is, has a nagging reminder that in reality he is weak. He may try to free himself from these thoughts by projecting his contemptibleness onto mankind in general. Thus, there is some basis for saying that the convict hates others because he hates his own inadequacies.
Berkowitz (2), interested in expression of hostility, conducted a study using two groups of subjects, one group having high self-esteem and the second group having low self-esteem. On hostility questionnaires, the men who were low in self-esteem experienced strong hostility and aggression anxiety. However, they inhibited signs of open aggression when given an opportunity to retaliate because they were not sure how this reaction would be accepted by the other people in the experiment. In other words, they were tempted to aggress, felt anxious because the aggressive behavior could bring disapproval, and then tried very hard to avoid showing such hostile behavior. In this study, anger and hostility were aroused which created a readiness to act out aggressively, but in the absence of suitable cues, the aggressive responses did not actually occur. In cases of hostility displacement, the target evokes aggressive behavior from an angered person. Aggressive cues in the angered person's thoughts activate an aggressive response sequence which does not attain completion until the anger instigator is injured or damaged in some way. Preventing completion of the activated hostility heightens the arousal state, which increases the strength of any subsequent aggressive responses, and raises the level of tension experienced by the person. Completing an aggressive sequence by inflicting injury, in the absence of guilt or anxiety, leads to a pleasureable reduction in the tension state. In a prison population, inflicting injury on an intended target is not
practical, thus it may be assumed that many convicts are frequently in a tension state and have a need to release their anger.

Hostility, if not readily observable, is certainly a dormant personality factor in prison inmates. Even though incarceration allows a degree of acting out behavior, hostility is still a major attribute that must undergo modification if more adaptive behavior is to follow. Wolfgang (37) views the criminal as a person who wants to free himself from painful feelings of frustration and helplessness. Some convicts will react to these feelings by direct acting out in a hostile manner; others will react by suppressing these feelings, and some will relieve this pressure through the attempted manipulation of others.

Once aroused, hostile impulses may be expressed in different ways. It may lead to overt expression in verbal or physical attack, may be expressed only in fantasy, or be completely denied expression. Since hostility is a major part of the inevitable frustration of living, the controls imposed by society upon the expression of hostility play an influential role in the development of the self-structure. For some individuals, all forms of hostile behavior have been met with severe counteraggression. To maintain an accepting self-picture these persons are compelled to deny any hostile experience. A facade of self-acceptance is presented, but at the expense of the continual repression of hostility. As
Veldman and Worchel (33) have demonstrated, the healthy or adjusted personality exists when hostile feelings are accepted and the resulting behavior is at times social and at other times aggressive. In the prison setting, authority figures are frequently perceived as threatening, and convicts are unable to retaliate for fear of punishment. If their hostility, then, is unable to be displaced appropriately the result is further depreciation and tension.

A prisoner's lack of ability to release hostility can precipitate serious consequences. Bennett (1) tested 300 inmates from a vocational institution in California. One hundred of these subjects were tested shortly after their arrival; 100 more were tested after six months of incarceration; and the following 100 were tested after having been imprisoned for one year. The Rosenzweig Picture Frustration Test was the instrument employed. Results indicated that the longer the offender remains in the institution, the more likely he is to increase his use of intropunitive responses to frustrating situations. Intensive treatment seemed to have little effect. Extropunitive responses did not seem to be affected by the length of incarceration. It seemed that there was a gradual modification of hostile attitudes; intropunitive responses increased with time. Thus, it follows that the long-term and repeat prisoners with a tendency toward intropunitive behavior tend to internalize their hostility instead of developing a true adjustment.
In another study, Newsletter (21) explains that an important indicator of potential danger is the presence of violent motivations which are introjected, deeply repressed, or denied by an individual. The inmate who is distant from his own feelings and does not recognize when he is hostile and further denies all unpleasant impulses is more of a threat than the inmate who is bothered by conscious aggressive thoughts. The prisoner who is conscious of aggressive motivations at least has the opportunity to seek alternative means of adaptation. If one denies that antisocial or hostile tendencies exist in himself, he has little room to maneuver when confronted with a stress situation in which denial cannot be maintained. Bennett and Rudoff (1) point out that convicts are individuals isolated from intimate contact with their loved ones and open contact with society. It has been confirmed by previous studies that confinement does not diminish already existing hostility, instead these emotions undergo change in relation to the prisoner's perception of confinement. Taylor (32) studied two groups in a controlled, isolated situation and noted that personality changes varied with types of confinement. The study indicated that combinations of social isolation produced varying degrees of stress and perceptual change which was related to personality functioning. Good adjustment was associated with flexibility as well as the ability to be aggressive and openly angry. The offender whose previous unlawful behavior was a reaction
or response to severe oppressive stress is more likely to commit an unreasonable act within the prison. Also, as in rigid prison rules, the more unrealistic or indirect the pressure to which the offender is responding, the likelihood is increased that subsequent acting out will be of unrealistic nature.

Halleck (11) contends that the criminally inclined person may have been exposed to learning experiences which encouraged him to react more impulsively to frustration, and to perceive more frustration in his environment than was actually present. Thus, an individual's choice of crimes is not entirely determined by stressful situations in his immediate environment. Conditions and traits which dispose a person to criminal behavior must be considered. Criminal behavior may be considered habit tendencies which develop as a response to the total amount of training and experiences which a person encounters with many different people throughout his life. This learning experience continues after incarceration and, when frustrated with confinement and inflexibility, it is understandable that the convict will respond accordingly.

In contrast, Korn (18) suggests that considerable criminal behavior occurs even where there is little or no stress. In some situations, crime would seem to be the most advantageous course for the offender to take. Therefore, it is possible that crime could be chosen even where other adaptations are available simply because the criminal knows that
his act will provide the most reward for a minimal expendi-
ture of energy. The white-collar criminal, often guilty of
larceny and forgery, is frequently a rational man and does
not behave in an unreasonable manner. Often criminals com-
mitting crimes against property are meticulous yet insecure
individuals who seem to be motivated by profit and status
motives.

Concerned about the convicts' hostility level and over-
all penal adjustment, Halleck (12) stresses the need for
increased psychiatric criminology. He notes that careful
attention has been given to problems of balancing the bio-
logical needs of imprisoned individuals against the needs of
society through the use of certain clinical techniques of
treatment. Many incarcerated adult offenders have been
assisted in their prison adjustment through the use of vari-
ous clinical techniques such as psychotherapy. When impris-
oned, the offender is often a miserable and unhappy person
who frequently suffers in the same way as a mental patient.
The prisoner, in many cases, harbors considerable hostility.
This hostility may be of an undifferentiated type or have a
specific object. Through psychotherapy a convict may learn
to accept the hostility he feels and further learn to express
degrees of this hostility in ways that will not bring about
retaliation from prison officials.

West (35) re-examined the clinical notes of 155 male
adult prisoners in a state correctional institution who had
been convicted for felony acts. He found that offenders with past or present psychiatric abnormalities had an increased likelihood of reconviction; whereas, offenders who received psychiatric treatment were less likely to be reconvicted. Evidence strongly indicates that more specific classification of prisoners would be an invaluable aid in providing the most appropriate treatment, psychiatric or otherwise, for the prisoner, thereby improving the chances for a better adjustment both during confinement and after release.


CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

A total of forty imprisoned male convicts were used in this study: twenty who had committed personal crimes such as murder, rape and assault, and twenty who had committed crimes against property such as larceny, embezzlement, and burglary. The criminals were serving sentences in the main prison unit, Huntsville, Texas. The age range was from eighteen to fifty-eight, and the protocols were obtained over a period of approximately two weeks.

Only felony crimes were included in this study. Crimes against persons are defined as the following: murder, negligent homicide, forcible rape, and aggravated assault. Crimes against property are those involving burglary, larceny, auto theft, and embezzlement.

On September 8, 1966, the day of selection, the total population of the main prison unit was 1,712. The population for the entire prison was 12,365.

Within the walls of the prison, part of the statistics room had a series of long tables. On the tables were rectangular-shaped trays. Each tray contained a brief resume of one hundred prisoners. The prison statistician, with the use
of an IBM Model 1407 computer, randomly selected the names of 330 first offenders by types of offenses. Rather than having each personal file pulled for inspection, the computer produced a list several feet long with each prisoner's name, serial number, offense, number of offenses, date of conviction, day he began serving sentence, prior offenses if any, and tentative date of completion of sentence. The list of 330 prisoners was divided into two equal groups: 165 convicted for crimes against persons, and 165 convicted for crimes against property. Actual subjects were then chosen by selecting every fifth number. Inmates convicted on multiple counts were eliminated. A total of twenty-six inmates were rejected for this reason.

Instruments Used

Three instruments were employed in this study: the abbreviated form of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (9), the Rorschach Ink Blot Test (1, 2), and the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey (5). In several studies it has been found that intelligence is not an important factor in the classification of prisoners according to the type of crimes committed (3, 7, 8). However, for the purpose of this study the intelligence range was controlled. Intelligence was determined by the abbreviated form of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. While the WAIS is primarily an instrument to assess intellectual ability, it can be used to assess personality traits. The latter was not undertaken in this
study, however, since the primary use of the WAIS was to provide a measure that would facilitate holding intelligence constant.

The Rorschach Ink Blot Test (1, 2) is an unstructured projective technique which consists of ten cards, on each of which is reproduced a laterally symmetrical ink-blot design. During the administration of this test the subject is asked what each of these ink-blots looks like. Unstructured techniques such as the Rorschach provide the clinical psychologist with an opportunity to make observation of the subject's characteristic mode of approach to complex problems. The unstructured technique of the Rorschach provides an opportunity to evaluate the subject in a situation that provides the subject with little information about what the socially acceptable response may be.

The method of scoring used on the Rorschach in this study was developed by Beck (1, 2). In his system he suggests that an individual's attraction to the White Space comes from an attitude with an emotional overtone. It displays an intellectual reaction that has first been permeated and worked over by a special attitude. In the individual who has above-average intelligence, the White Space can be indicative of thoroughness and perserverance to carry one through to his objective. In the less intelligent, partially educated, and persons with limited perceptive ability it is indicative of contrariness or hostility.
This study, therefore, restricts intelligence to those with a full scale WAIS I.Q. of 110 or less. Thus, subjects producing White Space responses in excess of the normal range of 32-35 were not considered superior intellectually since intellectual superiority had already been eliminated by the WAIS. It should be noted, however, that all White Space responses do not mean hostility (1). There is a normal range of 5.9 per cent. The percentage of White Space responses was computed for each protocol. A \( t \)-test was computed to determine if differences in the number of Space responses were significant. Considerable dissension as to whether the White Space response is an indicator of hostility necessitated the use of another test with less questionable reliability.

The instrument chosen to supplement the Rorschach technique was the Pensacola Z Survey, published in 1957 by Marshall B. Jones (5). This survey has five scales. The first scale, the Heteronomy Scale, is the original Z Scale from which the Z Survey was derived. The first sixty-six items of the survey are the items of the Z Scale. The remaining four scales are Dependency, Anxiety, Rigidity, and Hostility. The total survey has 197 items of a forced choice nature. Validity was obtained by giving the scale to 310 naval cadets, after un-pertinent items had been cut out from preceding studies. The Survey originally had 300 items but was modified with the use of two groups—respectively, 230 and 218 cadets. The items were reduced to the present number of 197 items. The
Homogeneity levels of the four scales range between .82 and .90. The twenty-four retest coefficients range between .83 and .89. Jones (5) validated the Pensacola Z Survey by comparing performance on the Z Survey with performance on the California F Scale. The F Scale is a measure of the authoritarian personality which is exemplified by the traits of anxiety, hostility, rigidity, social extraversion and impulsiveness. In constructing the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey, those items in the Friendliness and Personal Relations Scales of the Guilford Zimmerman Temperament Survey which had correlations significant at the .01 level with the California F Scale were interpreted as measuring hostility. Additional items of a similar nature and having content and face validity were then constructed and, after administering these items to a group of subjects the extreme items were removed and forty of the most internally consistent items from the remaining hostility cluster were selected to form the Hostility Scale. Overall, the Pensacola Z Survey was found to correlate 0.45 with the Califronia F Scale. The Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey was administered individually to each group of prisoners. The mean hostility score for each group was derived and t-tests were computed in order to determine differences between the two groups.

Procedure

Each subject was told that the examiner's purpose was simply to find out more about how prisoners felt about prison
life and how they were adjusting to it. The sequence of testing was as follows: the abbreviated form of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Rorschach Ink Blot Test, and the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey. On seven occasions the examiner had to explain part of the terminology from the Hostility Scale of the Z Survey. Explanation of the words in question consisted of a synthesis of Webster's (4) definitions.

Subjects were further assured that testing and interviews would have no bearing on their sentence nor on their treatment in the prison. However, each subject was informed by the guard who transported him to the testing area that prison officials "appreciated" their cooperation in talking to the examiner. This factor alone was probably sufficient to motivate each subject into at least superficial cooperation. However, this effect to some extent was probably negated since word was spread by means of the "pipeline" throughout the main unit that a parole officer was trying to help those who would cooperate. Prison gossip also rumored that there was a "secret way to tell" if someone was not being honest.

Testing was carried out under excellent physical conditions. A private office was provided, with adequate lighting, space, and privacy. Due to the convenience no testing problems were encountered; thus all testing was completed within two weeks.

All Rorschach responses were recorded verbatim, and interpreted according to the technique set forth by Beck.
However, during the inquiry attention was focused primarily upon the subjects' explanations of the White Space percept, since a complete diagnosis of the inmates' personality structure was not relevant to the present investigation.

In order to eliminate the possibility of examiner error it was necessary that the Rorschach responses be reviewed by experienced clinical psychologists. The examiner's interpretations were evaluated and confirmed by the chief clinical psychologist of a juvenile department in a large metropolitan area, and the chairman of a department of psychiatry in a prominent school of medicine.

The protocols examined were randomly selected by the following method: separation into two groups of twenty (by crimes against person and property); within each group every other protocol was chosen and subsequently surveyed.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The statistical treatment of data is relatively straightforward. To determine if differences existed between the groups of prisoners on the proportion of White Space responses made on the Rorschach, a critical ratio for two independent proportions was calculated (6). A critical ratio was also calculated to test for differences between the obtained proportion of White Space responses and the expected proportion. On the data from the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey, t-tests were calculated to determine if differences existed between either the two groups of prisoners or the
combined group of prisoners and the original standardizing population. In addition, a correlation was computed across all prisoners between their proportion of the White Space responses on the Rorschach Ink Blot Test and their score on the Hostility Scale. Finally, a t was computed to determine if this correlation was significant.
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CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Presentation of Data

In an attempt to distinguish between a group of convicts convicted of crimes against persons and a group of convicts convicted of crimes against property by a measure of hostility, the Rorschach Ink Blot Test (1) and the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey (8) were administered to two groups of prisoners from the main prison unit, Texas Department of Corrections, Huntsville, Texas. To control for intelligence, no prisoners with I.Q.'s greater than 110, as measured by the abbreviated form of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, were included in this study. The proportion of White Space responses made by the two groups of prisoners, as well as by the combined groups, and the expected value of the general population are given in Table I. The results of critical ratios between the two groups of prisoners and between the combined group of prisoners and the general population are also given in Table I. These data indicated that, while the two groups of prisoners did not differ from each other in the proportion of White Space responses made, the difference between the combined prisoner sample and the general population was statistically significant with a z of 2.194, p < .029.
TABLE I

SUMMARY OF COMPARISONS BETWEEN GROUPS ON THE PROPORTION OF WHITE SPACE RESPONSES MADE ON THE RORSCHACH INK BLOT TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Proportion of White Space Responses</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons Convicted of Crimes Against :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Property</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>$t = 0.394$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Sample of 40 Prisoners</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>$z = 2.194^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01.

Similar analyses were performed on the subjects' scores on the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey. The means and standard deviations on this instrument for the two prisoner groups, the combined prisoner group and the original standardizing sample, are given in Table II. The results of $t$-tests performed on these data are also given in Table II. These results indicate that while the differences between the two prisoner groups were not statistically significant, the difference between the combined prisoner sample and the original standardizing sample on the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey was statistically significant, $t = 3.217$, $p < .01$. 


TABLE II
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND t VALUES OF THE HOSTILITY SCALE OF THE PENSACOLA Z SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons Convicted of Crimes Against:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>t = .1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Sample of 40 Prisoners</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>z = 3.217*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardizing Sample</td>
<td>17.69</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01.

A correlation between the scores on the Hostility Scale and the proportion of White Spaces was also calculated. This was done since, regardless of whether or not the two convict groups differed on either the Hostility Scale or the White Space response of the Rorschach Ink Blot Test, the two measures may be related. The results of this analysis revealed a low negative correlational index of -0.196 with a t value of 1.233. These statistical indices were contrary to
expectations. It will be recalled that a statement was made to the effect that a high positive relationship would be expected to exist between measures of hostility on both instruments. An attempt to account for this unexpected low negative relationship will be offered in the discussion section that follows.

Discussion of Data

On the basis of the above results there is no support for the hypothesis that persons convicted of crimes against persons are more hostile than those convicted of crimes against property. Neither the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey nor the proportion of White Space responses on the Rorschach Ink Blot Test differentiated between subjects convicted of crimes against persons and subjects convicted of crimes against property. On both measures the sample of prisoners was found to differ from the general population. However, while the prisoners had a significantly greater proportion of White Space responses, they had significantly lower scores on the Hostility Scale. This inconsistency between the two dependent variables is further confirmed by the fact that no significant correlation was found to exist between the two instruments. Apparently, the Hostility Scale and the proportion of White Space responses do not measure the same psychological attribute.
These results are also too ambiguous to conclude that the White Space responses on the Rorschach Ink Blot Test may be interpreted as a measure of hostility or contrariness where it is not attributed to higher intelligence. While the prison sample does differ from the general population by giving a higher proportion of White Space responses, it may not be necessarily attributable to hostility or contrariness. This is only one of a number of things it could be attributed to. It must be assumed that a prison population is not going to be typical of the normal population and that a number of psychological disorders will be manifested among the prisoners. Data are consistent with previous studies indicating questionable status of White Space as related to hostility. A number of studies previously cited (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) have indicated that prisoners are more hostile than non-prisoners and that this hostility increases with the length of imprisonment. It would have been expected then, that there would have been statistically significant differences, in the direction opposite to those found, between the present sample and the population upon which the Z Survey was standardized. Surprisingly, the mean score made by the prisoners on the Hostility Scale was significantly below the normative data.

There is one plausible explanation for these results. It can be assumed that prisoners would be somewhat cautious about responses they made to questions if they thought that these answers might have some effect on them personally.
This misconception was apparent in some cases, as evidenced by questions asked by some subjects and verbal reports obtained from others. Rumors spread rapidly and are avidly accepted as truth in such a restricted environment, and reassurances to the contrary, as such were probably believed by a number of prisoners. In such a case, many subjects could be expected to be less honest in making their responses. Such a tendency might show up as overcompensation on an objective test like the Pensacola Z Survey. As a result, scores on the Hostility Scale might be expected to be lower than the standardizing population. It should be noted that when Jones (8) asked a group of subjects to "fake" the Pensacola Z Survey, a mean of 13.92 was reported. This is quite similar to the mean of 13.35 observed on the Hostility Scale in this study. It is highly probable, then, that the prisoners were in fact "faking" their answers on the Hostility Scale.

On the Rorschach Ink Blot Test, however, the responses are projections and there is no clear indication to the subjects as to what a socially acceptable response might be. Faking, then, on the Rorschach would be considerably more difficult than on the Pensacola Z Survey. This is an admittedly post hoc analysis of these data, but it is consistent with the results obtained and is perhaps not too implausible.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study was designed to test the hypothesis that persons convicted of crimes against persons are more hostile than those who commit crimes against property. Two instruments were used to measure hostility: the White Space response on the Rorschach Ink Blot Test and the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey. In addition, the abbreviated form of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale was administered so that all prisoners participating in the study had a Full Scale I.Q. of less than 110. A total of forty adult male prisoners from the main prison unit of the State Department of Corrections, Huntsville, Texas, participated in this study. Twenty of the subjects had been convicted of crimes against persons while the remaining twenty subjects had been convicted of crimes against property. None of the subjects had served prior sentences in any penitentiary.

No support was found for the experimental hypothesis. Neither the White Space response on the Rorschach nor the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey differentiated between the two groups of prisoners. While the combined groups of prisoners did make a statistically significantly higher proportion of White Space responses on the Rorschach than would be expected from the normal population, the prisoners
made significantly lower scores than did the standardizing population on the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey. Neither did the scores on the Hostility Scale correlate with the proportion of White Space responses. It was concluded, given previously reported data indicating that prisoners convey more hostility than the normal population, that the validity of the data collected on the Hostility Scale of the Pensacola Z Survey in this study must be questioned. The magnitude and direction of the deviation from the expected results is such that it is highly probable that the subjects in this study were "faking".

It may be a questionable assumption that persons who have committed crimes of a personal nature are more hostile than those who have committed crimes against property. The difference may be instead, not in the magnitude of the hostility but in the way in which it is expressed. It was pointed out that the Pensacola Z Survey is a structured forced-choice test, and as such, is subject to falsification by subjects who want to make the socially desirable response. The performance of the subjects in this study on the Hostility Scale resulted in means below and statistically different from the normalizing population. The data were similar to data from subjects in the standardizing population who had been instructed to "fake" their answers. It was noted that these results are not incompatible with the suggestion that these subjects may have been in fact attempting to make a socially acceptable answer. Such
an approach by these subjects would explain the failure of the Hostility Scale to correlate with the White Space response.
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