INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book. These are also available as one exposure on a standard 35mm slide or as a 17" x 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9009726

A study of criminal behavior patterns in convicted felons both before and during incarceration

De Luca, Henry R., Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1989

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

A Study of Criminal Behavior Patterns in Convicted Felons both Before and During Incarceration.

by

Henry R. De Luca

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Criminal Justice in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, the City University of New York.

1989

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Criminal Justice in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

July 5, 1989
Date

Carl F Wiedemann
Chair of Examining Committee

September 5, 1989
Date

Carl F Wiedemann
Dr. Carl F. Wiedemann
Executive Officer

Dr. Carl F. Wiedemann

Dr. Barbara Raffel Price

Dr. Zelma Henriques

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ABSTRACT

A Study of Criminal Behavior Patterns in Convicted Felons both Before and During Incarceration.

by

Henry R. De Luca

Advisor: Professor Carl F. Wiedemann

Categories of crime, which resulted in incarceration, were compared with categories of misbehavior which were documented during a six month incarceration period. Data for the study were collected from institutional records of 621 convicted male felons imprisoned in a New York State maximum security correctional institution. Crimes of conviction were classified as Aggression, Property-related, Drug-related, and Other or Manipulative. These four categories were utilized to classify inmate misbehavior. A fifth category, None, identified inmates who had no disciplinary reports. Inmate misbehavior was also classified by levels of seriousness and by the frequency of violations. The study refutes the concept of habituation and tends to indicate that the prediction of inmate misbehavior based on demographic or situational characteristics or on the crime of commitment is not possible with substantial effect.

Dedication

This effort is dedicated to the special people who have had a major impact on my life, and who have all contributed to the successful completion of this work. First, I dedicate this work to my mother, Clara Walstrom Van Guilder, who taught me, by example, what the real treasures in life are, and who has been helping me across many bridges since we first crossed the Saunders Street Bridge and launched me on my educational journey.

I also dedicate this work to Dr. Tom (T. J.) Miller, an unflagging friend who has encouraged, supported and prodded me onwards to higher goals and to new beginnings, with my undying thanks for always being there with his hand extended.

Acknowledgments

My deepest appreciation to Dr. Carl F. Wiedemann, my advisor and friend, without whose support and guidance this work would not have been possible. To Professors Barbara Raffel Price and Zelma Henriques, my thanks for their efforts as members of my committee, for their constructive advice, and for their help and understanding throughout the dissertation approval process.

I would also like to thank Jean Rikhoff, Professor and Author who predicted that I would one day have a book of my own, for the confidence and encouragement she extended to a "Hack" returning to school after an absence of too many years. I would also like to acknowledge my indebtedness to my uncomplaining family, who understood my irrational behavior over these many months, and to my wife, Loretta Appleton DeLuca, who brought order out of chaos to this manuscript and to my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Abstract		iv.
Dedication and Acknowledgments		v.
List of Tables		vii.
CHAPTER		
I.	INTRODUCTION to the Problem	1
II.	THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
III.	METHODOLOGY Sample Data Collection for the Study Coding of Variables Data Coding Hypothesis Testing Variables Method of Analysis	31
IV.	RESULTS	51
V.	DISCUSSION First Discussion Second Discussion Summary Conclusions	105
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	151

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior First Violation, all Levels of Seriousness Combined, Including No Violations, Chi-square....	54
1A.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior First Violation, all Levels of Seriousness Combined, Chi-square.....	55
1B.	Category of Crime by Level of Seriousness of First Misbehavior Violation, Including No Violations, Chi-square.....	56
2.	Category of Crime by Frequency of Misbehavior at Lowest Level of Seriousness.....	57
3.	Category of Crime by Frequency of Misbehavior at Mid-Range Level of Seriousness.....	58
4.	Category of Crime by Frequency of Misbehavior at Highest Level of Seriousness.....	59
5.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, First Violation at Lowest Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	60
6.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, First Violation at Mid-Range Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	61
7.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, First Violation at Highest Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	62
8.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, Second Violation, All Levels of Seriousness Combined, Chi-square.....	63
9.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, Second Violation, at Lowest Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	64
10.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, Second Violation at Mid-Range Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	65

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE		Page
11.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, Second Violation at Highest Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	66
12.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, Third Violation at Lowest Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	67
13.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, Third Violation at Mid-Range Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	68
14.	Category of Crime by Category of Misbehavior, Third Violation at Highest Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	69
15.	Category of Crime by Level of Seriousness of Second Misbehavior, Chi-square.....	70
16.	Category of Misbehavior, First Violation by Second Violation, Including No Second Violation, all Levels of Seriousness Combined, Chi-square...	71
17.	Category of Misbehavior, First Violation by Second Violation, all Levels of Seriousness Combined, Chi-square.....	72
18.	Category of Misbehavior, First Violation by Second Violation, Including Those With No Second Violation, at Lowest Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	73
19.	Category of Misbehavior, First Violation by Second Violation, Including Those with No Second Violation, at Mid-Range Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	74
20.	Category of Misbehavior, First Violation by Second Violation, Including Those with No Second Violation, at Highest Level of Seriousness, Chi-square.....	75
21.	Crime Category Aggression Against all Predictors, General Linear Model.....	77

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE		Page
22.	Crime Category Aggression Against all Predictors, Stepwise Procedure.....	79
23.	Crime Category Property Against all Predictors, General Linear Model.....	80
24.	Crime Category Property Against all Predictors, Stepwise Procedure.....	82
25.	Crime Category Drug Related Against all Predictors, General Linear Model.....	83
26.	Crime Category Drug Related Against all Predictors, Stepwise Procedure.....	85
27.	Crime Category Other Against all Predictors, General Linear Model.....	86
28.	Crime Category Other Against all Predictors, Stepwise Procedure.....	87
29.	Misbehavior Category Aggression, Second Violation all Levels of Seriousness Combined Against all Predictors, General Linear Model.....	89
30.	Misbehavior Category Aggression, Second Violation all Levels of Seriousness Combined Against all Predictors, Stepwise Procedure.....	91
31.	Misbehavior Category Property, Second Violation all Levels of Seriousness Combined Against all Predictors, General Linear Model.....	93
32.	Misbehavior Category Property, Second Violation all Levels of Seriousness Combined Against all Predictors, Stepwise Procedure.....	95
33.	Misbehavior Category Drug Related, Second Violation all Levels of Seriousness Combined Against all Predictors, General Linear Model.....	96

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE		Page
34.	Misbehavior Category Drug Related, Second Violation all Levels of Seriousness Combined Against all Predictors, Stepwise Procedure.....	98
35.	Misbehavior Category Other, Second Violation all Levels of Seriousness Combined Against all Predictors, General Linear Model.....	99
36.	Misbehavior Category Other, Second Violation all Levels of Seriousness Combined Against all Predictors, Stepwise Procedure.....	101
37.	Misbehavior Category None, No Second Violation Against all Predictors, General Linear Model.....	102
38.	Misbehavior Category None, No Second Violation Against all Predictors, Stepwise Procedure.....	103
39.	Summary of Findings of Significance in Tables 21 through 28 with Crime Category as the Dependent Variable.....	129
40.	Summary of Findings of Significance in Tables 29 through 38 with Category of Misbehavior Second Violation as the Dependent Variable.....	131
41.	A Comparison of Crime Category with Category of Total Misbehavior.....	134
42.	A Comparison of Category of Misbehavior, First Violation with Category of Misbehavior, Second Violation.....	140

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is a study of the relationships between the category of crime resulting in the imprisonment of male felons and the category of misbehavior exhibited by male inmates confined to a maximum security prison. The central purpose of this study is to determine if a relationship exists between the type of criminal behavior which resulted in incarceration and the type of institutional misconduct and, if so, to determine the strength of this relationship. An identification of these relationships will aid in the development of an understanding of inmate misbehavior. Understanding inmate misbehavior is crucial for prison administrators who are responsible for protecting the public by securing convicted felons in correctional institutions. At the same time, administrators must provide a safe prison environment for both inmates and staff as well as offer inmates rehabilitation opportunities. In order to achieve these goals, correction administrators must not only provide an orderly institutional environment, but they must also attempt to prevent disruptive inmate behavior from occurring.

Since the 1970's, a greater proportion of felons sent to prison have been sentenced for crimes of violence (murder, manslaughter, assault) than for property crimes (Bowker, 1977). This shift from a less violent to a more violent inmate population, combined with the rapidly rising numbers of inmates housed under increasingly crowded conditions, makes it imperative that correction administrators develop a greater understanding of inmate behavior.

This research addresses male inmate misbehavior rather than the misbehavior of female inmates since the greatest proportion of inmates are males - approximately 95% of the total adult prison population (Allen and Simonsen, 1986) - and because disruptive behavior is more common among male inmates (Cole, 1986).

There are three predominant perspectives regarding inmate behavior: The Deprivation or Indigenous Model, the Importation Model, and the Integrated Model.

The first view, the Indigenous or Deprivation Model, considers inmate behavior to be the response to the dehumanizing process of undergoing incarceration (Korn and McCorkle, 1954) and the deprivations of imprisonment (Sykes, 1974). Sykes (1974) theorized that inmates react to the "pains of imprisonment" (loss of freedom, material goods and services, and the loss of social and sexual contacts) by uniting under the common bond of incarceration. This uniting and bonding results in the establishment of an inmate subculture through which the population can minimize their deprivations by sharing of material goods and providing social contacts.

The second model, the Importation Model, refutes the Indigenous Model which, according to Irwin and Cressey (1962), does not take into consideration the inmate's pre-prison experience. Irwin and Cressey (1962) expressed the belief that the inmate subculture is the criminal subculture brought into prison when the criminal is incarcerated. Irwin and Cressey (1962) opined that the behavior of prisoners is the result of criminal attitudes, values, and the criminal code which were learned and adhered to prior to incarceration.

The third model of inmate behavior combines the Indigenous and Importation models. This perspective, the Integrated Model, holds that inmate behavior is the end product of one's pre-prison experience, the prison environment, and post-prison expectations (Thomas and Foster, 1972). According to Thomas (1977) the Indigenous Model neglects the importance of the criminal history and the Importation Model minimizes the effects of the prison environment on inmate behavior and neither model considers the inmate's post-prison expectations.

Hans Toch (1978) expanded on the Integrated Model and identified inmate behavior as a product of pre-prison experience, personal disposition, and the situation in which one is involved. Toch (1978) referred to the "social climate" when discussing inmate behavior which included the inmate, other inmates, staff, and the prison environment. He maintained that an inmate's perceptions of the social climate as being hostile or threatening can impact on that inmate's behavior.

Early studies of prisoners (Hayner and Ash, 1936; Reimer, 1937) focused on whether prisoners were manipulative or aggressive. Clemmer (1940), in his study "The Prisoner Community," directed attention to the interaction among inmates in prison and conceptualized a prisoner social order. Subsequent studies (Schrag, 1941; Sykes, 1958; Irwin and Cressey, 1962) theorized about the origins of the inmate subculture.

More recent studies have directed their attention not to the origins of an inmate subculture but toward the relationship between criminal activity and inmate misconduct. These recent studies (Myers and Levy, 1978; Jaman, 1972; Wolfgang, 1961; Johnson, 1968) found positive correlations between criminal history factors and inmate misbehavior. Other recent studies (Brown and Spevacek, 1971; Coe, 1961; Ellis, et al., 1974) produced contradictory results when analyzing the relationships between criminal history factors and inmate misconduct. It is not surprising, of course, to have mixed results from similar studies given the complexity of human behavior. However, while factors which generate and shape human behavior are numerous, correlations can be found between certain demographic, acquired, situational, and environmental factors (Chapman, 1981).

This dissertation is building on that body of knowledge in three ways: First, by analyzing the strength of the relationships between the category of crime resulting in incarceration and subsequent misbehavior; secondly, by determining the strength of the relationships between the category of crime resulting in incarceration and the three levels of seriousness of the category of inmate

misbehavior; lastly, by analyzing the strength of the relationships between the category of inmate misconduct resulting from the first report of misconduct and the category of misconduct resulting from a second violation of institutional rules.

This concept of predictable, categorical behavior is in contradiction to other theories of inmate behavior which contend that an individual's behavior is a function of the opportunities, both legitimate and illegitimate (Ohlin and Cloward, 1960), to satisfy their needs and desires.

The concept of opportunity to act legitimately or illegitimately was introduced by Ohlin and Cloward (1960) who posited the belief that individuals actually occupy two positions in society at the same time. One position is occupied in the legitimate social situation and the second is in the illegitimate social structure. As long as an individual has the opportunity and ability to satisfy needs and meet goals via legitimate avenues, the illegitimate structure is seldom used. However, when illegitimate opportunities present an easier avenue for meeting these needs and goals or, if legitimate opportunity is blocked, then an illegal opportunity may be the route taken. With respect to the concept of opportunity theory, correction administrators are responsible for providing legitimate opportunities for inmates to satisfy their needs and meet their goals while preventing illegitimate opportunities from arising.

In this framework of opportunity theory, the rewards available and the likelihood and severity of sanctions will determine

the selection of both the legitimacy (or illegitimacy) of the behavior and the category (aggressive, manipulative, and so forth) of such behavior.

In addition to the availability of opportunities for behavior, a second set of factors which may have an impact upon behavior in this model are the abilities of the involved individual. One's ability (for example, bodytype) may influence one's mode of behavior (Glueck, S. and Glueck, E., 1956.)

The theoretical foundations for the concept of categorical behavior (which is the focus of this dissertation) are developed and presented in Chapter II.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

For the purposes of this study, crime and inmate misbehavior have been separated into four broad categories - Aggression, Property, Drug Related, and Other. Placement of crimes of conviction into one of the categories was based on the following guidelines:

Crimes against persons have been labeled "Aggression;"

Crimes against property have been labeled "Property;"

Crimes involving controlled substances have been labeled "Drug Related;" and

Crimes not placed into any of the above categories have been labeled as "Other."

The following guidelines were used to place incidents of Inmate Misbehavior into the same categories:

Misbehavior directed against persons has been labeled "Aggression;"

Misbehavior directed against property has been labeled "Property;"

Misbehavior associated with controlled substances have been labeled "Drug Related;" and

Misbehavior not included in the above three categories has been identified as "Other."

A fifth category of inmate behavior has been labeled "None," indicating those inmates with no incidents of misbehavior recorded on their institutional disciplinary record.

To further define the four categories of behavior used in this study, a second approach to separating crimes of conviction and inmate misbehavior into distinct classifications can be utilized which takes into account behavior and motivation. Based on the premise that individuals perform activities for material gain or personal satisfactions, behavior and motivation are each divided into two types: behavior can be either confrontational or manipulative and motivation can be for either internal gain (feelings of power, pleasure) or external gain (possessions, services).

The four classifications developed from this division of behavior and motivation and their relation to the four categories of behavior used in this study can be summarized as follows:

Confrontational-Internal Gain relates to Aggression (violence);

Confrontational-External Gain relates to Property (theft);

Manipulative-Internal Gain relates to Drug Related (substance abuse);

Manipulative-External Gain relates to Other (miscellaneous crimes).

An a priori classification of inmate behavior can be constructed from these categorizations which can be compared to a system developed by Robert Merton (1938). Known as Strain Theory, it identified both the behavior and motivation of individuals in a

defined social situation and identified people as Conformists, Innovators, Ritualists, Retreatists, and Rebels.

Based on an earlier theory developed by Emile Durkheim, Merton attempted to explain deviant behavior. Emile Durkheim (1933) had introduced the term "anomie" to describe a breakdown of societal norms. Durkheim believed that this condition existed when the normal procedures that govern how people interact break down, leaving society in a disorganized state. Elaborating on Durkheim's theory, Merton (1938) separated social norms into societal goals and legitimate means for reaching those goals. Merton also suggested that not everyone in society has an equal opportunity to achieve these goals through legitimate means and, as a result, the individual is strained between the legitimate goals and the restricted means of achieving them. Merton argued that strain generates deviance and, deviance is any behavior which strays from socially acceptable goals or from legitimate means of achieving those goals.

Merton (1938) defined five modes whereby the individual resolves the strain between legitimate goals and the restricted, legitimate means of achieving those goals. These modes of adaptation are:

Conformity — One accepts the legitimate means and the legitimate goals established by society.

Innovation — One rejects the legitimate means but accepts the legitimate goals. Innovators often invent new ways of achieving success.

Ritualism — One accepts the legitimate means but rejects the legitimate goals. The means replace the goals and become the goals in themselves.

Retreatism — One rejects both the legitimate means and the legitimate goals and refuses to participate in society. Withdrawal from society may be in the form of alcoholism, drug addiction or by becoming a recluse.

Rebellion — One rejects the legitimate means or the legitimate goals or both and replaces the rejected means or goals with their own means, goals or both (Merton, 1938).

Combining the four categories of inmate behavior identified for the purposes of this study with Merton's classifications of behavior and motivation results in the following operational framework for discussing inmate behavior:

Figure 1.

	Internal Gain (Feelings)	**External Gain (Material)**
Confrontational	**REBEL** Aggression (Violence, Murder)	**RITUALIST** Property (Robbery)
Manipulative	**RETREATIST** Drug Related	**INNOVATOR** Other (Fraud, Embezzelment)
No Misbehavior	**CONFORMIST**	

Within the realm of inmate misbehavior, Merton's Conformist describes the inmate who has no record of institutional misbehavior. The Innovator is an inmate who has been found guilty of the misbehaviors listed within Other. The Retreatist is an inmate who has

been found guilty of alcohol or drug abuse. The Rebel is an inmate who has committed an assault or threatened another person. Ritualists, having been defined as people for whom the means have become their goals, in a criminal context would be classified as an habitual thief. In terms of prison misbehavior, an inmate who continues to steal in prison, regardless of the risk or lack of profit, is classified as a Ritualist.

While Merton did not apply his modes of adaptation to incarcerated individuals, a social framework of means and goals can be defined as they occur in a prison setting.

For most inmates, goals would encompass release from prison as early as possible, and, while in prison, maintaining their safety, security, comfort, and serving their time with as few problems as possible. These goals would equate to an orderly institution.

A system of institutional rules and regulations provide the means by which the inmates can achieve these goals. By obeying (or giving the appearance of obeying) both the formal rules and regulations of the institution as well as the informal rules established by the inmate subculture (folkways, mores, and customs), an inmate can hope to obtain release from prison in as short a time as possible while avoiding difficulties with staff and inmates, maintaining safety, and living as comfortably as possible while in prison.

The goals of the prison administration include protecting the public by preventing escapes, protecting the inmates from each other, providing for the health and welfare of the inmate population,

providing programs which offer rehabilitation opportunities, and facilitating the early release of inmates. These goals would also equate to an orderly institution.

The means by which prison administrators would achieve these goals are supervision and control of the inmate population through the enforcement of rules and regulations. The provision of viable vocational, educational, and therapeutic programs would also contribute to administration's goals.

Thus, the goals of the inmates and prison administration are the same - maintaining order, providing safety, and facilitating early releases. While the inmates may not accept the rehabilitation objective of prison programs, most inmates engage in programs in order to facilitate their release. Similarly, the inmates may not agree with the rules and regulations, but they generally abide by them, or at least appear to comply, because obedience expedites release. Further, the means by which inmates and prison administrators can achieve their goals are much the same - both impose sanctions on those who violate the rules.

One of the first researchers to identify social roles of people in prison was Hans Reimer (1937) who labeled prisoner social roles as "Right Guys" and "Politicians." Right Guys were the inmate leaders of prison society and Politicians were the inmates who were concerned with their own interests. Right Guys, according to Reimer, were the inmates who followed the convict code. He believed that they would not take advantage of other prisoners nor inform on them and, that in the eyes of other prisoners, Right Guys were reliable, solid people.

While Reimer's two categories of inmate types are very broad, they relate to Merton's model for adapting to strain. Since some Politicians obey the rules and regulations (accept the means) and do not create trouble for themselves or prison administrators (accept the goals), they are comparable to Merton's Conformists. Other Politicians disobey rules and regulations (reject the means) but are careful to avoid detection which would cause trouble for themselves and prison administrators (accept the goals). These Politicians are comparable to Merton's Innovators.

Some Right Guys disobey institutional rules and regulations (reject the means) and are not concerned about disrupting the institution (reject the goals). These Right Guys are comparable to Merton's Rebels. Other Right Guys obey the rules and regulations (accept the means) but do not agree with the prison administration's mission (reject the goals). Hence, these Right Guys are related to Merton's Ritualists.

Another early study of the prison social structure was conducted by Hayner and Ash (1939). Their research, which was conducted in the Washington State Reformatory, identified a sub rosa inmate economic system which gave the inmates a way to offset the loss of goods and services caused by incarceration, and presented them with opportunities for succeeding in the inmate social structure. Hayner and Ash referred to this system as "conniving." It included gambling, smuggling of food, drugs and cigarettes, and providing services to inmates. Cash, prison tokens, and tobacco were the media of exchange. They identified two behavior types within this system - "Politicians"

and "Rangatangs." The successful connivers were classified as the Politicians and formed the upper class of the prison social set. The unsuccessful connivers were called Rangatangs. These were bullies who respected neither other inmates nor staff.

Hayner and Ash's classification of inmate behavior types also fits into Merton's modes of adaptation. The Politicians are self-serving and manipulative. They break institutional rules and regulations (reject the means) while pursuing business interests, and, at the same time, are careful to avoid upsetting the order of the prison (accepts the goals). The Politicians are equivalent to the Innovators defined by Merton. Rangatangs, however, respect neither prisoners nor staff. They violate the institutional rules (reject the means) and are unconcerned about the order of the institution (reject the goals). Their mode of adapting to life in prison is likened to Merton's Retreatists.

One of the major contributors to the field of sociology of prison life was Donnald Clemmer. His early studies were directed towards understanding the social interaction among prisoners and resulted in three broad categories of inmate types: the Hoosier, the Middle Class, and the Elite (Clemmer, 1940). Clemmer later refined his classifications into four inmate types: Clique Members, Group Members, Semi-Solitary Man, and the Complete-Solitary Man (Clemmer, 1958).

The Clique Member is one of a few select members who associate with each other, sharing resources and goods, and willing to accept the punishment for another Clique Member without complaint. Loyalty is to the clique and all actions taken benefit the group. The Clique Member

is equivalent to Reimer's Right Guy and fits into Merton's adaptive mode called Rebel.

Group Members mingle with other inmates and associate with them but are not close to anyone. They violate rules and regulations in order to satisfy their needs (reject the means) but are careful to do so with a minimum of trouble (accept the goals). They are similar to Merton's Innovator.

The Semi-Solitary Man maintains civil relationships with other inmates but is a loner who avoids trouble by conforming to institutional rules and regulations (accepts the means and the goals). This inmate fits Merton's description of a Conformist.

The Complete-Solitary Man shares virtually nothing with others. He belongs neither to the inmate social order nor does he accept the institution's system. He does his own time in his own way and, since he rejects both the means and goals of the prison, he fits Merton's Retreatist type.

Schrag (1954) did an early study of prisoners which resulted in the classification of criminals as violent offenders, sex offenders, and property offenders. Schrag (1961) later identified four major groups of prisoners: Square-Johns, Con-Politicians, Right-Guys, and Outlaws. These four inmate typologies are also compatible with Merton's modes of adaptation.

Schrag's Square-John is an inmate who is not a career criminal but adheres to the rules and regulations (accepts the means), engages in program activities for self-improvement, and does not disturb the order of the prison (accepts the goals). This inmate fits Merton's Conformist classification.

The Con-Politician is the inmate who ascribes to the legitimate goals but does not ascribe to the means. This is a manipulative, self-serving individual who appears to abide by (but actually rejects) both the inmate code and the institutional rules and regulations (rejects the means) thus avoiding trouble with either inmates or correction staff (accepts the goals). This adaptive behavior is similar to that of Merton's Innovator.

The Right-Guy adheres to the inmate code. A career criminal, this inmate rejects the goals of the prison administration but not the goals of the inmate culture and also accepts the sanctions imposed for his misconduct (accepts the means) in order to prevent disruption of the institution. His interest in maintaining the peace within the institution is not for the sake of the prison administration but rather for the preservation of the inmate social order and his potential for early release. The Right-Guy is similar to Merton's Rebel.

Schrag identified an Outlaw as an inmate who rejects the rules and regulations of the prison (rejects the means). He is unconcerned about the institutional goals (rejects the goals), and does not uphold the inmate code. He is an outlaw to both the inmate population and the prison administration. The Outlaw is also similar to Merton's Retreatist.

Schrag (Carter, et al., 1977) subsequently renamed these four types of prisoners as follows:

Square John	=	Prosocial
Con Politicians	=	Pseudo-social
Right Guy	=	Anti-social
Outlaw	=	Asocial

Schrag's work was not only a continuation of previous studies of inmate adaptation to prison society and the resulting inmate social order, but it made a connection between the inmates and their orientation toward society. His Prosocial type inmate had a positive orientation towards society, the Anti-social type inmate had a negative orientation, the Pseudo-social type inmate was only slightly oriented towards society, and the Asocial type inmate had a very low attachment to legitimate social values (Carter, et al., 1977).

The precept that the prison subculture was the product of incarceration continued to dominate the thinking of researchers during this period. Expanding on this premise, Gersham Sykes conducted an in depth study of the factors found within the prison environment which influenced the development of the prison social structure. His study, the population for which was drawn from inmates held in the maximum security prison in Trenton, N.J., took place between 1954 and 1957 (Sykes, 1974).

Sykes expressed a belief that the prison subculture was primarily a reaction to the deprivations of imprisonment. He suggested that by replacing a prisoner's name with a number and by replacing his personal clothing and effects with prison issue, the inmate suffered a depersonalization process which Sykes referred to as the "pains of imprisonment" (Sykes, 1974, p.64). He concluded that the inmate subculture developed as a result of the loss of security, the loss of freedom and the social, sexual and material deprivations associated with imprisonment (Sykes, 1974).

In his book, Society of Captives, Sykes (1974) identified the following prisoner argot roles: the Rat (a squealer), the Center Man (a boot licker, one who is servile), the Merchant (one who sells rather than gives, an exploiter), the Gorilla (a bully), the Weakling (one who is incapable of self-defense, an easy mark), the Wolf (an aggressive inmate who forces others into performing homosexual acts), the Punk (one who is forced into a homosexual role), the Fag (a homosexual), the Ball Buster (one who violates rules and regulations and defies authority when there is no hope of accomplishing anything, senseless defiance), the Tough (one who is aggressive and confronts people face-to-face regardless of the other's reputation), the Real Man (one who confronts his keepers but is neither overly aggressive nor subservient), and the Hipster (all mouth, one who cannot carry out the Tough Guy threats, bluster rather than substance) (Sykes, 1974, pp. 84-108). Sykes' argot roles can be compared to Merton's adaptive roles:

The Center Man obeys the rules and regulations (accepts the means) and cooperates with staff (accepts the means). The Center Man is similar to Merton's Conformist.

The Merchant appears to obey but actually disobeys the rules and regulations (rejects the means) while acquiring comforts and, while doing so, attempts to avoid disrupting the operations of the prison (accepts the goals). The Merchant is an Innovator.

The Real Man is another name for the Right Guys (one who rejects the means and goals of the prison administration) and is similar to Merton's Rebel.

The Gorilla is one who rejects the rules and regulations governing the prison and also rejects the inmate code. In the eyes of both the inmates and prison administrators, he is an Outlaw or Retreatist.

In addition to Sykes, Cloward (1960) also considered the behavior exhibited by prisoners to be primarily a reaction to the degradation created by incarceration. He held that the inmate subculture resulted from the efforts extended by inmates to minimize the deprivations of prison life, to regain their identity, and to restore their self-esteem. An inmate's status in that subculture was determined by his response to prison life.

One of two basic responses by which inmates adapt to life behind bars were hypothesized: institutionalization or prisonization. An institutionalized inmate makes prison his home, accepts the regimentation, and attempts to make himself as comfortable as possible in the prison environment. He becomes a good inmate and complies with the rules and regulations. His life in prison is an orderly existence and requires no major decision-making on his part, however, he suffers a loss of identity. When inmates lose their identity, become unconcerned about life outside the institution, and focus on being good inmates, they are said to be "institutionalized" (Shiloh, 1968).

The other response process of prisoners has been called "prisonization" (Clemmer, 1958). Prisonization is the process by which an inmate immerses himself in the inmate subculture in order to establish an identity, maintain autonomy and regain self-esteem. A

prisonized inmate adheres to the inmate code and opposes the rules of the prison administration.

Prisonization has been found to be linked to the length of time an inmate is incarcerated. When the sentence being served is broken down into three stages of imprisonment - early, middle, and late - prisonization is weakest during the early and late stages and is strongest during the middle stage of incarceration (Wheeler, 1961; Garabedian, 1964). Prisonization is more apt to occur in maximum security institutions where inmates feel more powerless than inmates in less restricted facilities (Thomas, 1977). The process which Clemmer defined as "...taking on, in greater or lesser degree, of the folkways, mores, customs and general culture of the penitentiary" (Ramirez, 1984, p.424) is the heart of the Deprivation Model, It is thought that inmates offset the pains of imprisonment (Sykes, 1958) and the loss of identity, which are unavoidable in a total institution (Goffman, 1961), by establishing an inmate subculture which is in direct opposition to the goals of prison administrators. A study by Weinberg (1942) revealed that prisonized inmates and prison staffs are polarized and see each other as enemies. Such polarization strengthens anti-social values and reduces the likelihood of a prisonized inmate leading a non-criminal life (Bowker, 1977).

The Deprivation Model has been derived from the results of these studies. It focuses on the development of the inmate subculture as a response to the loss of freedom, the loss of social and sexual contacts, the loss of security, the loss of material goods and

services, the loss of autonomy, and the regimentation associated with imprisonment (Sykes, 1974; Goffman, 1961).

Irwin and Cressey (1962) challenged the Deprivation Model with their Importation Model arguing that the inmate code is nothing more than the criminal code carried into the prison. It was their position that, since most prisoners are drawn from a "hard core," lower class strata of society who have been in and out of prison since adolescence, it is the pre-incarceration folkways, mores, and values of these criminals that permeates the inmate social system. They argued that confinement alone does not generate the subculture of prisoners. Furthermore, they maintained that the prison subculture is not one but actually three subcultures existing in prison at the same time. They classified these as the Thief, Convict, and Legitimate subcultures.

The Thief subculture was identified as being comprised of those inmates who adhered to the criminal code and whose core values were consistent with the values associated with being a Right Guy. Because they were imprisoned so often and for so much of their lives, the social values of this type of inmate formed a part of the prison social structure.

The Convict subculture, which Irwin and Cressey defined as being the subculture in which there is little outside influence on inmate behavior, consists of those inmates whose status in prison is determined by how they cope with the prison environment and by their ability to manipulate the people in that environment. These inmates are equivalent to Merton's Innovators.

The Legitimate subculture encompasses those prisoners who ascribe to neither the Thief subculture nor the Convict subculture. These prisoners, who comprise the largest group of prisoners, create few problems in prison. Their core values are the values associated with those of the Square John (Irwin and Cressey, 1962).

Irwin and Cressey (1962) hypothesized that there are actually three subcultures, two of which, Thief and Legitimate, support the Importation Model and one, Convict, which actually supports the Deprivation Model. Irwin and Cressey had, in effect, invented the Integrated Model but did not describe it as such.

The validity of the Deprivation Model was again challenged by Ramirez (1984) who suggested that the early researchers of prison life and inmate subcultures may have been predisposed to "...place primary causal status upon the unique aspects of the prison experience in explaining the emergence and salient characteristics of the 'inmate subculture'" (p. 426). Since these researchers were middle and upper-class whites and their subjects were lower-class and predominantly from minorities, Ramirez believed that they may have mistakenly identified an inmate subculture as being indigenous to prison when in fact it was imported. His study indicated that "...the 'us versus them' interpretation of the staff and inmate social system may exist more in the minds of the researchers and the general public than in the minds of staff and inmates." (p. 451).

Ramirez' study (1984), like Wheeler's (1961), found that both inmates and corrections staff over estimated the anti-staff attitude of

inmates, indicating that sociologists may have been measuring prisonization with the wrong ruler. Ramirez (1984) believed that the prisonization process which places inmates and staff at odds with each other is contrary to the observation made by Goffman (1961, p.66)) that prisons are "total institutions" which homogenize those within. Ramirez (1984) contended that this homogenizing process would affect staff as well as inmates and would result in cooperation among the keepers and the kept rather than generate opposition.

Another perspective on the origin and development of the inmate subculture has been expressed by Thomas. He proposed that neither the Deprivation Model nor the Importation Model function independently but, instead, co-exist (Thomas, 1977). His model of adaptation to the prison environment is referred to as the Integrated Model because it combines the Importation and Indigenous or Deprivation Models. The Integrated Model states that adaptation to the prison environment is influenced by the values developed prior to incarceration and the conditions of confinement (Thomas, 1977).

In earlier studies, Thomas and Foster (1973) and Schwartz (1971) had determined that pre-prison variables were indicators of the inmate's attitudes and values when he first enters the prison and indicators of the inmate's adherence to the inmate subculture. The pre-prison variables used in their studies were: age at first arrest, age at first conviction, social class, prior incarceration, and frequency of arrest. Extra-prison variables such as correspondence with people outside the prison and post-prison expectations, were also found to impact on an inmate's adjustment to the prison. Their research,

which supported the Importation Model, identified the following relationships between pre-prison and extra-prison variables, and the inmate's behavior in prison: A lower social class, arrest at an early age, fewer social contacts with people outside of prison, and a more negative post-prison expectation, all equated with a greater inmate role adaptation (Thomas and Foster, 1973).

Expanding on these research results, Thomas (1977) used these pre- and post-prison characteristics to further define the prisonization process. The Integrated Model of adaptation to life in prison considers three clusters of variables which influence the inmate subculture: pre-prison socialization, the prison organization, and extra-prison influences. Pre-prison variables which influence inmate behavior include education level, average income over the two-year period prior to incarceration, employment history during that same two-year period, prior arrests, and the number of self-reported felonies.

The prison organization variables affecting inmate behavior include the length of sentence (more than one year or less than one year), opposition to administration goals, opposition to correction staff, availability of programs, type of housing, and post-incarceration expectations. The extra-prison influence on inmate behavior refers to contacts with people outside of prison and is a factor which is imported into the prison environment.

Factors found to be related to prisonization are: the acceptance by and adaption of the prisoner to the inmate subculture which increases criminal tendencies. Where post-prison expectations

are negative, prisonization increases. As an inmate's social contacts decrease, acceptance of the inmate subculture is more likely to occur; as custodial influences become more coercive, alienation and prisonization increase; the younger a person is at the time of first conviction, the more acceptable the inmate subculture becomes (Thomas, 1977). Thomas' study (1977) indicates that the Integrated Model "...provides a more powerful explanatory model than does either [Deprivation or Importation models] taken separately," (p. 142).

A subsequent study made by Hans Toch (1978) supported Thomas' Integrated Model. Toch considered inmate behavior to be a product of both the inmate's individual characteristics and the prison environment. Toch referred to the prison environment as the "social climate" when discussing inmate behavior. This "social climate" included the inmate, other inmates, the staff, and the physical environment, all of which influenced an inmate's behavior (Carter, et al., 1985).

A comparison of the inmate types discussed thus far against Merton's modes of adaptation is made in the following chart:

Figure 2.

Merton's Modes of Adaptation Superimposed on Inmate Modes of Adaptation

	CONFORMIST	INNOVATOR	RETREATIST	RITUALIST	REBEL
Means:	Accepts	Rejects	Rejects	Rejects	Rejects
Goals:	Accepts	Accepts	Rejects	Accepts	Rejects
1936					
Hayner & Ash	n/a	Politician	Rangatangs	n/a	n/a
1937					
Hans Reimer	Politician	Politician	n/a	Right Guy	Right Guy
1938					
Clemmer	Hoosier	Middle Class	n/a	n/a	The Elite
1940					
Clemmer Reclassified Prisoners	Semi Solitary Man	Group Man	Complete Solitary Man	n/a	Complete Clique Man
1941					
Schrag	Square John	Politician	Outlaw		Right Guy
Schrag Reclasssified	Prosocial	Pseudosocial	Asocial	n/a	Antisocial
1958					
Sykes	Center Man	Merchant	Gorilla	n/a	Real Man
1962					
Irwin and Cressy	Do Right	Convicts	n/a	n/a	Thieves
1989					
Categories of Misbehavior	None	Other	Drug Related	Property	Aggression
Type of Gain:	Internal	External	Internal	External	External
Means:	Manipulation	Manipulation	Manipulation	Confrontation	Confrontation

In addition to the theoretical subculture studies cited above, recent studies have attempted to present correlations between demographics and other characteristics and misbehavior while

incarcerated. Several studies attempted to determine a relationship between criminal history factors and inmate misbehavior. The results, to date, have been mixed. Positive correlations were found between the frequency of prison rule violations and the frequency of juvenile arrests (Meyers and Levy, 1978), the frequency of juvenile commitments (Jason, 1972), and prior incarceration (Wolfgang, 1961; Johnson, 1966).

Contrary results were reached by other investigators. Brown and Spevacek (1971) noted that inmates with frequent misbehavior reports were found to have had fewer juvenile offenses and fewer felony arrests than those inmates with lower rates of misbehavior. Coe (1961) found no relationship between inmate misbehavior and the frequency of juvenile arrests, the total number of arrests, the number of previous convictions, and the number of sentences served. Another study (Ellis, et al., 1974) concluded that inmate misconduct was unrelated to the history of convictions for serious crimes. However, a relationship between the crime of commitment and inmate misconduct was found by both Schnur (1945-1950) and Flanagan (1983). Their research indicated that those convicted of serious crimes had significantly higher rates of inmate misbehavior. In addition, Flanagan also found that length of sentence had an inverse relationship to misbehavior: inmates with short sentences had higher rates of misbehavior (Goetting and Howsen, 1986).

Demographic characteristics have been found to have a bearing on the tendency to misbehave in prison. Several studies have utilized self-reports by inmates, or inmate disciplinary records to determine the relationship between inmate-specific characteristics and misbehavior.

A self-report study conducted by Goetting & Howsen (1986) related demographic factors to inmate misbehavior. It was discovered that being young, black, a recidivist, unemployed at the time of incarceration, and serving more than five years were all factors which were associated with inmates who violated prison rules. This same study found that no relationship existed between inmate misconduct and history of drug abuse, marital status, education prior to incarceration, military service, crime of conviction, frequency of visits, or the time spent out of the cell.

A study of inmate misbehavior by Flanagan (1983) used misbehavior as the dependent variable and identified the following relationships: Inmate misbehavior is inversely related to age. Inmates under 25 years of age at the time of incarceration were more likely to be involved in incidents of misbehavior and inmates who were 25 years or older when incarcerated were less likely to misbehave.

Race was not significantly related to misbehavior, and race as a pre-incarceration indicator of misconduct was found to be an unreliable factor. Flanagan (1983) referenced studies which found race to be significantly related to misbehavior and others where race was unrelated: Being non-white was significantly related to misbehavior (Jaman, 1971). Petersilia and Honig (1980) in a study of three states, found that being white was significantly related to misconduct in California prisons, and being Black in a Texas prison was significantly correlated to inmate misconduct; in Michigan prisons, race was not significantly related to inmate misbehavior.

Other pre-prison variables which Flanagan (1983) measured against inmate misbehavior included level of education, employment history, marital status, history of substance abuse, and record of prior arrests. Inmate pre-incarceration education levels significantly correlated to misconduct in prison - an inmate with a lower education level was involved in a greater number of incidents of misconduct. Being unemployed prior to incarceration had a significant correlation to inmate misbehavior and married inmates were shown to be less apt to violate institutional rules. Inmates with a history of drug or alcohol abuse were more frequently involved in acts of misconduct than non-users. An inmate's prior arrest record was found to be inversely related to misbehavior - inmates with no or few prior arrests had more rule violations than those with several prior arrests. Similarly, recidivism had a significant inverse correlation with inmate misbehavior; recidivists had fewer misbehavior reports than did first-time offenders (Flanagan, 1983).

Length of sentence was one of the prison-specific factors which Flanagan (1983) included in his research. He noted that inmates serving indeterminate sentences as opposed to determinate sentences were more likely to accrue reports of misconduct. He also found that inmates serving five years or less (a short term) were more apt to act out in the middle stage of their sentence whereas inmates serving more than five years (a long term) were more apt to spread their acts of misbehavior over the five year period. Flanagan (1983) also noted that, if an inmate had been convicted of murder, that inmate had fewer rule violations than did other types of offenders.

In their efforts to improve upon the explanations of inmate behavior provided by the Deprivation, Importation and Integrated models, researchers (Coe, 1961; Goffman, 1961; Wheeler, 1961; Johnson, 1966; Schwartz, 1971; Jaman, 1972; Thomas and Foster, 1973; Meyers and Levy, 1978; Chapman, 1981; Flanagan, 1983) have utilized objective, quantifiable variables in their studies. Their research, which has produced mixed results, has focused on such variables as demographic characteristics (age, race, sex, marital status, employment, education), criminal history (age at first arrest, age at first incarceration, recidivism), and prison specific factors (length of sentence, time served, type of sentence). These variables have also been utilized in this study within a framework which compares categories of crime of conviction and categories and frequency of inmate misbehavior.

Crimes of conviction have been separated into four broad categories: Aggression, Property, Drug Related, and Other or Manipulative crimes; and inmate misbehavior has also been separated into the same four categories. Research has been conducted to determine any correlations which may exist, and by factoring in demographic characteristics, preprison, and prison specific variables, this study attempts to develop a measure from which inmate misbehavior can be identified and, perhaps, better understood.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study investigates whether the categories of crime of conviction (aggression, property, drug related, or other) have a relationship to categories of inmate misbehavior (aggression, property, drug related, or other).

An a priori classification of inmate misbehavior has been created predicated upon a methods/goals cross-reference. Methods, or activities, can be either confrontational or manipulative. Goals can provide either internal or external gain. A cross-referencing of these activities creates the following grid:

Figure 3.

	INTERNAL GOAL (Feelings)	EXTERNAL GOAL (Material)
CONFRONTATION	(Rebel) AGGRESSION Violent Crime Murder, Rape	(Ritual) PROPERTY Robbery-
MANIPULATION	(Retreat) DRUGS	(Innovator) OTHER Fraud, Impersonation, Embezzelment

CONFORMITY (Under Merton) - No Misbehavior

As will be noted from the above grid, the crossing of method with goal identifies the categories of aggression, property, drugs, and other crime which are comparable to Merton's categories of rebellion, ritualism, retreat, and innovation.

A comparison of classification of crime of conviction and of classification of inmate misbehavior has also been made against demographic variables such as race, age, religion, employment, etc. to determine if significant relationships exist.

SAMPLE

The population used in this study was derived from data recorded on male inmates in the custody of the New York State Department of Correctional Services between May 1, 1984 and October 31, 1984. The research sample included all inmates housed at Eastern New York Correctional Facility, Napanoch, N.Y., a maximum security institution. The population included inmates assigned to cell housing (as opposed to dormitory units) and excluded those assigned to medical or disciplinary cells.

The inmates included in this sample were confined to cells on the following housing units:

1. General confinement housing which included South Hall, East Wing, and West Wing units. Inmates assigned to these units had no special program participation requirements, and had no prior behavior history which required assignment to another housing classification.
2. Prison industry housing which was identified as B-3 (Block Three). Inmates assigned to this unit were employed in the prison

industry program and received wages four times greater than the general prison pay scale.

3. Honor block housing, which constituted the North Hall cells, housed inmates with better-than-average disciplinary histories. These inmates were eligible for work assignments outside of the facility's security perimeter.

Inmate behavior standards are outlined in the New York State Department of Correctional Services "Standards of Inmate Behavior for All Institutions," (1983). Inmate misbehavior was measured by misconduct reports - deviation from the standards of behavior - as filed by staff members which were subsequently confirmed by the facility's disciplinary system.

In the New York State Department of Correctional Services disciplinary system, three levels of misconduct are used. These three levels of violations designate the seriousness of an infraction and are defined as Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III offenses.

Tier I violations include minor infractions which "...do not involve danger to life, health, security or property...." ("Title 7 of the NYS Official Compilation of Codes, Rules ane Regulations," 1983, Section 251.5).

Tier II violations are those which constitute "...an immediate threat to the safety, security or order of the facility or an immediate danger to other persons or property..."("Title 7 NYSCRR," 1983, Section 251.6).

Tier III violations are Tier II violations which, "...if substantiated, would warrant imposition of a penalty beyond that which

may be imposed at a disciplinary hearing [Tier II]..."("Title 7 NYSCRR," 1983, Section 251A.2.b.1).

Inmates without misbehavior records and inmates with charges that were dismissed were included in the population in a "No Inmate Misbehavior" category. The records included in this study were collected from misbehavior files after the fact which preserves the non-intrusive nature of this study.

DATA COLLECTION FOR THIS STUDY

The data used were collected at the Eastern New York Correctional Facility, Napanoch, N.Y. during the time period May through October, 1984.

The records used to compile the data were records for inmates housed in cells other than those designated as medical or special housing units as of 00:01 a.m. May 1, 1984. Inmates who were housed in medical and/or disciplinary cells, dormitories, annex housing and those who were out of the facility on furlough, medical leave or other type of absence were excluded from this study since they cannot be classified as being housed in general confinement cells.

The initial population for this study consisted of 909 subjects who, at the beginning of the study period, were housed as follows:

North - 140

South - 214

Wings - 267

B-3 - 288

The design required data collection over a six-month period of time or until any of the housing units in the study experienced a population loss equal to 50% of the starting population. The study concluded on October 31, 1984, six months after its inception. The study population at the end of the data collection phase totalled 621 and were housed as follows:

North - 107

South - 156

Wings - 192

B-3 - 166

The guidelines for elimination or retention of a subject were as follows:

1. An inmate was eliminated from the study population upon transfer to another area of the institution or to another facility, or upon release from confinement due to parole, conditional release or maximum expiration of sentence.

2. An inmate was retained in the study when transferred out of his original housing unit for medical reasons unless, upon completion of his medical treatment, he was transferred to a different housing unit, at which point he was eliminated from the study population.

3. An inmate involved in temporary release remained in the study if, upon return to the facility, he was assigned to the original housing unit. A returning inmate was dropped from the study if he was assigned to a different housing unit.

4. An inmate involved in a disciplinary proceeding which required transfer to a special housing unit or to another facility

remained in the study if the time of the disciplinary confinement extended beyond the time remaining in the study. At the end of the study period, a review of the data indicated that no subjects were dropped from the study as a result of disciplinary transfers.

SETTING OF THE STUDY

The Eastern New York Correctional Facility is located in the village of Napanoch, in Ulster County, New York. This rural farming area in the Catskill mountain range lies approximately ninety miles northwest of New York City. It was constructed in the early 1890's and was modeled on the Auburn design of correctional facilities. Expansion programs were completed during the 1930's and the 1950's.

Eastern is presently classified by the New York State Department of Correctional Services as a Maximum B security level facility. This classification designation indicates that the inmates at this facility, while extremely violent, are not considered to be extreme escape risks. This classification is one of six security risk levels used by the Department of Correctional Services to classify its prisons. The other security classifications are:

- Maximum A - for housing inmates who are both extremely violent and who pose an extreme escape risk,
- Medium A - for housing moderately violent to non-violent inmates who are considered to be escape risks.
- Medium B - for housing moderately violent to non-violent inmates who pose a moderate escape risk.

- Minimum A - for housing non-violent inmates who are slightly escape prone.
- Minimum B - for housing non-violent inmates who pose little or no escape threat.

Eastern Correctional Facility is designated as a "full program" facility. All of the inmates are employed and/or are actively participating in a program. Eastern offers a wide range of prison jobs, vocational training and educational programs which extend from pre-literacy remedial courses through post-graduate college curricula. Industrial training offers instruction in silkscreening, woodworking, and metal fabrication while other programs center on farming, lumbering, and community service projects. Aside from instructional programming, inmates are offered counseling, recreation, religious, and other therapy programs. Family-oriented festivals and provisions for regular visits allow inmates to maintain their contact with family and friends. The facility is accredited by the American Correctional Association and, as such, has been deemed to meet their "Standards for Adult Correctional Facilities" (American Correctional Association, 1983).

CODING OF VARIABLES

The data utilized in this study were collected from housing unit rosters, inmate locator change notices, school rosters, inmate program rosters, Warden's Cards, disciplinary reports, and hearing records. All of these documents are maintained at the institution and each provides specific information used in this study.

Housing unit rosters and inmate locater change notices provide housing unit assignments and movement. School rosters and inmate program rosters provide information as to each inmate's specific program and academic assignment.

Warden's Cards note the Department identification number assigned to the inmate, the date the inmate was received by the Department of Correctional services, the parole eligibility date, conditional eligibility release date, the date of maximum expiration of sentence, classification of crime of conviction, number of counts in conviction, number of prior felony convictions, the consecutive or concurrent status of sentence, minimum and maximum sentence (in years, months, days), if the conviction was the result of plea bargaining or a jury verdict, date of the crime(s) of conviction, location of the crime of conviction (rural, suburban or urban), a description of both the crime and the reason for the crime as stated by the inmate at the time of reception into the Department of Correctional Services, date of arrest, date of birth, age at reception, sex, height, weight, color of hair and eyes, ethic group (white, black, hispanic, other), religion, highest school grade attended, highest school grade completed, usual occupation, dates (start and end) of last job, last wage, military service history, drug use history including drugs used and frequency of use, alcohol use history, place of birth, marital status (single, married, widower, divorced, separated, common law, unknown) and the names of parents and number of siblings, plus the name and address of other spouse and children.

Violations of law which lead to incarceration of the subjects in this study have been categorized in four types: Aggression, Property, Drug Related and Other.

Crimes included in the Aggression category are:

Murder

Attempted Murder

Manslaughter

Rape

Attempted Rape

Sexual Abuse

Assault

Attempted Assault

Robbery

Attempted Robbery

Sodomy

Attempted Sodomy

Criminal Possession of a Dangerous Weapon (CPDW)

Attempted Criminal Possession of a Dangerous Weapon (ACPDW)

These crimes are acts or attempted acts where force was used, threatened or attempted to be used against persons. CPDW and ACPDW were included since the deadly weapon or an attempt to possess one is a step away from being a crime against a person.

Property crimes include:

Burglary

Attempted Burglary

Criminal Possession of Stolen Property

Grand Larceny

Attempted Grand Larceny

Attempted Criminal Possession of Stolen Property

Drug Related crimes include:

Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance

Criminal Sale of a Controlled Substance

Criminal Possession of a Dangerous Drug

Crimes included under the category of Other are:

Criminal Possession of a Forged Instrument

Arson

Attempted Arson

Kidnapping

Attempted Arson and Arson are crimes which damage or destroy property and often endanger life, but they are crimes utilized as a form of coercion. The objective of a crime of Arson is to manipulate the people associated with the property, i.e., intimidation for profit (insurance fraud) or revenge. Kidnapping is also a manipulative crime since the intent is to force either the victim or a third party to provide goods or services.

Institutional disciplinary reports and hearing records provide the date of the misbehavior, the hearing level (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III), the offense classification by rule violation, the penalty assessed, and the hearing officer. The classification of penalties

imposed range from reprimand through loss of privileges, cell confinement, to the loss of good time. Good time, which represents a one-third reduction of the maximum sentence, may be forfeited in whole or in part as a penalty for serious misconduct.

Inmate misconduct which leads to the filing of Misbehavior Reports against the subjects of this study have also been categorized into four types: Aggression, Property, Drug Related, and Other.

Acts of Misbehavior included in the Aggression category are:

Assault

Attempted Assault

Fighting

Practicing Martial Arts

Disorderly Conduct

Participating in a Riot

Disturbing the Order of the Facility

Sexual Assault

Attempted Sexual Assault

Threatening Others

Physically Interfering with Prison Staff

Using Abusive Language

Acts of Misbehavior included in the Property category are:

Possession of Keys or (unauthorized) State Property

Possession of Contraband

Buying, Selling, Exchanging Personal or State Property

Possession of Money

Possession of (unauthorized) Jewelry

Possession of tools

Possession of Cigarettes in Excess of Allowable Limits

Possession of Unauthorized Literature

Smuggling

Loss, Destruction or Theft of State Property

Altering State-Issued Clothing

Tampering with Electrical Outlets

Gambling

Abuse of Privileges

Drug-Related Misbehavior includes the following:

Using Narcotics

Possession of Narcotics

Using Controlled Substances

Consuming Alcoholic Beverages

Making Alcoholic Beverages

Buying/Selling Medication

Acts of Misbehavior included in the Category Other are:

Escape

Attempted Escape

Absconding

Possession of Escape Paraphernalia

Being out of Place

Leaving an Assigned Area

Failure to Follow Regulations

Altering an I.D. Card

Impersonating an Employee or Official

Delaying the Count

Failure to Obey Count Procedures

Causing a Miscount

Failure to Comply with Frisk and Search Procedures

Arson

Creating a Safety, Health or Fire Hazard

Self-Mutilation

Unhygienic Act (e.g., Spitting, Urinating, Defacating on the Floor)

Failure to Report Injury or Illness

Littering

Failure to Maintain Cleanliness of Cell, Clothing and Person

Causing a False Emergency Alarm

Failure to Comply with Posted Rules

Constantly Displaying Disruptive Misbehavior

DATA CODING

The data from the records utilized in this study were coded as follows:

SUBJECT I.D. NUMBER: A randomly assigned three digit number.

HOUSING UNIT:
00 = general confinement in Wings
10 = general confinement in the South Hall
01 = Honor Block confinement in the North Hall
11 = Industries housing in B-3

COLLEGE PROGRAM: 0 = not enrolled in prison college program
1 = enrolled

DATE RECEIVED IN PRISON SYSTEM: six digits for MO/DA/YR

PAROLE ELIGIBILITY DATE: six digits for MO/DA/YR

CONDITIONAL RELEASE DATE: 6 digits for MO/DA/YR

MAXIMUM EXPIRATION OF SENTENCE DATE: six digits for MO/DA/YR

COUNTS IN CONVICTION: number of counts 1-9 with 9=9 or more than 9

RECIDIVISM: 0 = no recidivism
1 = recidivist

MINIMUM SENTENCE: 6 digits for YR/MO/DA

MAXIMUM SENTENCE: 6 digits for YR/MO/DA

LIFE SENTENCE: coded 99/99/99

DATE OF CRIME: six digits MO/DA/YR

SETTING OF THE CRIME: 0 = rural
1 = urban
2 = suburban

CRIME TYPE: 00 = Aggression
01 = Other
10 = Property
11 = Drug Related

VIOLENCE INVOLVED IN CRIME: weapon or violence involved
0 = non-violent crime
1 = violent crime

CRIME RESULTING IN DEATH: 0 = death not caused
1 = death resulted

SUBJECT'S DATE OF BIRTH: six digits MO/DA/YR

AGE AT RECEPTION: two digits equals age in years

ETHNIC CLASSIFICATION: reported race of subject
00 = white
01 = black
10 = hispanic
11 = other

SUBJECT'S RELIGION: reported religious affiliation
000 = Catholic
001 = Protestant
010 = Hebrew
011 = Muslim
100 = other
101 = none
111 = unstated

PRE-PRISON EDUCATION LEVEL: highest level reported
grade attended 2 digit
grade completed 2 digit
00 = no education
08 = eighth grade
12 = high school
16 = four-year college
17 = masters degree
18 = doctorate

EMPLOYMENT STATUS: date last employed = four digits MO/YR

DRUG ABUSE: reported drug usage
00 = none
10 = marijuana only
01 = heroine, cocaine, barbituates, and other drugs (excluding marijuana)
11 = marijuana plus other drugs

ALCOHOL ABUSE: reported alcohol usage
0 = moderate or non-use
1 = excessive use

MARITAL STATUS: reported marital status at time of reception
000 = single
001 = married
010 = widower
011 = common law marriage recognized
100 = separated
101 = divorced
111 = unstated

CONVICTION: 0 = plea
1 = guilty verdict by trial

DATE OF ARREST: four digits MO/YR

DISCIPLINARY HEARINGS: 1 = Tier I
2 = Tier II
3 = Tier III

PENALTY ASSESSED: type of penalty
1 = cell confinement
2 = loss of privileges (i.e., telephone, recreation etc.)
3 = cell confinement plus loss of privileges
4 = other (i.e., reprimand, loss of visits)

MISCONDUCT TYPES: 00 = Aggression
01 = Other
10 = Property
11 = Drug Related

NON-CONFINEMENT PENALTY: 3 digits representing number of days

CONFINEMENT TO CELL: 3 digits representing number of days

GOOD TIME LOST: 2 digits representing number of months of Good Time lost

LOCATION OF MISCONDUCT: abbreviated name
0000 = location unknown or unreported

DATE OF MISCONDUCT: four digits for MO/DA

TIME OF MISCONDUCT: four digits = military time (e.g. 2:15 p.m. = 1415)

DEPARTMENTAL RULE VIOLATION: five digits = rule number
(if more than one rule violation involved, the lowest number is the most serious violation)

TOTAL NUMBER OF RULE VIOLATIONS: one digit, 1 - 9
9 = 9 or more than 9

DRUGS OR VIOLENCE IN CHARGED MISBEHAVIOR: one digit number
0 = neither
1 = drugs
2 = violence

HYPOTHESIS TESTING

For the purpose of this study inmate misbehavior will be defined as a rule violation which results in a disciplinary hearing and which produces an admission of guilt or a disposition of guilty.

The categories of inmate behavior will be operationalized by the crime of conviction (crimes against persons, crimes against property, drug-related crimes, and other offenses e.g. fraud, impersonation) and by the New York State Department of Correctional Services "Standards of Inmate Behavior" which also categorizes inmate misconduct as being against persons, property, drug related, and acts which threaten the order and safety of the institution (other).

Previous research (Sykes, 1974; Thomas, 1977; Thomas & Foster, 1972; Clemmer, 1958; Schwartz, 1971; Irwin & Cressey, 1962; Toch, 1978)

has focused on the Importation Model, the Deprivation Model, and the Integrated Model of inmate behavior. Based on these prior studies, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested.

HYPOTHESIS I

The main hypothesis examined in this dissertation tests the relationship between the type of crime of conviction which resulted in incarceration and the type of misconduct committed during incarceration for that crime. The purpose of the examination is to determine if the type of crime of conviction is indicative of the misconduct.

Individuals tend to exhibit patterns of behavior regardless of the social setting (i.e. in the community or in a prison) and will continue to react in that environment by exhibiting similar behaviorial patterns.

H1: The category of inmate misbehavior will be similar to the category of the crime of conviction.

In conjunction with the primary hypothesis, a series of secondary hypotheses were also tested. These secondary hypotheses were formatted by measuring significant levels of inmate background characteristics, and comparing those characteristics with the type of prison misconduct and the type of crime of conviction. Where significant relationships were identified, a Stepwise analysis to determine inter-relationships among variables was developed. A variable was declared significant only if it had a demonstrable effect over and above the net effect of all other variables combined.

HYPOTHESIS II

Individual characteristics, i.e. age, race, education, etc. will affect the strength of the link between the crime of conviction and the inmate misbehavior.

H2: Demographic characteristics will affect the link between the category of crime of conviction and the category of inmate misbehavior.

HYPOTHESIS III

Intervening variables, i.e., college education, proximity to release date, length of sentence, etc., will affect the link between the crime of conviction and the category of inmate misbehavior.

H3: Intervening variables will have an affect on the link between categories of crime of conviction and categories of inmate misbehavior.

HYPOTHESIS IV

The category of inmate misbehavior which results in the first misbehavior report being filed, will be the same category of misbehavior exhibited in subsequent misbehavior reports.

H4: The category of misbehavior exhibited in the first violation will be reflected in subsequent violations.

VARIABLES

The dependent variable tested in this study was Inmate Misbehavior. This is a continuous variable generated by assigning values to the results of disciplinary hearings held in response to the filing of inmate misbehavior reports. These results were recorded as

either 0 - indicating no hearing or not guilty, or 1 - indicating the inmate was found guilty.

The dependent variable with a value of 1 was broken down into four categories of rule violations from which four categories of the dependent variable were generated:

Rule Violation equals 00 indicates Aggressive misbehavior

Rule violation equals 10 indicates Property-Related misbehavior

Rule violation equals 11 indicates Drug-Related misbehavior

Rule violation equals 01 indicates Other misbehavior

Three levels of seriousness for each category of the dependent variable have been used to identify the degree of misbehavior committed:

Tier I hearings involve charges of misbehavior at the least-serious level. Tier II hearings are concerned with charges of misbehavior at the mid-range level of seriousness and Tier III hearings involve incidents of misbehavior at the highest level of seriousness.

Independent variables identified by previous studies as being related to the frequency and seriousness of inmate misbehavior have been used in this study. These variables were drawn from demographic characteristics (age, race, religion) and acquired characteristics (criminal history, recidivism, education level, employment).

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

Both "Stepwise MAX-R" and "General Linear Model" (SAS Institute Incorporated, 1985) statistical procedures were used in this study. These procedures were used to identify those independent

variables which are more significantly related to the dependent variable, Inmate Misbehavior. The General Linear Model presents an overview of all variables while a Stepwise procedures provides a detailed look at the variables with the greatest impact.

These variables were further analyzed in a General Linear Model procedure where the independent variable was treated as a dependent variable and was regressed on other independent variables, which had been identified as significant, in order to determine any possible interactions.

Both the General Linear Model and the Stepwise procedures were used because they often produce different results. The General Linear Model treats each independent variable as the last one to be introduced in the analysis process. This shows the effect of all variables in comparison with each other. Beta weight of the variables is not considered in a General Linear Model process. The Stepwise procedure creates the best fitted subset of variables being tested without indicating the subset size. It also provides the beta weight of each of the tested variables which indicates the positive or negative effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter examines the results of the analysis performed on the data concerning categories of crime and inmate misbehavior categories. Two sets of tables are presented which relate all tested variables for 621 inmates to 265 incidents of misbehavior documented during the six month study. The first set are Chi-square tables and the second are General Linear Model and Stepwise Regression tables.

The variables utilized in the analysis and subsequently reported in Tables 1 through 38 are constructed in the following manner:

Crime of Conviction (Dummy)	00=Crime against Persons 10=Crime against Property 11=Drug Related Crime 01=Other Crime
Inmate Misbehavior (Dummy)	00=offenses against Persons 10=offenses against Property 11=Alcohol/Drug Related offenses 01=Other offenses
Race or Ethnicity (Dummy)	00=White 01=Black 10=Hispanic 11=Other
Religion (Dummy)	000=Catholic 001=Protestant 010=Hebrew 011=Muslim
Marital Status (Dummy)	000=unmarried 001=married 011=common law relationship

Current Age	1=25 years of age or younger 0=26 years of age or older
Age at Incarceration	1=25 years of age or younger 0=26 years of age or older
Conviction (Dummy)	1=by trial 0=by plea
Recidivism	1=prior conviction 0=no prior conviction
More or Less than Five Years in Prison	1=5 years or less 0=6 years or more
More or Less than Five Years to Release	1=5 years or less 0=6 years or more
Housing Unit (Dummy)	00=Wings 10=South Hall 01=Honor Block 11=B-3 (Industry)
Crime Setting	1=urban 0=rural
Pre-Prison Employment History	1=unemployed 0=employed
Prison College Program	1=enrolled 0=not enrolled
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	1=alcohol and drug use 0=only alcohol or drugs or no history of use
History of Substance Abuse	00=non-user 10=marijuana user 01=heroin user

Tables 1 through 20 are chi-square tables relating classification of crime to classification of inmate misbehavior. This analysis has been performed on the data relating to all occurrences of misbehavior within each classification regardless of seriousness of the incident as well as at each level of seriousness - Tier I, Tier II and Tier III. Additionally, comparisons have been made of first misbehaviors with second misbehaviors, again broken by Tier levels and crime classifications.

For each comparison being made, the cells within the chi-square tables are formated as follows: the upper left number is the frequency of occurrence within the cell, the upper right is the expectation of occurrence within the cell, the lower left is the percentage of the table accounted for within the cell, and the lower right is the chi-square calculation for the cell. Additionally, at the end of each chi-square table, the statistics for the table will be presented with both the chi-square probability and Cramer's V, which is analogous to a Pearson's R in that 0 indicates no correlation and 1 is a perfect correlation.

Table 1 shows a chi-square value of 19.790 for a comparison of category of crime by category of first misbehavior and including no misbehavior. This is a four by five grid comparing Aggressive crime, Other crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior, and no misbehavior. All misbehaviors indicated are first violation at all three levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II and Tier III).

Table 1.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
FIRST VIOLATION - ALL LEVELS OF SERIOUSNESS COMBINED (TIER I, TIER II, TIER III)
INCLUDING NO VIOLATIONS

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME								TOTAL # / %
	AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		
AGGRESSION	80 (.1288)	82.6 (.082982)	2 (.0032)	3.1 (.402507)	13 (.0209)	6.6 (6.29284)	7 (.0113)	9.7 (.747152)	102 /16.43
OTHER	44 (.0709)	41.3 (.175276)	1 (.0016)	1.6 (.201253)	1 (.0016)	3.3 (1.58944)	5 (.0081)	4.8 (.004932)	51 / 8.21
PROPERTY	30 (.0483)	28.3 (.096099)	1 (.0016)	1.1 (.004688)	4 (.0064)	2.3 (1.35157)	0 (.0000)	3.3 (3.32528)	35 / 5.64
DRUG RELATED	20 (.0322)	17.0 (.525708)	0 (.0000)	.6 (.642512)	0 (.0000)	1.4 (1.35266)	1 (.0016)	2.0 (.49638)	21 / 3.38
NONE	329 (.5298)	333.7 (.066572)	15 (.0242)	12.6 (.454862)	22 (.0354)	26.5 (.775949)	46 (.0741)	39.1 (1.20108)	412 /66.34
TOTAL # / %	503 / 81.0		19 / 3.06		40 / 6.44		59 / 9.50		621

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 1

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	12	19.790	.071
Cramer's V		.103	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits, consequently, the factors involved in this table have been refined through the elimination of no misbehavior and are presented in Table 1A.

Table 1A shows a chi-square value of 11.438 for a comparison of category of crime by category of first misbehavior. This is a four by four grid comparing Aggressive crime, Other crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - first violation, all three levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II and Tier III).

Table 1A.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
FIRST VIOLATION - ALL LEVELS OF SERIOUSNESS COMBINED (TIER I, TIER II, TIER III)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME: AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	80	84.9	2	2.0	13	8.8	7	6.3	102 / 48.80
	(.3828)	(.284899)	(.0096)	(.001173)	(.0622)	(2.02271)	(.0335)	(.067725)	
OTHER	44	42.5	1	1.0	1	4.4	5	3.2	51 / 24.40
	(.2105)	(.055904)	(.0048)	(No Report)	(.0048)	(2.62001)	(.0239)	(1.05309)	
PROPERTY	30	29.1	1	.7	4	3.0	0	2.2	35 / 16.75
	(.1435)	(.025455)	(.0048)	(.162714)	(.0191)	(.322291)	(.0000)	(2.17703)	
DRUG RELATED	20	17.5	0	.4	0	1.8	1	1.3	21 / 10.05
	(.0957)	(.36229)	(.0000)	(.401914)	(.0000)	(1.80861)	(.0048)	(.071788)	
TOTAL # / %	174 / 83.25		4 / 1.91		18 / 8.61		13 / 6.22		209

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 1A

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	9	11.438	.247
Cramer's V		.135	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 1B shows a summary of category of crime by level of misbehavior, including no misbehavior. It compares Aggressive crime, Other crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime with no misbehavior, misbehavior at the Tier I level, misbehavior at the Tier II level, and misbehavior at the Tier III level for the first misbehavior. It has a chi-square value of 17.293.

Table 1B.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS OF FIRST MISBEHAVIOR - INCLUDING NO VIOLATIONS

LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS	CATEGORIES OF CRIME								TOTAL
	AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		# / %
NONE	329 (.5298)	333.7 (.066572)	15 (.0242)	12.6 (.454862)	22 (.0354)	26.5 (.775949)	46 (.0741)	39.1 (1.20108)	412 / 66.34
LOWEST LEVEL (TIER I)	38 (.0612)	37.3 (.014726)	1 (.0016)	1.4 (.117934)	3 (.0048)	3.0 (No Report)	4 (.0064)	4.4 (.031387)	46 / 7.41
MID-RANGE LEVEL (TIER II)	96 (.1546)	98.0 (.041142)	3 (.0048)	3.7 (.13315)	15 (.0242)	7.8 (6.66268)	7 (.0113)	11.5 (1.75834)	121 / 19.48
HIGHEST LEVEL (TIER III)	40 (.0644)	34.0 (1.05142)	0 (.0000)	1.3 (1.28502)	0 (.0000)	2.7 (2.70531)	2 (.0032)	4.0 (.992759)	42 / 6.76
TOTAL # / %	503 / 81.0		19 / 3.06		40 / 6.44		59 / 9.50		621

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 1B

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	9	17.293	.044
Cramer's V		.096	

The probability of chi-square is within acceptable limits. The significance in this table is primarily generated in the Property crime category and is represented by a lack of Tier III misbehaviors and an excess of Tier II misbehaviors in relation to the expected numbers in these areas. The significance of this will be explored in subsequent tables.

Table 2 shows a comparison of category of crime by frequency of misbehavior. This is a four by four grid comparing Aggressive crime, Other crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime to the frequency of misconduct ranging from no violations to a third violation at the lowest level of seriousness, or Tier I level.

Table 2.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY FREQUENCY OF MISBEHAVIOR AT THE LOWEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER I)

FREQUENCY OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME				TOTAL #
	AGGRESSION	OTHER	PROPERTY	DRUG RELATED	
NONE	116	3	15	7	141
FIRST MISBEHAVIOR	55	1	3	5	64
SECOND MISBEHAVIOR	2	0	0	1	3
THIRD	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	174	4	18	13	209

NOTE: In each cell, the number gives the observed frequency of misbehavior.

The above table is in conformance with the table developed and noted as Table 1B in that there is a lack of activity generated by Property crime and also a lack of activity generated by Other crime at the Tier I level.

Table 3 shows a comparison of category of crime by frequency of misbehavior and is a four by six grid comparing Aggressive crime, Other crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime to the frequency of misbehavior ranging from no violations to five violations at the mid-range or Tier II level of seriousness.

Table 3.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY FREQUENCY OF MISBEHAVIOR
AT THE MID-RANGE LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER II)

FREQUENCY OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME				TOTAL
	AGGRESSION	OTHER	PROPERTY	DRUG RELATED	#
NONE	64	1	3	5	73
FIRST MISBEHAVIOR	79	3	9	5	96
SECOND MISBEHAVIOR	23	0	6	2	31
THIRD MISBEHAVIOR	4	0	0	1	5
FOURTH MISBEHAVIOR	1	0	0	0	1
FIFTH MISBEHAVIOR	3	0	0	0	3
TOTAL	174	4	18	13	209

NOTE: In each cell, the number gives the observed frequency of misbehavior.

This table is also in agreement with the data generated in Table 1B in that Other and Property crimes generated no Tier II misbehavior beyond the second misbehavior.

Table 4 shows a comparison of category of crime by frequency of misbehavior. It is a four by three grid comparing Aggressive crime, Other crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime by frequency of misconduct ranging from no violations to two violations at the highest level of seriousness or Tier III level.

Table 4.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY FREQUENCY OF MISBEHAVIOR
AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER III)

FREQUENCY OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME				TOTAL #
	AGGRESSION	OTHER	PROPERTY	DRUG RELATED	
NONE	121	4	15	8	148
FIRST MISBEHAVIOR	47	0	3	5	55
SECOND MISBEHAVIOR	6	0	0	0	6
TOTAL	174	4	18	13	209

NOTE: In each cell, the number gives the observed frequency of misbehavior.

This table is also in comformance with the information generated in Table 1B in that Other and Property crimes did not exhibit a second misbehavior, and again, Other crime did not exhibit a first misbehavior.

Table 5 shows a chi-square value of 7.132 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a four by four grid comparing Aggressive crime, Other crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - first violation at the lowest level of seriousness (Tier I).

Table 5.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
FIRST VIOLATION - LOWEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER I)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME								TOTAL
	AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		# / %
AGGRESSION	6 (.1304)	6.6 (.056064)	0 (.0000)	.2 (.173913)	1 (.0217)	.5 (.438406)	1 (.0217)	.7 (.133152)	8 / 17.39
OTHER	19 (.4130)	19.0 (.000)	1 (.0217)	.5 (.5)	0 (.0000)	1.5 (1.5)	3 (.0652)	2.0 (.5)	23 / 50.00
PROPERTY	10 (.2174)	9.9 (No Report)	0 (.0000)	.3 (.26087)	2 (.0435)	.8 (1.89372)	0 (.0000)	1.0 (1.04348)	12 / 26.09
DRUG RELATED	3 (.0652)	2.5 (.10984)	0 (.0000)	.1 (.065217)	0 (.0000)	.2 (.195652)	0 (.0000)	.3 (.26087)	3 / 6.52
TOTAL # / %	38 / 82.61		1 / 2.17		3 / 6.52		4 / 8.70		46

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 5

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	9	7.132	.623
Cramer's V		.227	

The probability for chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 6 shows a chi-square value of 7.172 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a four by four grid comparing Aggressive crime, Other crime, Property crime, and

Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - first violation at the mid-range level of seriousness (Tier II).

Table 6.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
FIRST VIOLATION - MID-RANGE LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER II)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME: AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	50 (.4132)	54.7 (.411072)	2 (.0165)	1.7 (.048908)	12 (.0992)	8.6 (1.3885)	5 (.0413)	4.0 (.254675)	69 / 57.02
OTHER	22 (.1818)	19.8 (.236377)	0 (.0000)	.6 (.619835)	1 (.0083)	3.1 (1.42184)	2 (.0165)	1.4 (.211995)	25 / 20.66
PROPERTY	20 (.1653)	18.2 (.168224)	1 (.0083)	.6 (.323871)	2 (.0165)	2.9 (.254138)	0 (.0000)	1.3 (1.33058)	23 / 19.01
DRUG RELATED	4 (.0331)	3.2 (.21522)	0 (.0000)	.1 (.099174)	0 (.0000)	.5 (.495868)	0 (.0000)	.2 (.231405)	4 / 3.31
TOTAL # / %	96 / 79.34		3 / 2.48		15 / 12.40		7 / 5.79		121

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 6

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	9	7.172	.563
Cramer's V		.146	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 7 shows a chi-square value of .357 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a two by three grid comparing Aggressive crime and Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - first violation at the most serious level (Tier III).

Table 7.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
FIRST VIOLATION - HIGHEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER III)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME: AGGRESSION		DRUG RELATED		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	24 (.5714)	23.8 (.001524)	1 (.0238)	1.2 (.030476)	25 / 59.52
OTHER	3 (.0714)	2.9 (.007143)	0 (.0000)	.1 (.142857)	3 / 7.14
DRUG RELATED	13 (.3095)	13.3 (.008333)	1 (.0238)	.7 (.166667)	14 / 33.33
TOTAL # / %	40 /	95.24	2 /	4.76	42

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 7

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	2	.357	.837
Cramer's V		.092	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 8 shows a chi-square value of 8.420 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a three by four grid comparing Aggressive crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - second violation at all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III).

Table 8.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
SECOND VIOLATION - ALL LEVELS OF SERIOUSNESS COMBINED
(TIER I, TIER II, TIER III)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME: AGGRESSION		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	29 (.3766)	29.5 (.007015)	6 (.0779)	3.3 (2.27273)	1 (.013)	3.3 (1.57828)	36 / 46.75
OTHER	17 (.2208)	16.4 (.024747)	0 (.0000)	1.8 (1.81818)	3 (.0390)	1.8 (.768182)	20 / 25.97
PROPERTY	10 (.1299)	9.8 (.003367)	0 (.0000)	1.1 (1.09091)	2 (.0260)	1.1 (.757576)	12 / 15.58
DRUG RELATED	7 (.0909)	7.4 (.017957)	1 (.0130)	.8 (.040404)	1 (.0130)	.8 (.040404)	9 / 11.69
TOTAL # / %	63 / 81.82		7 / 9.09		7 / 9.09		77

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 8

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	6	8.420	.209
Cramer's V		.234	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 9 shows a chi-square value of .744 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a two by three grid comparing Aggressive crime, and Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, and Property misbehavior - second violation at the lowest level of seriousness (Tier I).

Table 9.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
SECOND VIOLATION - LOWEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER I)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME: AGGRESSION		DRUG RELATED		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	4	3.8	0	.2	4 / 23.53
	(.2353)	(.014706)	(.0000)	(.235294)	
OTHER	9	9.4	1	.6	10 / 58.82
	(.5294)	(.018015)	(.0588)	(.288235)	
PROPERTY	3	2.8	0	.2	3 / 17.65
	(.1765)	(.011029)	(.0000)	(.176471)	
TOTAL # / %	16 / 94.12		1 / 5.88		17

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 9

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	2	.744	.689
Cramer's V		.209	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 10 shows a chi-square value of 10.798 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a three by four grid comparing Aggressive crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - second violation at the mid-range level of seriousness (Tier II).

Table 10.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
SECOND VIOLATION - AT THE MID-RANGE LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER II)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME: AGGRESSION		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	22	22.2	5	3.0	0	1.8	27 / 60.00
	(.4889)	(.001802)	(.1111)	(1.33333)	(.0000)	(1.8)	
OTHER	8	7.4	0	1.0	1	.6	9 / 20.00
	(.1778)	(.048649)	(.0000)	(1.0000)	(.0222)	(.266667)	
PROPERTY	5	5.8	0	.8	2	.5	7 / 15.56
	(.1111)	(.099185)	(.0000)	(.777778)	(.0444)	(5.0381)	
DRUG RELATED	2	1.6	0	.2	0	.1	2 / 4.44
	(.0444)	(.076877)	(.0000)	(.222222)	(.0000)	(.133333)	
TOTAL # / %	37 / 82.22		5 / 11.11		3 / 6.67		45

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 10

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	6	10.798	.095
Cramer's V		.346	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 11 shows a chi-square value of 5.343 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a three by four grid comparing Aggressive crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - second violation at the highest level of seriousness (Tier III).

Table 11.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
SECOND VIOLATION - AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER III)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME: AGGRESSION		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	3	3.3	1	.7	1	1.0	5 / 33.33
	(.2000)	(.033333)	(.0667)	(.166667)	(.0667)	(.0000)	
OTHER	0	.7	0	.1	1	.2	1 / 6.67
	(.0000)	(.666667)	(.0000)	(.133333)	(.0667)	(3.2)	
PROPERTY	2	1.3	0	.3	0	.4	2 / 13.33
	(.1333)	(.333333)	(.0000)	(.266667)	(.0000)	(.4)	
DRUG RELATED	5	4.7	1	.9	1	1.4	7 / 46.67
	(.3333)	(.02381)	(.0667)	(.004762)	(.0667)	(.114286)	
TOTAL # / %	10 / 66.67		2 / 13.33		3 / 20.00		15

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 11

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	6	5.343	.501
Cramer's V		.422	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 12 shows a chi-square value of 1.905 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a two by four grid comparing Aggressive crime and Drug Related crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - third violation at the lowest level of seriousness (Tier I).

Table 12.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
THIRD VIOLATION - AT THE LOWEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER I)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME AGGRESSION		DRUG RELATED		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	3 (.3750)	2.6 (.053571)	0 (.0000)	.4 (.375)	3 / 37.50
OTHER	2 (.2500)	2.6 (.14881)	1 (.1250)	.4 (1.04167)	3 / 37.50
PROPERTY	1 (.1250)	.9 (.017857)	0 (.0000)	.1 (.125)	1 / 12.50
DRUG RELATED	1 (.1250)	.9 (.017857)	0 (.0000)	.1 (.125)	1 / 12.50
TOTAL # / %	7 / 87.50		1 / 12.50		8

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 12

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	3	1.905	.592
Cramer's V		.488	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 13 shows a chi-square value of .325 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a two by three grid comparing Aggressive crime and Property crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, and Property misbehavior - third violation at the mid-range level of seriousness (Tier II).

Table 13.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
THIRD VIOLATION - AT THE MID-RANGE LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER II)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME: AGGRESSION		PROPERTY		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	9	9.2	1	.8	10 / 76.92
	(.6923)	(.005769)	(.0769)	(.069231)	
OTHER	2	1.8	0	.2	2 / 15.38
	(.1538)	(.012821)	(.0000)	(.153846)	
PROPERTY	1	.9	0	.1	1 / 7.69
	(.0769)	(.00641)	(.0000)	(.076923)	
TOTAL # / %	12 / 92.31		1 / 7.69		13

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 13

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	2	.325	.850
Cramer's V		.158	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 14 shows a chi-square value of 2.917 for a comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior. This is a two by four grid comparing Aggressive crime and Property crime by Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - third violation at the highest level of seriousness (Tier III).

Table 14.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY CATEGORY OF MISBEHAVIOR
THIRD VIOLATION - AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER III)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORIES OF CRIME AGGRESSION		PROPERTY		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	1 (.1429)	1.7 (.297619)	1 (.1429)	.3 (1.78571)	2 / 28.57
OTHER	2 (.2857)	1.7 (.047619)	0 (.0000)	.3 (.285714)	2 / 28.57
PROPERTY	2 (.2857)	1.7 (.047619)	0 (.0000)	.3 (.285714)	2 / 28.57
DRUG RELATED	1 (.1429)	.9 (.02381)	0 (.0000)	.1 (.142857)	1 / 14.29
TOTAL # / %	6 / 85.71		1 / 14.29		7

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 14

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	3	2.917	.405
Cramer's V		.645	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 15 shows a chi-square value of 5.228 for a comparison of second misbehavior by category of crime. It is a three by three grid comparing Aggressive crime, Property crime, and Drug Related crime to second misbehavior, Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III.

Table 15.

CATEGORY OF CRIME BY LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS OF SECOND MISBEHAVIOR

LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS	CATEGORIES OF CRIME						TOTAL
	AGGRESSION		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		# / %
LOWEST LEVEL (TIER I)	16 (.2078)	13.9 (.31432)	0 (.0000)	1.5 (1.54545)	1 (.0130)	1.5 (.192513)	17 / 22.08
MID-RANGE LEVEL (TIER II)	37 (.4805)	36.8 (No Report)	5 (.0649)	4.1 (.20202)	3 (.0390)	4.1 (.290909)	45 / 58.44
HIGHEST LEVEL (TIER III)	10 (.1299)	12.3 (.420875)	2 (.0260)	1.4 (.29697)	3 (.0390)	1.4 (1.96364)	15 / 19.48
TOTAL # / %	63 / 81.82		7 / 9.09		7 / 9.09		77

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 15:

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	4	5.228	.265
Cramer's V		.184	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (.05 or less) for a valid analysis, therefore, the statistics generated in this table are questionable.

Table 16 shows a chi-square value of 14.805 for a comparison of first misbehavior for all three levels of seriousness (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) by second misbehavior all three levels of seriousness. It is

a four by five grid comparing each of the categories of misbehavior - first violation to the same categories of misbehavior - second violation and including those who did not commit a second violation.

Table 16.

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION BY SECOND VIOLATION INCLUDING NO SECOND VIOLATION - ALL LEVELS OF SERIOUSNESS COMBINED (TIER I, TIER II, TIER III)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR SECOND VIOLATION	CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION								TOTAL # / %
	AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		
AGGRESSION	25 (.1196)	17.6 (3.14264)	8 (.0383)	8.8 (.070092)	1 (.0048)	6.0 (4.19458)	2 (.0096)	3.6 (.723045)	36 /17.22
OTHER	10 (.0478)	9.8 (.005864)	6 (.0287)	4.9 (.256853)	3 (.0144)	3.3 (.036425)	1 (.0048)	2.0 (.507188)	20 / 9.57
PROPERTY	6 (.0287)	5.9 (.003518)	2 (.0096)	2.9 (.294243)	2 (.0096)	2.0 (No Report)	2 (.0096)	1.2 (.523202)	12 / 5.74
DRUG RELATED	5 (.0239)	4.4 (.084066)	1 (.0048)	2.2 (.65151)	1 (.0048)	1.5 (.170669)	2 (.0096)	.9 (1.32759)	9 / 4.31
NO SECOND VIOLATION	56 (.2679)	64.4 (1.10079)	34 (.1627)	32.2 (.099415)	28 (.1340)	21.1 (1.57193)	14 (.0670)	13.3 (.040936)	132 /63.16
TOTAL # / %	102 / 48.80		51 / 24.40		35 / 16.75		21 / 10.05		209

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 16:

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	12	14.805	.252
Cramer's V		.154	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 17 shows a chi-square value of 8.793 for a comparison of first misbehavior for all three levels of seriousness (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) by second misbehavior all three levels of seriousness. This is a four by four grid comparing the first violation by the second violation of Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - all three levels of seriousness combined.

Table 17.

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION BY SECOND VIOLATION
ALL LEVELS OF SERIOUSNESS COMBINED - (TIER I, TIER II, TIER III)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR SECOND VIOLATION	CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION								TOTAL # / %
	AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		
AGGRESSION	25 (.3247)	21.5 (.567484)	8 (.1039)	7.9 (No Report)	1 (.0130)	3.3 (1.57828)	2 (.0260)	3.3 (.494949)	36 /46.75
OTHER	10 (.1299)	11.9 (.317617)	6 (.0779)	4.4 (.568526)	3 (.0390)	1.8 (.768182)	1 (.0130)	1.8 (.368182)	20 /25.97
PROPERTY	6 (.0779)	7.2 (.19057)	2 (.0260)	2.6 (.159155)	2 (.0260)	1.1 (.757576)	2 (.0260)	1.1 (.757576)	12 /15.58
DRUG RELATED	5 (.0649)	5.4 (.026382)	1 (.0130)	2.0 (.490281)	1 (.0130)	.8 (.040404)	2 (.0260)	.8 (1.70707)	9 /11.69
TOTAL # / %	46 / 59.74		17 / 22.08		7 / 9.09		7 / 9.09		77

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 17

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	9	8.793	.457
Cramer's V		.195	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Table 18 shows a chi-square value of 26.079 for a comparison of first misbehavior by second misbehavior. It is a four by five grid comparing Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - first violation at the lowest level of seriousness (Tier I) by the second violation, including those with no second violation - at the lowest level of seriousness.

Table 18.

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION BY SECOND VIOLATION
INCLUDING NO SECOND VIOLATION - AT THE LOWEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER I)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR SECOND VIOLATION	CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION: AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		TOTAL # / %
AGGRESSION	5 (.0735)	2.6 (2.24733)	2 (.0294)	3.2 (.43573)	1 (.0147)	1.6 (.254202)	0 (.0000)	.6 (.588235)	8 /11.76
OTHER	7 (.1029)	3.9 (2.50357)	2 (.0294)	4.8 (1.60421)	2 (.0294)	2.5 (.089636)	1 (.0147)	.9 (.015686)	12 /17.65
PROPERTY	3 (.0441)	1.9 (.57754)	2 (.0294)	2.4 (.061365)	1 (.0147)	1.2 (.044818)	0 (.0000)	.4 (.441176)	6 / 8.82
DRUG RELATED	0 (.0000)	.3 (.323529)	0 (.0000)	.4 (.397059)	0 (.0000)	.2 (.205882)	1 (.0147)	.1 (11.6735)	1 / 1.47
NO SECOND VIOLATION	7 (.1029)	13.3 (2.95872)	21 (.3088)	16.3 (1.36884)	10 (.1471)	8.4 (.287866)	3 (.0441)	3.0 (NoReport)	41 /60.29
TOTAL # / %	22 / 32.35		27 / 39.71		14 / 20.59		5 / 7.35		68

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 18:

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	12	26.079	0.010
Cramer's V		.358	

The probability of chi-square is within the acceptable limits (.05 or less) indicating that the statistic has significance.

Table 19 shows a chi-square value of 21.575 for a comparison of first misbehavior by second misbehavior. It is a four by five grid comparing Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior - first violation at the mid-range level of seriousness (Tier II) by the second violation, including those with no second violation - at the mid-range level of seriousness.

Table 19.

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION BY SECOND VIOLATION
INCLUDING NO SECOND VIOLATION - AT THE MID-RANGE LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER II)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR SECOND VIOLATION	CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION								TOTAL # / %
	AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		
AGGRESSION	25	19.9	8	7.7	1	6.4	2	2.1	36 /26.47
	(.1838)	(1.33442)	(.0588)	(.013635)	(.0074)	(4.51035)	(.0147)	(.006536)	
OTHER	9	9.4	5	3.6	2	3.0	1	1.0	17 /12.50
	(.0662)	(.015)	(.0368)	(.521552)	(.0147)	(.333333)	(.0074)	(.0000)	
PROPERTY	5	6.1	2	2.3	2	1.9	2	.6	11 / 8.09
	(.0368)	(.187389)	(.0147)	(.050917)	(.0147)	(.001783)	(.0147)	(2.82888)	
DRUG RELATED	4	4.4	1	1.7	1	1.4	2	.5	8 / 5.88
	(.0294)	(.038431)	(.0074)	(.292089)	(.0074)	(.120098)	(.0147)	(4.97059)	
NO SECOND VIOLATION	32	35.3	13	13.6	18	11.3	1	3.8	64 /47.06
	(.2353)	(.307451)	(.0956)	(.03068)	(.1324)	(3.98162)	(.0074)	(2.03033)	
TOTAL # / %	75 / 55.15		29 / 21.32		24 / 17.65		8 / 5.88		136

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 19:

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	12	21.575	0.043
Cramer's V		.230	

The probability of chi-square is within acceptable limits (.05 or less) indicating that the statistic is significant. The

major generator of effect is second misbehavior Property which is under-represented in terms of second misbehavior Aggression and is over-represented in terms of second misbehavior None. Therefore, individuals who commit a first misbehavior that is Property related tend to avoid aggressive second misbehaviors and, in general, tend to avoid committing second misbehaviors altogether.

Table 20 shows a chi-square value of 18.781 for a comparison of first misbehavior by second misbehavior. It is a four by five grid comparing Aggressive misbehavior, Other misbehavior, Property misbehavior, and Drug Related misbehavior, first violation at the highest level of seriousness (Tier III), by the second violation, including those with no second violation, at the highest level of seriousness.

Table 20.

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION BY SECOND VIOLATION
INCLUDING NO SECOND VIOLATION - AT THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF SERIOUSNESS (TIER III)

CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR SECOND VIOLATION	CATEGORIES OF MISBEHAVIOR - FIRST VIOLATION								TOTAL # / %
	AGGRESSION		OTHER		PROPERTY		DRUG RELATED		
AGGRESSION	10 (.1639)	8.3 (.36547)	2 (.0328)	1.6 (.096353)	0 (.0000)	.5 (.459016)	2 (.0328)	3.7 (.761417)	14 /22.95
OTHER	3 (.0492)	3.5 (.08265)	2 (.0328)	.7 (2.49805)	0 (.0000)	.2 (.196721)	1 (.0164)	1.6 (.209187)	6 / 9.84
PROPERTY	2 (.0328)	3.5 (.670613)	2 (.0328)	.7 (2.49805)	1 (.0164)	.2 (3.28005)	1 (.0164)	1.6 (.209187)	6 / 9.84
DRUG RELATED	4 (.0656)	4.7 (.1102)	1 (.0164)	.9 (.007319)	1 (.0164)	.3 (2.0748)	2 (.0328)	2.1 (.004611)	8 /13.11
NO SECOND VIOLATION	17 (.2787)	15.9 (.071258)	0 (.0000)	3.1 (3.09836)	0 (.0000)	.9 (.885246)	10 (.1639)	7.1 (1.20234)	27 /44.26
TOTAL # / %	36 / 59.02		7 / 11.48		2 / 3.28		16 / 26.23		61

NOTE: In each cell, the upper left number gives the observed frequency, the upper right number is the expected frequency, the lower left is the observed percentage total, and the lower right is the cell chi-square.

STATISTICS FOR TABLE 20:

	Degrees of Freedom	Value	Probability
Chi-Square	12	18.781	0.094
Cramer's V		.320	

The probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits (greater than .05) indicating that the significance of the statistic is questionable.

Tables 21 through 28 are General Linear Model and Stepwise Regression tables relating classification of crime to inmate misbehavior categories. Tables 29 through 38 are also General Linear Model and Stepwise Regression tables relating classification of inmate misbehavior second violation to classification of inmate misbehavior first violation.

Table 21.

D.V. = Crime Category Aggression Against All Predictors
General Linear Model Inmates N = 621
F Value = 2.02 PR>F = 0.0012 R-Square = 0.093172

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	ATTRIBUTES		F VALUE TYPE 3
Category of Misbehavior: Aggression	2	(1 or 0)	1.13
Property	2	"	0.13
Alcohol/Drug Related	2	"	1.29
Other	2	"	1.71
Current Age	2	"	0.00
Age When Incarcerated	2	"	3.96
Conviction by Plea	2	"	1.12
Multiple Indictment	2	"	0.55
Recidivist	2	"	0.00
Race: White	2	"	0.05
Black	2	"	0.09
Hispanic	2	"	0.11
Religion: Catholic	2	"	0.72
Protestant	2	"	0.44
Hebrew	2	"	1.48
Muslim	2	"	0.71
Enrolled in Prison College Program	2	"	0.23
History of Employment	2	"	2.66
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	2	"	0.84
History of Alcohol Abuse	2	"	0.46
No History of Drug Offenses	2	"	0.10
History of Marijuana Use	2	"	2.32
History of Heroin Use	2	"	0.06
Married	2	"	0.21
Common Law Relationship	2	"	0.07
Unmarried	2	"	1.17
Urban or Rural Crime Setting	2	"	0.63
More or Less than Five Years in Prison	2	"	6.64
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date	2	"	1.91
Housing Unit	4	(00, 01, 10 or 11)	0.53

The analysis in Table 21 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to crime category Aggression are not very meaningful. The R-Square of 0.093 means that 9.3% of the variance in the category of crime Aggression is explained. Both the F value, which indicates the significance of the analysis, and the value of PR>F, which indicates the confidence level in the F-value, suggest a non-zero R-Square in the population. However, two of the variables produced F values of 0.00, raising the issue of co-linearity. (Meaning that these variables were a linear composite of other variables in the equation. This was addressed by using these variables as the dependent variable against all other predictors, which did not produce significant results. This analysis eliminated the co-linearity issue). Some of the variables which are the focus of this dissertation, did produce significant F values.

The variables were then coded by the investigator, which is a process not necessary in the General Linear Model procedure, to accommodate a Stepwise procedure and an analysis was conducted.

The best model consisted of 7 variable attributes comprising 7 variables as used in the General Linear Model and is shown in Table 22. Overall, 7.64% of the variance in the crime category Aggression is explained.

Table 22.

D.V. = Crime Category Aggression Against All Predictors
Stepwise Procedure Inmates N = 621
F Value = 7.24 PR>F = 0.0001 R-Square = 0.07640103

STEP	PROCESS	I.V.	BETA +/-	(Incremental) R-SQUARE	F VALUE	PR>F=
1	Add	Age When Incarcerated	+	0.03191443	20.41	0.0001
2	Add	More or Less than 5 years in Prison	-	0.01484680	15.16	0.0001
3	Add	Unmarried	+	0.00774401	11.86	0.0001
4	Add	Race: White	-	0.00727279	10.14	0.0001
5	Add	History of Marijana Use	+	0.00608036	8.95	0.0001
6	Add	Religion: Hebrew	-	0.00460636	7.99	0.0001
7	Add	Employment History	+	0.00393628	7.24	0.0001

The analysis in Table 22 indicates that the regression relating crime category Aggression to all variables is not very meaningful. However, both the F-value and the value of the PR>F suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. This analysis clearly does not find the variables of misbehavior category to be significant and that those variables which are significant in the analysis do not provide a substantial explanation for the variance. The order of introduction of the variables in the stepwise process is shown in the table.

Table 23.

D..V. = Crime Category Property Against All Predictors
General Linear Model Inmates N = 621
F Value = 2.23 PR>F = 0.0002 R-Square = 0.101794

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE		ATTRIBUTES		F VALUE TYPE 3
Category of Misbehavior:	Aggression	2	(1 or 0)	6.32
	Property	2	"	0.01
	Alcohol/Drug Related	2	"	0.63
	Other	2	"	4.87
Current Age		2	"	0.00
Age When Incarcerated		2	"	1.94
Conviction by Plea		2	"	0.74
Multiple Indictment		2	"	0.86
Recidivist		2	"	13.72
Race: White		2	"	0.02
Black		2	"	0.01
Hispanic		2	"	0.22
Religion: Catholic		2	"	0.63
Protestant		2	"	1.21
Hebrew		2	"	0.05
Muslim		2	"	0.43
Enrolled in Prison College Program		2	"	0.12
History of Employment		2	"	0.00
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse		2	"	4.05
History of Alcohol Abuse		2	"	2.49
No History of Drug Offenses		2	"	7.08
History of Marijuana Use		2	"	0.13
History of Heroin Use		2	"	2.30
Married		2	"	0.97
Common Law Relationship		2	"	2.13
Unmarried		2	"	2.53
Urban or Rural Crime Setting		2	"	5.65
More or Less than Five Years in Prison		2	"	5.39
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date		2	"	0.06
Housing Unit		4	(00, 01, 10 or 11)	0.62

The analysis in Table 23 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to crime category Property are not very meaningful. Overall, the R-square of 0.1017 means 10.17% of the variance in the crime category Property is explained. Both the F value and the PR>F value suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. Two of the variables produced F values of 0.000 raising the issue of co-linearity (one variable being a function of another). This problem of co-linearity was addressed by using these variables as the dependent variable against all predictors which did not produce significant results. This analysis eliminated the co-linearity issue. Some of the variables which are the focus of this dissertation did produce significant F values.

The variables were then coded to accommodate a Stepwise procedure and an analysis was performed. The best model consisted of 8 variable attributes comprising 8 variables as used in the General Linear Model and is shown in Table 24.

Table 24.

D.V. = Crime Category Property Against All Predictors
Stepwise Procedure Inmates N = 621
F Value = 6.90 PR>F = 0.0001 R-Square = 0.08269615

STEP	PROCESS	I.V.	BETA +/-	(Incremental) R-SQUARE	F VALUE	PR>F=
1	Add	Recidivist	+	0.02623602	16.68	0.0001
2	Add	More or Less Than 5 Years in Prison	+	0.01536026	13.41	0.0001
3	Add	Urban or Rual Crime Setting	-	0.00994053	11.18	0.0001
4	Add	History of Drug and Alcohol	-	0.00862186	9.86	0.0001
5	Add	Category of Misbehavior: Aggression	-	0.00816679	9.02	0.0001
6	Add	Category of Misbehavior: Other	-	0.00710720	8.35	0.0085
7	Add	Age When Incarcerated	+	0.00379063	7.53	0.0001
8	Add	Race: Hispanic	-	0.00347286	6.90	0.0001

The analysis in Table 24 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to crime category Property are not very meaningful. Overall, only 8.26% of the variance has been accounted for. Both the F value and the value of PR>F suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. This validates the factors in Table 23 which also appear in this table. The analysis indicates that the regression findings relating crime category Property to all variables does find attributes or variables of misbehavior category Aggression and misbehavior category Other to be significant. The order of introduction of the variables in the Stepwise process is shown in the table.

Table 25.

D.V. = Crime Category Drug Related Against All Predictors
General Linear Model Inmates N = 621
F Value = 2.46 PR>F = 0.0001 R-Square = 0.111375

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE		ATTRIBUTES		F VALUE TYPE 3
Category of Misbehavior:	Aggression	2	(1 or 0)	0.14
	Property	2	"	0.06
	Alcohol/Drug Related	2	"	0.53
	Other	2	"	0.19
Current Age		2	"	0.09
Age When Incarcerated		2	"	13.08
Conviction by Plea		2	"	1.03
Multiple Indictment		2	"	2.14
Recidivist		2	"	3.64
Race: White		2	"	0.31
Black		2	"	0.01
Hispanic		2	"	0.06
Religion: Catholic		2	"	0.56
Protestant		2	"	0.05
Hebrew		2	"	0.19
Muslum		2	"	0.59
Enrolled in Prison College Program		2	"	0.22
History of Employment		2	"	1.98
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse		2	"	2.32
History of Alcohol Abuse		2	"	5.73
No History of Drug Offenses		2	"	2.70
History of Marijuana Use		2	"	4.67
History of Heroin Use		2	"	3.15
Married		2	"	3.17
Common Law Relationship		2	"	4.12
Unmarried		2	"	0.01
Urban or Rural Crime Setting		2	"	1.82
More or Less than Five Years in Prison		2	"	0.88
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date		2	"	8.53
Housing Unit		4	(00, 01, 10 or 11)	0.03

The analysis in Table 25 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to crime category Drug Related are not very meaningful. Overall, the R-square of 0.1111 means that 11.11% of the variance is explained. It is important to note that there are no F values of 0.00 produced by this dependent variable. None of the variables which are the focus of this dissertation produced significant F values.

The variables were then coded to accommodate a Stepwise procedure and an analysis was performed. The best model consisted of 6 variable attributes comprising 6 variables as used in the General Linear Model and is shown in Table 26.

Table 26.

D.V. = Crime Category Drug Related Against All Predictors
Stepwise Procedure Inmates N = 621
F Value = 8.73 PR>F = 0.0001 R-Square = 0.07860333

STEP	PROCESS	I.V.	BETA +/-	(Incremental) R-SQUARE	F VALUE	PR>F=
1	Add	Age When Incarcerated	-	0.03660273	23.52	0.0001
2	Add	Unmarried	-	0.02360140	16.33	0.0001
3	Add	More or Less than 5 Years in Prison	+	0.01427593	14.18	0.0001
4	Add	Recidivist	-	0.00558129	11.60	0.0001
5	Add	History of Alcohol Abuse	-	0.00401126	9.84	0.0001
6	Add	History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	+	0.00453072	8.73	0.0001

The analysis in Table 26 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to crime category Drug Related are not very meaningful. Overall, only 7.86% of the variance is accounted for. Both the F value and the value of PR>F suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. This analysis clearly does not find the misbehavior category variables to be significant and that those variables which are significant in the analysis do not provide a substantial explanation for the variance. The order of introduction of the variables in the Stepwise process is shown in the table.

Table 27.

D.V. = Crime Category Other Against All Predictors
General Linear Model Inmates N = 621
F Value = 1.68 PR>F = 0.0139 R-Square = 0.078741

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	ATTRIBUTES		F VALUE TYPE 3
Category of Misbehavior: Aggression	2	(1 or 0)	0.26
Property	2	"	0.08
Alcohol/Drug Related	2	"	0.05
Other	2	"	0.32
Current Age	2	"	0.50
Age When Incarcerated	2	"	0.32
Current Age	2	"	0.17
Conviction by Plea	2	"	0.27
Multiple Indictment	2	"	0.28
Recidivist	2	"	3.84
Race: White	2	"	0.05
Black	2	"	0.43
Hispanic	2	"	0.25
Religion: Catholic	2	"	0.20
Protestant	2	"	0.18
Hebrew	2	"	5.47
Muslum	2	"	0.09
Enrolled in Prison College Program	2	"	0.03
History of Employment	2	"	1.94
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	2	"	10.94
History of Alcohol Abuse	2	"	22.06
No History of Drug Offenses	2	"	0.07
History of Marijuana Use	2	"	0.11
History of Heroin Use	2	"	0.07
Married	2	"	0.30
Common Law Relationship	2	"	0.54
Unmarried	2	"	0.00
Urban or Rural Crime Setting	2	"	0.50
More or Less than Five Years in Prison	2	"	0.98
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date	2	"	2.00
Housing Unit	4	(00, 01, 10 or 11)	0.08

The analysis in Table 27 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to crime category Other are not very meaningful. Overall, the R-square of 0.078 means that 7.8% of the variance is explained. Both the F value and PR>F suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. However, one of the variables produced an F value of 0.000, raising the issue of co-linearity (one variable being a function of another). This problem of co-linearity was addressed by using this variable as the dependent variable against all other predictors and there were no significant results. This analysis eliminated the co-linearity issue. None of the variables which are the focus of this dissertation produced significant F values.

The variables were then coded to accommodate a Stepwise procedure and an analysis was performed. The best model consisted of 6 variable attributes and 6 variables as used in the General Linear Model and is shown in Table 28.

Table 28.

D.V. = Crime Category Other Against All Predictors
Stepwise Procedure **Inmates N = 621**
F Value = 7.13 **PR>F = 0.0001** **R-Square = 0.06513947**

STEP	PROCESS	I.V.	BETA +/-	(Incremental) R-SQUARE	F VALUE	PR>F=
1	Add	History of Alcohol Abuse	+	0.02068028	13.07	0.0003
2	Add	History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	-	0.02008083	13.13	0.0001
3	Add	Religion: Hebrew	+	0.01166706	11.38	0.0001
4	Add	Recidivist	-	0.00491231	9.37	0.0001
5	Add	History of Employment	-	0.00458537	8.12	0.0001
6	Add	Race: White	+	0.00321362	7.13	0.0001

The analysis in Table 28 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to the crime category Other are not very meaningful. Overall, only 6.51% of the variance is accounted for. Both the F value and the value of PR>F suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. This analysis clearly does not find the misbehavior category variables to be significant, and indicates that those variables which are significant in the analysis do not provide a substantial explanation for the variance. The order of introduction of the variables in the Stepwise process is shown in the table.

The analyses performed in Tables 29 through 38 follow the format utilized for presenting Tables 21 through 28 where a General Linear Model analysis is followed by a Stepwise process. In Tables 29 through 38 however, the dependent variable utilized is the category of misbehavior second violation rather than the category of crime.

Table 29.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category Aggression, Second Violation, All Levels of Seriousness Combined (Tier I, II, III) Against all Predictors

General Linear Model — Inmates N = 209
F Value = 1.78 — PR>F = 0.0135 — R-Square = 0.216820

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	ATTRIBUTES	F VALUE TYPE 3
Category of Misbehavior:		
Aggression, 1st Violation	2 (1 or 0)	7.33
Alcohol/Drug Related, 1st Violation	2 "	1.66
Other, 1st Violation	2 "	1.97
Current Age	2 "	0.66
Age When Incarcerated	2 "	2.76
Conviction by Plea	2 "	0.16
Multiple Indictment	2 "	0.41
Recidivist	2 "	0.04
Race: White	2 "	0.72
Black	2 "	0.62
Hispanic	2 "	0.30
Religion: Catholic	2 "	0.28
Protestant	2 "	0.26
Hebrew	2 "	2.49
Muslim	2 "	4.63
Enrolled in Prison College Program	2 "	0.22
History of Employment	2 "	0.01
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	2 "	0.22
History of Alcohol Abuse	2 "	0.10
No History of Drug Offenses	2 "	0.60
History of Marijuana Use	2 "	0.70
History of Heroin Use	2 "	0.62
Married	2 "	1.29
Common Law Relationship	2 "	0.12
Unmarried	2 "	0.00
Urban or Rural Crime Setting	2 "	1.19
More or Less than Five Years in Prison	2 "	4.53
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date	2 "	2.04

The analysis in Table 29 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to misbehavior category Aggression, second violation at all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III), are somewhat meaningful. Overall, an R-square with a value of 0.216 means that 21.6% of the variance is explained. The PR>F of 0.0135 and the F value of 1.78 both indicate significance of the overall analysis. However, one variable produced an F value of 0.00, raising the issue of co-linearity which means that this variable was a composite of other variables in this equation. The co-linearity issue was addressed by using this variable as a dependent variable against all other predictors. There were no significant results, thus eliminating the possibility of co-linearity. Some of the variables which are the focus of this disseration produced significant F values.

The variables were coded to accommodate a Stepwise procedure and an analysis was performed. The best model consisted of 7 variable attributes comprising 7 variables as used in the General Linear Model and is shown in Table 30.

Table 30.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category Aggression, Second Violation, All Levels of Seriousness (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) Against all Predictors

Stepwise Procedure — Inmates N = 209
F Value = 5.87 — PR>F = 0.0001 — R-Square = 0.16970095

STEP	PROCESS	I. V.	BETA +/-	(Incremental) R-SQUARE	F VALUE	PR>F=
1	Add	Religion: Catholic	-	0.03794788	8.17	0.0047
2	Add	Category of Misbehavior: Aggression, 1st Violation	+	0.03840153	8.51	0.0003
2	Add Drop	Religion: Muslim Religion: Catholic	+	0.00176830	8.73	0.0002
3	Add	Religion: Hebrew	+	0.02163278	7.57	0.0001
4	Add	Married	-	0.02098545	7.00	0.0001
5	Add	More or Less than 5 Years in Prison	+	0.01901670	6.60	0.0001
6	Add Drop	Age when Incarcerated Married	+	0.00044416	6.62	0.0001
6	Add	Category of Misbehavior: Other, 1st Violation	+	0.01475397	6.17	0.0001
7	Add	Married	-	0.01148266	5.73	0.0001
7	Add Drop	Religion: Protestant Category of Misbehavior: Other, 1st Violation	+	0.00326752	5.87	0.0001

The analysis in Table 30 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to misbehavior category Aggression, second violation all levels of seriousness (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) are minimally meaningful. Overall, 16.9% of the variance is explained.

Both the F value and the value of PR>F suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. This validates the factors in Table 29 which also appear in this table. In addition, the analysis of the regression findings indicates that a significant relationship exists between category of misbehavior Aggression, second violation all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) and the attribute or variable of the category of misbehavior Aggression, first violation.

Table 31.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category Property, Second Violation, All Levels of Seriousness Combined (Tier I, II, III) Against all Predictors

General Linear Model — Inmates N = 209
F Value = 0.82 — PR>F = 0.7279 — R-Square = 0.112976

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	ATTRIBUTES	F VALUE TYPE 3
Category of Misbehavior:		
Aggression, 1st Violation	2 (1 or 0)	0.00
Alcohol/Drug Related, 1st Violation	2 "	0.14
Other, 1st Violation	2 "	0.10
Current Age	2 "	2.00
Age When Incarcerated	2 "	0.05
Conviction by Plea	2 "	0.68
Multiple Indictment	2 "	0.64
Recidivist	2 "	2.79
Race: White	2 "	0.40
Black	2 "	0.16
Hispanic	2 "	0.31
Religion: Catholic	2 "	0.00
Protestant	2 "	0.02
Hebrew	2 "	0.58
Muslim	2 "	0.34
Enrolled in Prison College Program	2 "	0.00
History of Employment	2 "	0.87
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	2 "	0.35
History of Alcohol Abuse	2 "	0.24
No History of Drug Offenses	2 "	2.18
History of Marijuana Use	2 "	0.29
History of Heroin Use	2 "	0.30
Married	2 "	1.70
Common Law Relationship	2 "	0.53
Unmarried	2 "	0.10
Urban or Rural Crime Setting	2 "	0.05
More or Less than Five Years in Prison	2 "	0.10
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date	2 "	0.07

The analysis in Table 31 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to misbehavior category Property, second violation at all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) are not very meaningful. The R-square of 0.1129 means that 11.29% of the variance in the total category of misbehavior Property, second violation, is explained. Neither the F values nor the value of PR>F suggest that the statistics developed are valid. Specifically, the PR>F is in excess of 0.05. Further, three variables produced an F value of 0.00, raising the issue of co-linearity (meaning that this variable was a composite of other variables in the equation). This problem of co-linearity was addressed by using these variables as dependent variables against all other predictors, which did not produce significant results. This analysis eliminated the question of co-linearity. None of the variables which are the focus of this dissertation produced significant F values.

The variables were then coded to accommodate a Stepwise procedure and an analysis was conducted. The best model consisted of 5 variable attributes comprising 5 variables as used in the General Linear Model and is shown in Table 32.

Table 32.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category Property, Second Violation, All Levels of Seriousness (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) Against all Predictors

Stepwise Procedure — Inmates N = 209
F Value = 3.27 — PR>F = 0.0074 — R-Square = 0.07462400

STEP	PROCESS	I.V.	BETA +/-	(Incremental) R-SQUARE	F VALUE	PR>F=
1	Add	Current Age	+	0.02503777	5.32	0.0221
2	Add	No History of Drug Offenses	-	0.01416531	4.20	0.0163
3	Add	Married	+	0.01292268	3.76	0.0118
4	Add	Recidivist	+	0.01249405	3.52	0.0083
5	Add	History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	-	0.01000419	3.27	0.0074

The analysis in Table 32 indicates that the regression relating misbehavior category Property, second offense at all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III), to all variables is not very meaningful. Overall, only 7.46% of the variance has been accounted for. Both the F value and the value of PR>F suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. This validates the factors in Table 31 which also appear in this table. The analysis in this table indicates that the regression findings relating misbehavior category Property, second violation all levels of seriousness, and the first violations of misbehavior categories are not significant. The order of introduction of the variables in the Stepwise procedure is shown in the table.

Table 33.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category Drug Related, Second Violation, All Levels of Seriousness Combined (Tier I, II, III) Against all Predictors

General Linear Model — Inmates N = 209
F Value = 0.51 — PR>F = 0.9818 — R-Square = 0.073239

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	ATTRIBUTES	F VALUE TYPE 3
Category of Misbehavior:		
Aggression, 1st Violation	2 (1 or 0)	0.80
Alcohol/Drug Related, 1st Violation	2 "	1.97
Other, 1st Violation	2 "	0.08
Current Age	2 "	0.92
Age When Incarcerated	2 "	0.02
Conviction by Plea	2 "	2.59
Multiple Indictment	2 "	1.14
Recidivist	2 "	0.12
Race: White	2 "	0.15
Black	2 "	0.24
Hispanic	2 "	0.00
Religion: Catholic	2 "	0.02
Protestant	2 "	0.07
Hebrew	2 "	0.16
Muslim	2 "	0.01
Enrolled in Prison College Program	2 "	0.22
History of Employment	2 "	0.16
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	2 "	0.00
History of Alcohol Abuse	2 "	0.22
No History of Drug Offenses	2 "	0.19
History of Marijuana Use	2 "	0.47
History of Heroin Use	2 "	0.04
Married	2 "	0.01
Common Law Relationship	2 "	0.00
Unmarried	2 "	0.29
Urban or Rural Crime Setting	2 "	0.08
More or Less than Five Years in Prison	2 "	0.01
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date	2 "	0.15

The analysis in Table 33 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to inmate misbehavior category Drug Related, second violation at all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) are not very meaningful. Overall, the R-square of 0.073 means 7.30% of the variance in the misbehavior category Drug Related, second violation at all levels of seriousness, is explained. Neither the F value nor the value of PR>F suggest a valid analysis. Further, three variables produced F values of 0.00 raising the issue of co-linearity (meaning that these variables were composites of other variables in this equation). The co-linearity issue was addressed by using these variables as dependent variables against all other predictors. There were no significant results, thus eliminating the issue of co-linearity. Some of the variables which are the focus of this dissertation did produce significant F values.

The variables were then coded to accommodate a Stepwise procedure and an analysis was performed. The best model consisted of 2 variable attributes comprising 2 variables as used in the General Linear Model and is shown in Table 34.

Table 34.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category Drug Related, Second Violation, All Levels of Seriousness Combined (Tier I, II, III) Against all Predictors
Stepwise Procedure Inmates N = 209
F Value = 2.79 PR>F = 0.0639 R-Square = 0.02634734

STEP	PROCESS	I.V.	BETA +/-	(Incremental) R-SQUARE	F VALUE	PR>F=
1	Add	Conviction by Plea	-	0.01280423	2.68	0.1028
2	Add	Current Age	-	0.01354311	2.79	0.0639

The analysis in Table 34 indicates that the regression relating misbehavior category Drug Related, second violation at all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) to all variables, is not very meaningful. Overall, only 2.63% of the variance has been accounted for. The F value suggests a non-zero R-square in the population. However, the PR>F exceeds acceptable limits making the validity of the analysis suspect. This analysis validates the factors in Table 33 which also appear in this table. The regression findings relating inmate misbehavior category Drug Related, second violation at all levels of seriousness, to all variables do not find any variables, which are the subject of this study, to be significant. The order of introduction of the variables in the Stepwise process is shown in the table.

Table 35.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category Other, Second Violation, All Levels of Seriousness Combined (Tier I, II, III) Against all Predictors

General Linear Model — Inmates N = 209
F Value = 0.83 — PR>F = 0.7085 — R-Square = 0.114734

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	ATTRIBUTES	F VALUE TYPE 3
Category of Misbehavior:		
Aggression, 1st Violation	2 (1 or 0)	0.05
Alcohol/Drug Related, 1st Violation	2 "	0.44
Other, 1st Violation	2 "	0.06
Current Age	2 "	0.01
Age When Incarcerated	2 "	0.53
Conviction by Plea	2 "	0.13
Multiple Indictment	2 "	1.83
Recidivist	2 "	0.24
Race: White	2 "	1.65
Black	2 "	1.80
Hispanic	2 "	0.46
Religion: Catholic	2 "	0.00
Protestant	2 "	0.02
Hebrew	2 "	1.09
Muslim	2 "	0.14
Enrolled in Prison College Program	2 "	1.02
History of Employment	2 "	1.55
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	2 "	1.08
History of Alcohol Abuse	2 "	0.37
No History of Drug Offenses	2 "	0.02
History of Marijuana Use	2 "	0.60
History of Heroin Use	2 "	1.64
Married	2 "	0.63
Common Law Relationship	2 "	1.85
Unmarried	2 "	2.51
Urban or Rural Crime Setting	2 "	1.88
More or Less than Five Years in Prison	2 "	2.26
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date	2 "	0.51

The analysis in Table 35 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to inmate misbehavior category Other, second violation all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III), are not very meaningful. Overall, the R-square of 0.1147 means 11.47% of the variance in the misbehavior category Other, second violation at all levels of seriousness, is explained. Neither the F value nor the value of PR>F suggest a valid analysis. Furthermore, one variable produced an F value of 0.00, raising the issue of co-linearity (meaning this variable was a composite of other variables in this equation). The co-linearity issue was addressed by using this variable as a dependent variable against all other predictors, and no significant results were produced. This analysis, therefore eliminates the question of co-linearity. None of the variables which are the focus of this dissertation produced significant F values.

The variables were then coded to accommodate a Stepwise procedure and an analysis was performed. The best model consisted of 2 variable attributes comprising 2 variables as used in the General Linear Model and is shown in Table 36.

Table 36.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category Other, Second Violation, All Levels of Seriousness Combined (Tier I, II, III) Against all Predictors

Stepwise Procedure **Inmates N = 209**
F Value = 3.43 **PR>F = 0.0343** **R-Square = 0.03222281**

STEP	PROCESS	I.V.	BETA +/-	(Incremental) R-SQUARE	F Value	PR>F=
1	Add	More or Less than 5 years in Prison	-	0.01615862	3.40	0.0666
2	Add	Race: Hispanic	-	0.01606419	3.43	0.0343

The analysis in Table 36 indicates that the regression relating misbehavior category Other, second violation all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III) to all variables is not very meaningful. Overall, only 3.22% of the variance has been accounted for. Both the F value and the value of PR>F suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. This validates the factors in Table 35 which also appear in this table. The analysis indicates that the regression findings relating inmate misbehavior category Other, second violation, all levels of seriousness to all variables show attributes or variables More or Less Than 5 Years in Prison and Race: Hispanic to be significant. The order of introduction of the variables in the Stepwise process is shown in the table.

Table 37.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category None, No Second Violation, Against All Predictors

General Linear Model — Inmates N = 209
F Value = 1.59 — PR>F = 0.0380 — R-Square = 0.198448

INDEPENDENT VARIABLE	ATTRIBUTES		F VALUE TYPE 3
Category of Misbehavior:			
Aggression, 1st Violation	2	(1 or 0)	7.05
Alcohol/Drug Related, 1st Violation	2	"	1.03
Other, 1st Violation	2	"	1.46
Current Age	2	"	0.08
Age When Incarcerated	2	"	3.72
Conviction by Plea	2	"	0.72
Multiple Indictment	2	"	1.64
Recidivist	2	"	1.37
Race: White	2	"	3.90
Black	2	"	3.57
Hispanic	2	"	1.35
Religion: Catholic	2	"	0.10
Protestant	2	"	0.08
Hebrew	2	"	0.00
Muslim	2	"	2.45
Enrolled in Prison College Program	2	"	1.41
History of Employment	2	"	1.33
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	2	"	0.39
History of Alcohol Abuse	2	"	0.01
No History of Drug Offenses	2	"	2.69
History of Marijuana Use	2	"	1.40
History of Heroin Use	2	"	3.25
Married	2	"	0.46
Common Law Relationship	2	"	0.07
Unmarried	2	"	1.31
Urban or Rural Crime Setting	2	"	2.20
More or Less than Five Years in Prison	2	"	0.31
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date	2	"	0.91

The analysis in Table 37 indicates that the regression findings relating all variables to misbehavior category No Second Violation at any level of seriousness are meaningful. Overall, R-square 0.198 means that 19.8% of the variance is explained. The PR>F of 0.0380 and the F value of 1.59 indicates significance of the overall analysis. Some of the variables which are the focus of this study produced significant F values.

The variables were then recoded to accommodate a Stepwise procedure and an analysis was performed. The best model consisted of 6 variable attributes comprising 6 variables as used in the General Linear Model and is shown in Table 38.

Table 38.

D.V. = Misbehavior Category None, No Second Violation, Against all Predictors

Stepwise Procedure **Inmates N = 209**
F Value = 4.00 **PR>F = 0.0008** **R-Square = 0.10626757**

STEP	PROCESS	I.V.	BETA +/-	(Incremental) R-SQUARE	F Value	PR>F=
1	Add	Category of Misbehavior: Aggression, 1st Violation	-	0.02792394	5.95	0.0156
2	Add	Religion: Catholic	+	0.02092662	5.29	0.0057
3	Add	Conviction by Plea	+	0.02193800	5.21	0.0019
4	Add	Age When Incarcerated	-	0.01170441	4.59	0.0014
4	Add Drop	Religion: Muslim Religion: Catholic	-	0.00053302	4.62	0.0014
5	Add	Recidivist	-	0.01258648	4.29	0.0011
5	Add Drop	Catholic Religion: Muslim	+	0.00007278	4.30	0.0011
6	Add	Religion Muslim	-	0.01058232	4.00	0.0008

The analysis in Table 38 indicates that the regression findings relating No Second Misbehavior to all variables are not very meaningful. Overall, 10.6% of the variance is accounted for. The F value and the PR>F both suggest a non-zero R-square in the population. This validates the factors in Table 37 which also appear in this table. In addition, the analysis of the regression findings relating No Second Misbehavior to all variables indicates that the attribute or variable misbehavior category Aggression, first violation, is significant. The order of introduction of the variables in the Stepwise process is shown in the above table.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This chapter discusses and summarizes the findings of this study of inmate misbehavior based on incidents recorded over a six-month period. The discussion centers on the hypothesis related to classification of criminal activity on the street and classification of misbehavior while incarcerated. It also deals with classification of the first incident of inmate misbehavior and views subsequent misbehaviors to explore the possibility of the development of a continued behavior pattern.

Discussion One

The first discussion will focus on the hypothesis set forth in the methodology section of this dissertation and will analyze the results in the chi-square and regression tables as they relate to the hypotheses.

The first hypothesis tested concerns classification of crime and classification of inmate misbehavior. It proposes that H1: The classification of an inmate's crime of conviction will relate to and predict that inmate's misbehavior in a similar classification. The analysis tested for the null hypothesis which is that there will be no

significant similarity between classification of crime - specifically, Aggressive, Drug Related, Property, and Other - and classification of misbehavior utilizing the same designations.

Table 1, which relates category of crime to the category of misbehavior, all levels of seriousness of the first misbehavior and includes no misbehavior, indicates that the probability of chi-square exceeds acceptable limits. A review of the table reveals that the cell which crosses Aggressive misbehavior with Property crime generates the major portion of the developed chi-square in this analysis. This particular configuration does not conform to any developed hypothesis. The second major generator of significance is the cross between Property related misbehavior and Drug Related crime category. This configuration also does not conform to any specified hypothesis. These relationships will be explored further in General Linear Model and Stepwise Tables.

Table 1A, which relates the category of crime to the category of first misbehavior at all levels of seriousness combined (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III), indicates that the probability of chi-square exceeds the acceptable limit (.05). Therefore, the data presented in this table is of questionable validity.

Table 1B, which relates category of crime to all levels of seriousness of the first misbehavior (Tier I, Tier II, Tier III), indicates that the probability of chi-square is within acceptable limits for a valid analysis, however, the validity of the chi-square test is still open to question based on the fact that 43% of the cells have expected counts less than 5. Therefore, the chi-square information generated may not be valid. The prime generators of this

chi-square are the cells relating Property crime to Tier II and Tier III misbehavior where no Tier III misbehavior was exhibited and a larger than expected Tier II misbehavior pattern existed. This relationship will be explored further in subsequent General Linear Model and Stepwise tables.

Table 2, which relates category of crime by frequency of misbehavior, Tier I level, indicates that there were 55 Tier I misbehaviors as a first misbehavior associated with crimes in the Aggressive category, 2 second Tier I misbehaviors in the Aggressive crime category, and 1 third misbehavior. There was one misbehavior in the Other crime category which was a first misbehavior and there were no subsequent occurrences. There were 3 Property crime-related misbehaviors which were first misbehaviors and no subsequent misbehaviors. There were 5 Tier I first misbehaviors associated with drug-related crime of conviction and one subsequent Tier I misbehavior.

Table 3 indicates that, with respect to misbehaviors at the Tier II or mid-range level of seriousness, 79 first misbehaviors related to Aggressive crimes, 23 second misbehaviors, 4 third misbehaviors, 1 fourth misbehavior, and 3 fifth misbehaviors were committed by inmates convicted of crimes classified as Aggressive. This table reveals that it is possible for the frequency of misbehaviors to vary between both levels of seriousnesss Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III and category consequently resulting in 3 fifth misbehaviors as opposed to only 1 fourth misbehavior related to the Aggressive crime category. This clearly indicates that Tier II misbehaviors occurred with individuals convicted of Aggressive crimes

after an interspersing of misbehaviors at other Tier levels. In the Other or Manipulative crime of conviction category there were 3 first misbehaviors and no subsequent misbehaviors. In the Property crime related Tier II misbehaviors, there were 9 first misbehaviors, 6 second misbehaviors, and no subsequent misbehaviors. In the crime of conviction Drug Related category, there were 5 first misbehaviors, 2 second misbehaviors, 1 third misbehavior, and no subsequent misbehaviors.

In the Table 4 comparison of category of crime by frequency of misbehavior at the Tier III or most serious level of misbehavior, it is to be noted that there were 47 first misbehaviors and 6 second misbehaviors committed by inmates convicted of Aggressive crimes. No serious misbehaviors appeared in the Other or Manipulative crime of conviction category. Three first misbehaviors and no subsequent misbehaviors were reported in the Property crime category, and there were 5 first misbehaviors and no subsequent misbehaviors in the crime of conviction category Drug Related.

In the Table 5 chi-square comparisons of category of crime with category of misbehavior first violation at Tier I, or least serious level of misbehavior, indicates that the probability of chi-square exceeds the acceptable limit (.05). Therefore, the statistics generated are of questionable validity.

Table 6, which relates category of crime by category of misbehavior first violation at the Tier II, or mid-range, level of seriousness also indicates that the probability of chi-square far exceeds the acceptable limit for confidence, therefore, the validity of the statistics in this table is questionable.

In reviewing Table 7, category of misbehavior first violation at the Tier III level, the highest level of seriousness, against category of crime, it should be noted that there were no Tier III misbehaviors in either the Other or Property categories. It should also be noted that the confidence level for the probability of chi-square greatly exceeds the acceptable limit hence the statistics in this table are not to be relied upon.

Table 8 compares category of crime by category of misbehavior, second violation all levels of seriousness combined, from which it should be noted that there are no Other misbehaviors indicating that manipulative criminal activity on the street did not generate any second misbehaviors at any of the Tier levels. The confidence level of the probability of chi square exceeds the .05 level and, therefore, the validity of the statistics in this table is questionable.

In viewing Table 9, category of crime by category of misbehavior second violation Tier I level, it should be noted that there were no Other or Property, Tier I second offenses. One should also note that the confidence indicator of probabilty of chi-square again exceeds the acceptable limit and, therefore, the statistics developed in this table are not to be relied upon.

In Table 10, category of crime by category of misbehavior, second violation at the Tier II, mid-range level of seriousness, as before, it is indicated that the crime category Other was not involved in generating this behavior. It is further noted that the probability of chi-square exceeds the acceptable limit (.05), therefore, the statistics developed in this table are of questionable validity.

In Table 11, category of crime by category of misbehavior second violation at Tier III or most serious level of misbehavior, it is to be noted that there were no Other crime-generated misbehaviors. It is to be further noted that there was only 1 Other misbehavior generated in the crime category Drug Related. The probability of chi-square exceeds the acceptable confidence level, therefore, the statistics generated in this table are not to be relied upon.

The Table 12 comparison of category of crime by category of misbehavior, third violation at the Tier I level, shows that the only crimes generating misbehavior are Aggressive and Drug Related crimes. Both Other and Property crimes are no longer generative of misbehavior and the Drug Related crimes generated no misbehaviors at the third level except in the misbehavior category Other. Drug crimes did not relate to Drug misbehaviors at the third offense. Taking into consideration that the probability of chi-square far exceeds the acceptable confidence level limit, the statistics developed cannot be relied upon.

Table 13, which examines category of crime by category of misbehavior third violation at the Tier II or mid-range level of seriousness, reveals that the only crimes generating misbehavior are Aggressive and Property. Crime categories Other and Drug Related do not generate any Tier II misbehaviors. Furthermore, there are no Drug Related misbehaviors generated at the Tier II level. The probability of chi-square far exceeds the .05 confidence level, therefore, the statistics generated in this table are of doubtful validity.

From Table 14, category of crime by category of misbehavior third violation at the Tier III or highest level of seriousness, one notes that the only crime categories generating misbehavior are Aggressive and Property. It can be further noted that all four categories of misbehavior are represented by these crimes, however, on viewing the probability of chi-square, the statistics developed far exceed the .05 confidence level hence the statistical analysis obtained in this table is of questionable validity.

Table 15, relates category of crime to levels of seriousness of second misbehavior. This table shows the results of an analysis involving 77 subjects and the statistics generated exceed acceptable limits for a valid analysis. The resulting statistics are of questionable validity.

Table 16, relating categories of misbehavior first violation to categories of misbehavior second violation, at all levels of seriousness and including No Second Violation, also indicates that the probability of chi-square exceeds the acceptable confidence level limits.

In Table 17, categories of misbehavior first violation by second violation, all levels of seriousness combined and deleting No Misbehavior from both first violation and second violation, it can be noted that the probability of chi-square far exceeds the acceptable confidence limit thus eliminating the potential for a valid analysis.

From Table 18, categories of misbehavior first violation by second violation including No Second Violation, at the Tier I level, it can be noted that the probability of chi-square is within acceptable

limits for analysis. These results lead to the possibility that there is a relationship to be developed. This potential for relationship will be explored subsequently in Tables 29 through 38 in a Stepwise analysis.

From the Table 19 comparison of categories of misbehavior first violation by second violation, including those with No Second Violation, at the Tier II or mid-range level of seriousness, it is noted again that the probability of chi-square is within acceptable limits presenting the potential for a valid analysis.

Table 20, categories of misbehavior first violation by second violation, including those with No Second Violation, at Tier III or highest level of seriousness of misbehavior, indicates that the probability of chi-square exceeds the acceptable confidence level limits thus the statistics developed in Table 20 are of questionable validity.

In reviewing the foregoing chi-square analyses performed in Tables 1 through 20, it is noted that only Tables 1B, 18, and 19 produced probabilities of chi-square within acceptable confidence level limits. It is further noted that these tables, in conjunction with Tables 1, 16, and 20, were the only tables which included an analysis category of no misbehavior. In Tables 18 and 19, it is suspected that the inclusion of the category of No Misbehavior as one of the comparison categories between first and second violation at the Tier II level is the generator of the validity of the statistics.

These last two Tables, 18 and 19, however, offer the possibility that there is a relationship between misbehavior first violation and misbehavior second violation. These possibilities will

be explored through the more sophisticated analysis techniques of General Linear Model and Stepwise procedure in Tables 21 through 38 along with an analysis procedure for all other data developed regardless of the confidence level of the chi-square tables.

In the subsequent analyses, dealing with Tables 21 through 38, the order of presentation is such that the dependent variable will be analyzed first in a General Linear Model and subsequently in a Stepwise procedure. The presentation of tables will be for each dependent variable. Odd numbered Tables 21 through 37 will present the General Linear Models and, the Stepwise analysis reflecting the same variables reconfigured to accommodate a Stepwise procedure, are presented in the even-numbered Tables 22 through 38. These tables present the progression of the Stepwise analysis up until the point where the validity factor of the analysis diminished below acceptable limits. This presentation of data has been predicated upon an analysis of the F value of the Type 3 sum of squares such that (as this relates to a Pearson's correlation) F value type 3 sum of squares at or above 1.00 in a General Linear Model Table are considered significant.

The F value is a function of the sum of squares developed in the statistical regression analysis. There are three F value types: Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3. A Type 1 F value determines the strength of a relationship between a specific independent variable and the dependent variable without taking into consideration any other variables. A Type 2 F value indicates the strength of the relationship between one of several independent variables and a dependent variable, without any forced order of introduction or a specified number of independent variables. A Type 3 F value reflects the correlation

between a specific independent variable and the dependent variable, but the specified independent variable is introduced after all other independent variables have been considered. A Type 3 F value results from the specific independent variable being forced last into the analysis. An F value Type 3 sum of squares below 1.00 is considered insubstantial and, therefore, is not deemed to be a significant factor in the analysis.

Table 21, category of crime Aggression against all predictors including category of misbehavior total for Aggression, Property, Drug Related, and Other misbehavior for 621 inmates in a General Linear Model procedure, reveals a developed overall F value of 2.02 with a probability factor of 0.0012 which is well within acceptable limits of 0.05. This information develops an R-square or equivalent percentage of variance explained of 0.93. Factors which were significant in the analysis are: categories of misbehavior-Aggression, Property, and Other; age when incarcerated; conviction by plea; religion-Hebrew; history of prior incarceration; employment; history of marijuana abuse; marital status-unmarried; more than 5 years incarcerated, and more than 5 years to potential release. The other factors were not noted as developing substantial F values and, therefore, were not considered significant in the analysis. The 30 variables comprising 62 attributes were then reconfigured to accommodate a Stepwise analysis and are presented in Table 22.

Table 22, utilizing crime category Aggression as the dependent variable against all predictors, indicates an F value of 7.24, a validity level for the analysis of 0.0001, and a developed R-square of 0.076. The factors noted as significant were: age when incarcerated,

time in prison, history of marijuana use, race-white, religion-Hebrew, history of employment, and marital status-unmarried. There is a negative correlation with time in prison, race-white, and religion-Hebrew. The misbehavior categories did not generate significance in this analysis such that they were not included as predictors of crime category-Aggression in this Stepwise regression. The order of introduction of the variables was: age when incarcerated, more or less than 5 years incarcerated, marital status-unmarried, race-white, marijuana abuser, religion-Hebrew, and employment prior to incarceration-status unemployed.

Table 23, a General Linear Model analysis of 30 variables comprising 62 attributes against all predictors for crime category Property, notes an F value of 2.23, an analysis validity of 0.0002, well within acceptable limits, and a developed R-square of 0.101. Variables noted as significant in the General Linear Model analysis of crime category Property are: Aggression as a misbehavior category and Other or Manipulative misbehavior, age when incarcerated, history of recidivism, religion-Protestant, history of alcohol and drug abuse combined, history of alcohol abuse, history of no drug offense, history of heroin abuse, marital status-common law, marital status-unmarried, urban crime setting, and more or less than 5 years incarcerated. The variables were then reconfigured to accommodate a Stepwise analysis the results of which are shown in Table 24.

In Table 24, with dependent variable crime category Property against all predictors in a stepwise procedure, there is a developed F value of 6.9, an acceptable confidence level, and an R-square of 0.082. Factors noted as significant in this analysis are: category of

misbehavior Aggression, which has a negative relationship to crime category Property; category of misbehavior Other, which also has a negative relationship to crime category Property; age when incarcerated, which has a positive relationship; recidivisist, which has a positive relationship; time in prison more than 5 years, which has a positive relationship; race-Hispanic, which has a negative relationship; history of alcohol and drug abuse, which has a negative relationship; and urban crime setting, which has a negative relationship. The order of introduction of the variables was: recidivist, time in prison, urban crime setting, history of combined drug and alcohol abuse, category of misbehavior-Aggression, category of misbehavior-Other, age when incarcerated, and race-Hispanic.

Table 25, a General Linear Model analysis regressing category of crime Drug Related against all predictors, reveals an F value of 2.46, an acceptable confidence level, and a developed R-square of 0.111. Of the 30 variables comprising 62 attributes, the variables noted as having a significant relationship to crime category Drug Related are: age when incarcerated, conviction by plea, multiple indictment, recidivism, prior history of employment, history of combined drug and alcohol abuse, history of alcohol abuse, no history of drug offenses, history of marijuana abuse, history of heroine abuse, marital status-married, marital status-common law, urban crime setting, and more or less than 5 years to release. No category of misbehavior had any significant relationship in this analysis to the crime category Drug Related offenses.

These variables were then reconfigured to accommodate a Stepwise analysis the results of the Stepwise analysis as shown in Table 26 compares Drug Related crime category to all predictors and finds a negative relationship to age when incarcerated, a negative relationship to a history of recidivism, a positive relationship to multiple substance abuse-alcohol and drugs, a negative relationship to history of alcohol abuse, a negative relationship to marital status-unmarried, and a positive relationship with more than 5 years to release. The variable marital status-unmarried, which did not appear significant in the General Linear Model analysis, was introduced as significant in the Stepwise analysis. Again, it should be emphasized that no category of misbehavior was noted as significant. The order of introduction of variables in the Stepwise analysis in Table 26 was: age when incarcerated, marital status-unmarried, more or less than 5 years to release, recidivism, history of alcohol abuse, and history of drug and alcohol abuse combined.

When one views Table 27, category of crime Other against all predictors in a General Linear Model of 30 variables with 62 attributes, one notes an F value of 1.68, a confidence level of 0.0139, still within acceptable limits, and an R-square of 0.078. It should be noted that no category of misbehavior was identified as being a significant contributor to the analysis. Recidivism was noted as a significant contributor as was religion-Hebrew, prior incarceration, employment history, history of drug and alcohol abuse, history of alcohol abuse, and more or less than 5 years to release.

These variables were then reconfigured to accommodate a Stepwise procedure. The Stepwise analysis indicated six variables

comprising 12 attributes as significant in the analysis of crime category Other. These included a negative relationship with history of recidivism, a positive relationship with race-white, a positive relationship with religion-Hebrew, a negative relationship with being unemployed prior to incarceration, a negative relationship with multiple subtance abuse of alcohol and drugs, and a positive relationship alcohol abuse. The variables were introduced in the Stepwise analysis as follows: alcohol abuse was introduced followed by alcohol and drug abuse, religion-Hebrew, history of recidivism, history of employment, and by race-white.

These tables conclude the General Linear Model and Stepwise analysis of Crime category relationship to all variables including misbehavior category. Subsequent tables analyze misbehavior category first offense to misbehavior category second offense.

In viewing the results of the tables thus far introduced, Tables 21 through 28, it is to be noted that the R-square developed in any analysis does not exceed 0.12. It is further to be noted that there is minimal significant correlation between crime category and category of misbehavior and no correlation between crime category and category of misbehavior such that Aggression is a major predictor of Aggression, or Drug of Drug, Other of Other, or Property of Property. This lack of developed results corresponds with the lack of significance of chi-square Tables 1 through 20 and, further, confirms the null hypothesis that the category of crime will not significantly relate to the category of misbehavior such that aggressive crime will not predict aggressive misbehavior.

In tables 29 through 38 the dependent variable in all of these tables is category of misbehavior second violation against all predictors. The major focus of the analysis in this series of tables will be category of misbehavior second violation against category of misbehavior first violation. The presentation order of the tables will be the same as the prior analysis series utilizing a General Linear Model followed by a Stepwise model.

In Table 29, the dependent variable misbehavior category Aggression, second violation all levels of seriousness combined, is compared against all predictors which results in a developed F value of 1.78, a confidence level of 0.0135 and an R-square of 0.216. This is a significant enhancement of R-square over any previously developed R-square level. Factors noted as significant in this analysis are: categories of misbehavior first violation Aggression, Drug Related, and Other.

It is to be noted that, throughout the analysis series, Tables 29 through 38, category of misbehavior first violation Property was not utilized as an independent variable and, therefore, no figures for this category will be reported. Other independent variables of significance in this analysis were: religion-Muslim and religion-Hebrew, age when incarcerated, urban or rural crime setting, more or less than 5 years incarcerated, more or less than 5 years to release, and marital status-married. No other factors in this analysis generated an F value noted as significant. Variables were then reconfigured to accommodate a Stepwise procedure, and the results are presented in Table 30.

Table 30 is a Stepwise procedure with the dependent variable misbehavior category Aggression second violation all levels of

seriousness combined, measured against all predictors and specifically including misbehavior first violation all levels of seriousness and all classifications except Property. The variables noted as significant were: age at time of incarceration, more or less than 5 years incarcerated, religion-Protestant, religion-Hebrew, and religion-Muslim. All of these factors had a positive relationship. Marital status-Married had a negative relationship, and first misbehavior Aggression had a positive relationship. In the analysis series itself, two variables, religion-Catholic and category of misbehavior-Other first violation, were producing significant R-squares at the point of their introduction into the analysis and were replaced in later process steps for the purpose of enhancement of the R-square in this analysis. It is to be noted, however, that in a one-variable analysis, religion-Catholic produced a negative relationship with an R-square of 0.037 and in a six-step analysis, category of misbehavior-Other first violation produced an enhancement of R-square of 0.014. In the seventh step this category was eliminated. It is also noteworthy that this category had a positive relationship to category of misbehavior-Aggression second violation. Therefore, while a best-series analysis would not include this factor, this factor does have a positive and significant relationship to category of misbehavior-Aggression second violation.

The introduction and subsequent deletion of this factor correlates with and validates the analysis developed in Table 29 which showed that, in relation to category of misbehavior Aggression, second violation, the categories of misbehavior first violation-Aggression, Drug Related, and Other all maintained a significant relationship. The

inclusion of this category as a significant factor in the analysis also tends to raise a question about the validity of a one-to-one correlation between category of misbehavior second violation and category of misbehavior first violation. This will be further explored in subsequent tables.

Table 31 with the dependent variable category of misbehavior second violation-Property, all levels of seriousness combined, against all predictors in a General Linear Model, develops an F-value of 0.82 and a probability of 0.7279 with a developed R-square of 0.1129. The probability of F in this table leads to serious question as to the validity of any statistics developed. There are four factors noted as significant in this analysis: current age, recidivism, drug abuse, history of no drug usage, and marital status-married. The factors which are the focus of this portion of the dissertation were not indicated as significant in the analysis.

Table 32, which is the Stepwise analysis of the same factors in Table 31, develops an F value of 3.27 and a PR>F of 0.0074. This is within an acceptable range and indicates that the analysis in this table is valid. It further develops an R-square of 0.074. The factors noted as significant do not include any of the variables which are the focus of the portion of the study, specifically, categories of misbehavior first violation. It can be concluded, therefore, that there is no correlation between first misbehavior and second misbehavior in terms of second misbehavior Property violations.

Table 33 relates the dependent variable misbehavior category Drug Related, second violation all levels of seriousness combined, against all predictors. Here, again, the F value and PR>F are suspect;

the F value being 0.51 and the PR>F being 0.9818. The developed R-square in this table is 0.073. This table indicates that there is a significant relationship in this General Linear Model analysis between Drug Related category of misbehavior second violation and Drug Related category of misbehavior first violation. Other variables noted as significant are conviction by plea and multiple indictment. No other variables achieved a notable level of significance necessary for inclusion in the analysis. However, due to the suspect F and PR>F values, the statistics developed in this table are not to be relied upon as valid hence the correlation posited is questionable. The validity of this analysis was checked in Table 34 through the analysis of the same factors in a Stepwise Model.

Table 34 utilized a dependent variable of category of misbehavior Drug Related, second violation all levels of seriousness combined, against all predictors. It developed an F value of 2.79 and a PR>F of 0.0639. The developed R-square in this analysis was 0.026. Only two factors were found to have a relationship: conviction by plea, a negative relationship; and current age, a negative relationship. However, here again, the probability of F exceeds the acceptable limit of 0.05 and consequently the statistics developed in this table are suspect. There is no indication of a relationship existing between the second violation and first violation of category of misbehavior Drug Related.

Table 35, a General Linear Model analysis utilizing the dependent variable category of misbehavior Other, second violation all levels of seriousness combined, against all predictors, produces an F value of 0.83 and a PR>F of 0.7085 with an R-square of 0.114. The F

value and probability of F developed in this analysis make the results of the analysis suspect as to their validity. In the table itself, none of the variables which are subject of this portion of the dissertation are noted as significant. Factors which proved significant in this analysis are: multiple indictment, race-White, race-Black, religion-Hebrew, enrolled in college program, history of employment, history of alcohol and drug abuse, history of heroin abuse, marital status-commonlaw relationship, marital status-unmarried, urban versus rural crime setting, and more or less than 5 years in prison.

The variables re-analyzed in a Stepwise procedure and recorded in Table 36 developed an acceptable F value of 3.43 and a PR>F of 0.0343. The developed R-square in this analysis was 0.032. In this valid analysis which compared misbehavior category Other, second violation all levels of seriousness combined, against all predictors, only two factors are introduced. The first factor, more or less than 5 years in prison, had a negative relationship, and the second factor, race-Hispanic, also had a negative relationship.

Table 37 is a General Linear Model analysis utilizing as a dependent variable No Second Misbehavior against all predictors. This table develops an F value of 1.59 and a PR>F 0.038. The developed R-square in this analysis is 0.198. The results of the analysis reveal that the study variables, categories of misbehavior first violation Aggression, Drug Related and Other, are all significant. In addition, other significant variables in this analysis are: age when incarcerated, multiple indictment, recidivism, race-White, race-Black, race-Hispanic, religion-Muslim, enrolled in college program, history of employment, no history of drug abuse, history of marijuana use, history

of heroin use, marital status-unmarried, and urban or rural crime setting. No other factors were found to be significant. The level of significance proved to be within acceptable parameters and indicates that all analyzed categories of misbehavior first violation, have a relationship to No second misbehavior.

The variables, as analyzed in the Stepwise procedure and reported in Table 38, produced an F value of 4.00, an acceptable PR>F of 0.0008, and an R-square of 0.106. The variables introduced in order were: category of misbehavior-Aggression first violation which exhibited a negative relationship and had an R-square value of 0.27. This is the only category of misbehavior variable appearing in the Stepwise analysis. Other variables in this analysis were: religion-Catholic, a positive relationship; conviction by plea, which had a positive relationship; age when incarcerated, which had a negative relationship; recidivism, which had a negative relationsip, and religion-Muslim, which had a negative relationship.

In reviewing the analysis provided in the foregoing tables, it is to be noted that only tables 29, 30, 37, and 38 produced either acceptable analyses or analyses which included an indication of a relationship existing between the variables which are the focus of this portion of the disseration. Specifically, categories of misbehavior first violation, and the dependent variable, categories of misbehavior second violation. Tables 31, 33, 34, and 35 produced analyses in which the validity of the analysis is suspect. Table 32, which is a Stepwise table relating category of misbehavior-Property second violation to all predictors, developed a valid analysis but did not indicate any category of misbehavior first violation variables as being

significant. The same is true for Table 36. The results in these tables parallel those developed in the chi-square analyses presented in the first series of tables. Tables which developed a valid analysis and which included variables which are the focus of this study are the General Linear Model Table 29 and Table 37.

Table 29, a General Linear Model analysis of the variable second misbehavior Aggression, reports a strong relationship between second misbehavior Aggression and first violation Aggression and a significant, although not as strong, relationship to categories of misbehavior Aggression and Other, first violation. The Stepwise analysis of the same factors (Table 30) found category of misbehavior first violation Aggression to be significant throughout the analysis stages, beginning with the second step, and category of misbehavior first violation Other, to be significant even though it was subsequently replaced by other variables. The significance of this variable and a positive relationship to Aggression with a substantial, although not major, R-square is worthy of note. Table 37, a General Linear Model analysis utilizing the dependent variable of No Second Misbehavior against all predictors, also indicated a strong significance for category of misbehavior Aggression first violation and a significant, although not as strong, relationship for the other two categories of misbehavior first violation Drug Related and Other. The Stepwise analysis performed in Table 38, which parallels Table 37, indicated a negative relationship for category of misbehavior first violation Aggression. No additional categories of misbehavior first violation variables appeared in the Stepwise analysis.

A further analysis of the comparisons of General Linear Model and Stepwise tables follows. In this analysis, the inclusion or exclusion of variables as significant in the contrasting analysis methods will be explored. Before beginning this discussion, it is necessary to present an explanation of the development of the variables and of the Beta weight system utilized in construction of the Stepwise tables. These are as follows:

Figure 3.

BETA WEIGHT CHART

Variable	Elements	+ Beta For
Category of Crime:		
Aggression	Crime against persons	Aggression
Property	Property crime	Property
Drug Related	Controlled substance related offenses	Drug Related
Other	Miscellaneous offenses	Other crimes
Category of Misbehavior:		
Aggression	Rule violations against persons	Aggression
Property	Rule violations involving property	Property
Alcohol/Drug Related	Alcohol and/or drug-related violations	Drug Related
Other	Miscellaneous violations	Other
Current Age	Over or under age 25	Under 25
Age When Incarcerated	Before or after age 25	Under 25
Conviction by Plea	Finding of guilt by trial or plea	Trial
Multiple Indictment	Two or more indictments	Two or more indictments
Recidivist	History of imprisonment	Recidivist

BETA WEIGHT CHART (Continued)

Variable	Elements	+ Beta For
Race: White	White	White
Black	Black	Black
Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic
Religion: Catholic	Catholic	Catholic
Protestant	Protestant	Protestant
Hebrew	Hebrew	Hebrew
Muslim	Muslim	Muslim
Enrolled in Prison College Program	Enrolled in Prison College Program or not enrolled	Enrolled
History of Employment	Employed or unemployed at time of arrest	Employed
History of Alcohol and Drug Abuse	Hard and soft drug abuser	Substance abuser
History of Alcohol Abuse	Alcohol use	Alcohol abuser
No History of Drug Offenses	No history of drug abuse	Non-user
History of Marijuana Use	Marijuana only	Marijuana user
History of Heroin Use	Heroin, cocaine, etc.	Hard drug user
Married	Married	Married
Common Law Relationship	Common Law	Common Law
Unmarried	Unmarried	Unmarried
Urban or Rural Crime Setting	Urban or non-urban	Urban
More or Less than Five Years in Prison	Time served 5 years or less or over 5 years	Over 5 years
More or Less than Five Years to Release Date	More or less than 5 years to possible release	More than 5 years to possible release

The elements and the determinations of the cause of a positive (+) Beta and, inversely, a negative (-) Beta, are such that the only factors requiring clarification of internal comparison structure are: history of drug abuse, marital status, race, and religion. A history of drug abuse compared non-abuse, marijuana abuse, and heroin abuse to multiple drug abuse. Race compared white, black, and Hispanic ancestry against other. Catholic, Protestant, Hebrew, and Muslim religions were internally compared against other or no religion specified. For example, where the element heroin abuse received a negative (-) Beta weight, it is the result of comparing heroin abuse against the attribute of multiple drug abuse (abuse of both hard and soft drugs).

Table 39, presented below, is a comparison of the results exhibited in Tables 21 through 28. In all these tables, the dependent variable was a variant of category of crime of conviction. Table 39 presents a comparison between the results of significance by independent variable between the General Linear Model and Stepwise tables for all factors other than misbehavior category. It should be noted that the R-squares for Tables 21 through 28 do not exceed 0.12. The development of findings of significance as they relate to category of crime of conviction or variables other than the category of misbehavior, have not been expanded upon due to the limited explanatory values available within the tables themselves.

Table 39.
Summary of Findings of Significance in Tables 21 through 28
with Crime Category as the Dependent Variable

Factor		Crime Category			
		Aggression	Property	Other	Drug Related
Current Age:	GLM				
	Stepwise				
Age When Incarcerated:	GLM	1	1		1
	Stepwise	+	+		-
Conviction by Plea:	GLM	1			1
	Stepwise				
Recidivist:	GLM		1	1	1
	Stepwise		+	-	-
Enrolled in College Program:	GLM				
	Stepwise				
More or Less than 5 years in Prison:	GLM	1	1		
	Stepwise	-	+		
No History of Drug Abuse:	GLM		1		1
	Stepwise				
History of Marijuana Use:	GLM	1			1
	Stepwise	+			
History of Heroin Abuse:	GLM		1		1
	Stepwise				
Race White:	GLM				
	Stepwise	-		+	
Race Black:	GLM				
	Stepwise				
Race Hispanic:	GLM				
	Stepwise		-		
Religion Catholic:	GLM				
	Stepwise				
Religion Protestant:	GLM		1		
	Stepwise				
Religion Hebrew:	GLM	1		1	
	Stepwise	-		+	
Religion Muslim:	GLM				
	Stepwise				

Table 39. (Continued)
Summary of Findings of Significance in Tables 21 through 28
with Crime Category as the Dependent Variable

Factor		Crime Category			
		Aggression	Property	Other	Drug Related
Multiple Indictment:	GLM				1
Employment History:	GLM	1		1	1
	Stepwise	+		-	
Alcohol & Drug Abuse:	GLM		1	1	1
	Stepwise		-	-	+
Alcohol Abuser:	GLM		1	1	1
	Stepwise			+	-
Married:	GLM				1
	Stepwise				
Common Law:	GLM		1		1
	Stepwise				
Unmarried:	GLM	1	1		
	Stepwise	+			-
Urban or Rural:	GLM		1		1
	Stepwise		-		
More or less than 5 years to release:	GLM	1		1	1
	Stepwise				+

Table 40 presents a comparison of the results found in Tables 29 through 38. In all of these tables, the dependent variable is one of the categories of type of misbehavior, second offense. As was noted in the tables relating category of crime of conviction, the explanatory value of the results found in these tables, as measured by the R-square, is not very meaningful. All of the meaningful explanatory results developed in Tables 29 through 38, relate to the comparisons of category of misbehavior second offense, to category of misbehavior first offense. An in depth analysis of this data will not be provided although the materials necessary for such analysis are available in the body of this dissertation.

Table 40.

Summary of Findings of Significance in Tables 29 through 38 with Category of Misbehavior Second Violation as the Dependent Variable

Factor		Category of Misbehavior-Second Violation				
		Aggression	Property	Other	Drug Related	No Second Misbehavior
Current Age:	GLM		1			
	Stepwise		+		-	
Age When Incarcerated:	GLM	1				1
	Stepwise	+				-
Conviction by Plea:	GLM				1	
	Stepwise				-	+
Recidivist:	GLM		1			1
	Stepwise		+			-
Enrolled in College Program:	GLM			1		1
	Stepwise					
More or Less than 5 years in Prison:	GLM	1		1		
	Stepwise	+		-		
No History of Drug Abuse:	GLM			1		1
	Stepwise		-			
History of Marijuana Use:	GLM					1
	Stepwise					
History of Heroin Abuse:	GLM			1		1
	Stepwise					
Race White:	GLM			1		1
	Stepwise					
Race Black:	GLM			1		1
	Stepwise					
Race Hispanic:	GLM					
	Stepwise	+		+		
Religion Catholic:	GLM					
	Stepwise					+
Religion Protestant:	GLM					
	Stepwise	+				
Religion Hebrew:	GLM	1		1		
	Stepwise	+				

Table 40. (Continued)
Summary of Findings of Significance in Tables 29 through 38 with Category of Misbehavior Second Violation as the Dependent Variable

Factor		Category of Misbehavior-Second Violation				
		Aggression	Property	Other	Drug Related	No Second Misbehavior
Religion Muslim:	GLM	1				1
	Stepwise	+				-
Multiple Indictment:	GLM			1	1	1
	Stepwise					
Employment History:	GLM			1		1
	Stepwise					
Alcohol & Drug Abuse:	GLM			1		
	Stepwise		-			
Alcohol Abuser:	GLM					
	Stepwise					
Married:	GLM	1	1			
	Stepwise	-	+			
Common Law:	GLM			1		
	Stepwise					
Unmarried:	GLM			1		1
	Stepwise					
Urban or Rural:	GLM	1		1		1
	Stepwise		-			
More or less than 5 years to release:	GLM	1				
	Stepwise					

Tables 41 and 42 follow the framework established for Tables 39 and 40, however, they deal specifically with comparisons against categories of misbehavior. Table 41 presents the comparison of category of crime of conviction against category of total misbehavior. It is an extension of the data presented in Table 39. Table 42 presents a comparison of category of misbehavior second offense against category of misbehavior first offense and is an extension of Table 40.

Table 41, presented below, indicates the comparison developed between the General Linear Model and Stepwise procedures and specifically relates category of crime to total misbehavior at all levels of seriousness. The columns in Table 41 indicate the category of crime Aggression, Property, Other, and Drug Related. The rows indicate total misbehavior at all levels of seriousness. The first row reports the category of crime Aggression General Linear Model results, the second relating the Aggression Stepwise Procedure Beta weight indicator, and the third row indicating the Aggression Stepwise procedure Incremental R-square for the misbehavior factor Aggression. This format is followed then for Property, Other, and Drug Related.

In Table 41, the numeral 1 indicates that there was a Type 3 sum of squares F value equal to or greater than 1.0 for the factors being compared. A blank indicates that there was a General Linear Model Type 3 sum of squares F value of 0.99 or less. The Beta indication is either a plus for a positive Beta, a minus for a negative Beta, or a blank indicating that the Stepwise procedure did not find the factor to be significant within the range of validity for that Stepwise analysis. The incremental R-square is either indicated by a number or a blank indicating that there was no significance for that factor in the Stepwise procedure.

Table 41.

A Comparison of Crime Category with Category of Total Misbehavior

Total Misbehavior	Crime Category			
	Aggression	Property	Other	Drug Related
Aggression:				
GLM	1	1		
Stepwise Beta Direction Indicator		-		
Stepwise Incremental R-square		.008		
Property:				
GLM				
Stepwise Beta Direction Indicator				
Stepwise Incremental R-square				
Other:				
GLM	1	1		
Stepwise Beta Direction Indicator		-		
Stepwise Incremental R-square		.007		
Drug Related:				
GLM	1			
Stepwise Beta Direction Indicator				
Stepwise Incremental R-square				

Table 41 relates directly to the hypotheses statements testing the concepts of the Importation Model. The hypothesis statement for the Importation Model is that the category of crime of conviction will relate to the category of institutional misbehavior. The null hypothesis is that there will not be a significant relationship between the category of crime of conviction and the category of institutional misbehavior such that conviction for a crime categorized as Aggression will not be an indicator of misbehavior in the institution categorized as Aggression. The same being true for crime and misbehavior categories relating to Property, Other, and Drug Related activities.

Table 41 shows that the crime category Aggression produced a significant General Linear Model result related to the misbehavior category Aggression. The crime category Aggression, however, did not

produce a significant result in the Stepwise analysis in terms of the misbehavior category Aggression, therefore, neither a Beta direction nor an incremental R-square was developed. The crime category Property did not produce a significant result in either General Linear Model or Stepwise procedure when related to the misbehavior category Property. The same is true for the comparison of the crime category Other and the misbehavior category Other, and for the crime category Drug Related and the misbehavior category Drug Related. Therefore, in reviewing the primary analysis areas relating crime category to misbehavior category, there is only one point at which the analysis indicated the potential of significant correlation and the correlation developed was not substantial enough to show up in both the General Linear Model and Stepwise procedures. In fact, this correlation only exhibited itself in the General Linear Model procedure in the Aggressive to Aggressive comparison of category of crime of conviction and category of misbehavior.

A further analysis of the data in Table 41 can be summarized as follows:

The results presented in the column category of crime of conviction Aggression indicate that there is no noted correlation between category of crime of conviction Aggression and category of misbehavior Property. There is a significant General Linear Model result from the comparison of category of crime Aggression with category of misbehavior Other, however, there is no comparable significant result in this comparison in the Stepwise procedure. In the comparison of crime category Aggression with misbehavior category Drug Related, there is, again, a significant result in the General

Linear Model and a lack of significant result in the Stepwise procedure. Therefore, the crime category Aggression can be summarized as relating to the misbehavior categories such that there are significant General Linear Model results in the comparisons with misbehavior Aggression, Other, and Drug Related but there are no comparable significant results in the Stepwise procedure comparisons of these categories.

In the column category of crime of conviction Property, the comparison with category of misbehavior Aggression produces a significant General Linear Model result and a significant Stepwise result. The Beta indicator in the Stepwise procedure is negative indicating that conviction for a crime categorized as Property will be a contra-indicator of misbehavior categorized as Aggressive. The incremental R-square signifies that 0.8% of the variance in behavior is explained by this negative indication.

The comparison of category of crime Property to category of misbehavior Property indicates that there are no significant results in either the General Linear Model or Stepwise analyses. The comparison of category of crime Property to category of misbehavior Other, indicates that there is both a significant result in the General Linear Model and in the Stepwise analysis. Again, in the Stepwise procedure, the Beta direction indicator is negative leading to the conclusion that conviction for a crime categorized as a Property crime will be a contra-indicator of misbehavior categorized as Other. In comparing the crime category Property to the misbehavior category Drug Related, there are no significant results noted. A

review of the balance of the chart, crime category Other compared to all misbehavior categories and crime category Drug Related to all misbehavior categories, indicates that there are no significant results in either General Linear Model or Stepwise analyses.

A review of the results obtained from Table 41 indicates support for the null hypothesis relating to the Importation Model. There is more significance in the intersection of category of crime Property with categories of misbehavior Aggression and Other than there is with category of crime Property and category of misbehavior Property. Furthermore, the same level of significance is indicated in category of crime Aggression when compared to categories of misbehavior Aggression, Other, and Drug Related with no specifically developed results in the Stepwise procedure to indicate direction, significance or degree of significance. This leads to the conclusion that the relationships which may exist are not very meaningful.

An overview of these results indicates that the expected correlation between category of crime of conviction and category of misbehavior does not exist and, in fact, stronger correlations between category of crime and category of misbehavior other than the specific category do exist. The results derived from Table 41 confirm the null hypothesis and, therefore, question the validity of the Importation Model.

Table 42 follows the same format as Table 41. This table compares category of misbehavior second violation with category of misbehavior first violation and, in both cases, it combines all levels

of seriousness. Presented below, Table 42 relates directly to the Deprivation Model which posits that people in prison will, as a result of the pains of incarceration, become involved in misbehavior in an effort to minimize their discomfort and to satisfy their needs. The Deprivation Model is tested here in two parts. The first test examines the involvement in institutional misbehavior per se and the second test investigates the concept of habituation of misbehavior or running to type. The hypotheses relating to these two functions can be stated as follows:

Deprivation Hypothesis 1: Inmates will engage in significant amounts of misbehavior as a response to the deprivations resulting from incarceration and this misbehavior will be repeated. The null hypothesis states that misbehavior will not be repeated on an ongoing basis and incidents of misbehavior are not significant indicators of behavior which would support the Deprivation Model.

In terms of this Deprivation Model hypothesis, it is to be noted that there were 621 subjects in the final study population. Of these subjects, only 209, or approximately one-third, engaged in any misbehavior at all. In other words, two-thirds of the population during this six-month study period were not involved in recorded acts of misbehavior. Secondly, of the 209 inividuals who were involved in an act of misbehavior, only 77 engaged in a second act of misbehavior. Once again, approximately two-thirds of the individuals who had a first violation did not commit a subsequent act of misbehavior. The strength and continuation of a two-third behaviorial rate (which produced a significant result in the chi-square tables,

and which were deleted so that the tables focused only on active misbehavior) raises questions about the validity of the first deprivation hypothesis and tends to confirm the null hypothesis that the experience of imprisonment will not generate misbehavior or patterns of continuous misbehavior.

The second Deprivation Model hypothesis can be stated in terms analogous to the hypothesis of the Importation Model and relate not only to the Deprivation Model but also to the Integration Model which holds that, individuals will, based upon their pre-prison and prison experiences, develop habituated patterns of behavior. Therefore, the second Deprivation hypothesis can be stated that, H2: Individuals who engage in misbehavior while incarcerated will do so in a category of misbehavior and will continue to engage in misbehavior within that category. The null hypothesis for this statement can be expressed as follows: If incarcerated individuals engage in misbehavior at all, they will neither engage in misbehavior that can be categorized as repetitious nor engage in patterns of misbehavior.

Table 42.
A Comparison of Category of Misbehavior First Violation with Category of Misbehavior Second Violation

CATEGORY OF SECOND MISBEHAVIOR	CATEGORY OF FIRST MISBEHAVIOR		
	AGGRESSION	DRUG	OTHER
AGGRESSION			
GLM	1	1	1
Stepwise	.0384	—	—
Beta	+	—	—
PROPERTY			
GLM	—	—	—
Stepwise	—	—	—
Beta	—	—	—
DRUG			
GLM	—	1	—
Stepwise	—	—	—
Beta	—	—	—
OTHER			
GLM	—	—	—
Stepwise	—	—	—
Beta	—	—	—
NONE			
GLM	1	1	1
Stepwise	.0279	—	—
Beta	-	—	—

Table 42 compares category of misbehavior first violation with category of misbehavior second violation. It is a five by three grid displaying in the rows of the table categories of second misbehavior Aggression, Property, Drug Related, Other, and None, and, in the columns, categories of first misbehavior Aggression, Drug Related, and Other. The category of first misbehavior Property was deleted to provide for a valid analysis comparison series. The category of first misbehavior None was not utilized to provide for a reduced and focused population.

In Table 42, in each row heading, the existence of a General Linear Model F value Type 3 in excess of 1.0 is indicated by the numeral 1, and, where the F value Type 3 was less than 1.0, a dash is utilized. Opposite the Stepwise notation, the incremental R-square developed for the category of first misbehavior is noted. Opposite the notation Beta, the Beta sign of the category of misbehavior is entered as either positive or negative. When the Stepwise analysis did not include the category of first misbehavior as an independent variable containing a significant relationship within the validity limits of the Stepwise procedure, a dash is indicated for both the Stepwise and Beta.

It can be noted from the first row in Table 42, second category of misbehavior Aggession, that this category had a significant relationship in the General Linear Model against category of first misbehavior, Aggression, Drug Related, and Other. This category of second misbehavior developed a positive Beta in the Stepwise analysis with an incremental R-square of .0384 against category of first misbehavior Aggression. This indicates that 3.84% of the variance in second misbehavior category Aggression is explained by its relationship to first misbehavior category Aggression. It is further noted that, while the General Linear Model indicated that there was a significant relationship with category of first misbehavior Drug Related and Other, the Stepwise model did not develop either category of first misbehavior (Drug Related or Other) as a significant factor in that analysis.

In the final analysis, however, it is important to remember that Table 30 was a seven-stage Stepwise analysis and that the category of misbehavior first violation Other was introduced at step six of

that seven-step analysis as a significant addition accounting for an incremental R-square of 0.014. It was subsequently deleted at step seven and replaced by two other variables. The inclusion of category of first misbehavior Other in the analysis program at a level of assured validity indicates that, while not an optimum explanatory factor in a seven-step analysis, this factor is significant in its relationship to the category of second misbehavior Aggression. It is to be further noted that the Beta weight at its point of introduction, was positive indicating that 1.4% of the variance in the category of second misbehavior Aggression is explained by the category of first misbehavior Other. This percentage is approximately 40% of the variance of misbehavior explained by the category of first misbehavior Aggression and, in the overall percentage of variance explained, is a significant contributor to the understanding of variance.

Therefore, while this category of first misbehavior Other is not included in the final Stepwise analysis, it is a significant contributor to our understanding of variance in category of second misbehavior Aggression and its relationship is similar in that it is positive to the relationship of category of first misbehavior Aggression.

When one views the second row of Table 42, which relates second category of second misbehavior Property to categories of first misbehavior Aggression, Drug Related, and Other, one notes that no significant result has been developed in either General Linear Model or Stepwise models. It is important to remember that the PR>F of the General Linear Model, Table 31, was beyond the bounds of acceptability in terms of validity for this table, however, the PR>F value

did confirm the validity of the Stepwise analysis in Table 32. Therefore, the exclusion of any of the categories as having a significant relationship is important.

From the third row of Table 42, it can be noted that the category of second misbehavior Drug Related exhibits a significant relationship in the General Linear Model with category of first misbehavior Drug Related. There is no such significance noted with either category of first misbehavior Aggression or Other. It is important to remember that the PR>F value developed in Table 33, the General Linear Model relating to the dependent variable, second misbehavior category Drug Related, was beyond acceptable limits and, in fact, the PR>F of Table 34, the Stepwise analysis, was also beyond acceptable limits. Therefore the development of a General Linear Model notation of significance in this row is questionable.

From the fourth row of Table 42, it can be seen that no significant relationships are developed from a comparison of category of second misbehavior Other against all categories of first misbehavior as noted. It is important to note here that, while the PR>F for Table 35 was beyond acceptable confidence limits, the probability for Table 36 (the Stepwise analysis) was within acceptable limits. Therefore, while the negative notations of the General Linear Model may be suspect, the exclusion of category of first misbehavior Aggression, Drug Related, and Other as bearing a significance in the Stepwise analysis to category of second misbehavior Other is a valid exclusion.

Row five of Table 42 reports the results of analysis of category of second misbehavior None, or no second misbehavior, as developed in Tables 37 and 38. The PR>F for both these tables was

within acceptable confidence limits and the results of the General Linear Model analysis indicates that all three categories of first misbehavior - Aggression, Drug Related, and Other - have a significant relationship to No Second Misbehavior. The Stepwise table analyzing these factors did not indicate a significant relationship between the dependent variable category of second misbehavior No Second Misbehavior and categories of first misbehavior, Drug Related and Other. It did, however, indicate a negative relationship between category of second misbehavior No Second Misbehavior and category of first misbehavior Aggression. This relationship is a negative relationship with a developed R-square or percentage of variance explained of .0279 meaning that 2.79% the variance is explained by this factor. In essence, the dependable results developed in tables where the PR>F was within an acceptable confidence level, indicate that there is no relationship between category of misbehavior second violation Property and any of the categories of first misbehavior, and no relationship between category of second misbehavior Other and any of the categories of first misbehavior.

The results relating category of second misbehavior Drug Related to the categories of first misbehavior are suspect. Valid results were obtained for the relationship between categories of second misbehavior Aggression and None, and the categories of first misbehavior. In both instances, the General Linear Model indicated that all three categories of first misbehavior had a relationship to the dependent variables of category of second misbehavior either Aggression or None. The Stepwise analysis relating to these variables indicated that a first misbehavior categorized as Aggressive will tend

to indicate a second misbehavior categorized as Aggressive. Further, it will be a negative indicator of behavior in terms of no second misbehavior. This would tend to create an hypothesis stating that those who misbehave in an aggressive manner will tend to misbehave again, although not necessarily in an aggressive manner.

Further, when one reviews the Stepwise table relating category of misbehavior Aggression second violation, one notes that the category of first misbehavior Other was also a significant indicator of a second misbehavior catgegorized as Aggressive. All categories of first misbehavior maintained a significant relationship with category of second misbehavior None in the General Linear Model as developed in Table 37.

When reviewing the overall analysis presented in Table 42, one finds a strong result in the effect of comparisons of category of misbehavior second violation Aggression with all categories of misbehavior first violation and an extremely strong and significant result in the category misbehavior Aggression, second violation with category of misbehavior Aggression, first violation. However, in terms of the confirmation of the Deprivation Model hypothesis relating to either repetitive behavior and/or habituated behavior, the results presented in Table 42 tend to confirm, the null hypothesis rather than the initial hypothesis. Therefore, both the Deprivation Model and the Integrated Model, as explanations of inmate misbehavior, are refuted since the null hypotheses relating to these models have been confirmed by the results presented in Tables 41 and Table 42.

Overall, in assessing the results of this study as it relates to the concepts of habituation of behavior and the concepts of inmate misbehavior as expressed in the Importation, Deprivation, and Integrated Models, in all cases, the null hypotheses rejecting confirmation of these models have been confirmed. This leads to a consideration of alternate explanations of the data developed in this study which are presented in the following section.

Discussion Two

From the results presented in Tables 39 and 40 and the developed R-squares in Tables 21 through 38, there is a clear indication that the percentage of variance explained utilizing a large variety of demographic and situational characteristics, does not achieve a meaningful result. This calls into question the possibility that inmate misbehavior, as measured by overt misbehavior, is predictable from clearly definable characteristics and attributes. Furthermore, when considering the results of Table 41, there is a clear refutation of the Importation Model concept, and the results of Table 42 clearly call into question the validity of the Deprivation Model. The refutation of both the Importation and Deprivation Models raises a serious question as to the validity of the Integration Model for inmate conduct.

The results in Table 42 do indicate that inmates who tend to misbehave in an Aggressive fashion are identifiable as the most likely candidates for continued institutional misbehavior, although not necessarily continuing in the same aggressive mode of institutional misbehavior.

This study has revealed a pattern of diminishing misbehavior. From the original pool of 621 inmates, only 209 were involved in misbehaviors, only 77 were charged with a second act of misbehavior, and only 28 inmates exhibited a third misbehavior. This seems to indicate that, either the sanctions imposed for misbehavior are effective, which may tend to validate the classical theory, or the opportunities for misbehavior present themselves in ways in which individuals tailor their type of misbehavior to the opportunities available to them, thus tending to validate the Opportunity Theory.

It is significant to note both the decrease in misbehavior which occurred during the course of this study and the variety of misbehaviors exhibited by these individuals did not follow any specific pattern. It is most important to note that Aggressive behavior in terms of the category of crime of conviction did not relate to Aggressive misbehavior within the institution and that Aggressive misbehavior in the first instance, while related to Aggressive misbehavior in the second instance, did not produce a correlation of a high level of meaningfulness, and calling into question the habituation concept. The variety of behavior as noted in the Table 42 column First Misbehavior Aggression would tend to indicate the potential for validating theories classifiable as Opportunity Theory, and it is recommended that further research be performed to explore the potential for validity within this concept.

This research did not pursue an analysis of misbehavior by levels of seriousness due to the diminishing number of individuals exhibiting such misbehavior. If such analysis were pursued, the

reduction in the number of subjects in the study would raise serious validity questions. When inmate misbehavior was further divided into levels of seriousness or levels of seriousness by offense, additonal analyses such as Tobit, concatenations by month and other such analysis techniques were not pursued since the initial review of the data from these analyses did not justify their inclusion in this report. It is to be noted that a full spectrum of General Linear Model and Stepwise runs by frequency and by level of seriousness of misbehavior were conducted verifying the absence of an N capable of producing a valid and reliable result.

SUMMARY

This study of the conduct of 621 inmates confined in a maximum security correctional facility for a six month period compared the category of crime of conviction with the category of institutional misbehavior and also compared the category of first act of institutional misbehavior with the category of second act of institutional misbehavior. The categories created for making these comparisons were: Aggression, Property, Manipulative or Other, and Drug Related. Additionally, this analysis included as independent variables factors which had been noted from previous studies as having the potential for significance. Overall, the developed R-square for the analyses, with one exception, did not exceed 0.12. The one exception was a comparison of categories of first misbehavior to categories of second misbehavior in which the category of first misbehavior Aggression produced a significant result. No other demographic, situational or category variables developed results of significance.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation attempted to validate models of inmate behavior which have been developed to explain misbehavior in correctional facilities. Specifically, the study tested the Importation Model, the Deprivation Model and the Integrated Model. In all cases, the null hypothesis was substantiated refuting the validity of these Models.

The analysis indicates that the concept of importation of previously learned behavior into the prison environment does not occur. Inmates do not continue to act in ways which reflect their crime of commitment. The results of this study also refute the Deprivation Model since inmate misbehavior diminishes over the period of incarceration. If the Deprivation Model were accurate, misbehavior would have occurred consistently and would not have diminished over time. The results of this research have also disproven the hypotheses associated with the components of the Integrated Model, which is a composite of both the Importation and Deprivation Models.

A secondary analysis examined the concept of habituation which was also refuted by the results of this study. When misbehavior is exhibited on an ongoing basis, the classification of misbehavior is not predictable based on previous misconduct.

The results of this study, in total, indicate that the prediction of inmate misbehavior based on demographic characteristics, situational characteristics or previous conduct is not possible with

any degree of significance or reliability. However, once an inmate has committed a first misbehavior which has been classified as Aggression, that individual can be identified as being more likely than other inmates to commit a subsequent violation, but subsequent incidents of misbehavior will not necessarily involve acts of aggression. In other words, inmates who misbehave aggressively tend to continue to misbehave but in a variety of ways. The analysis further reveals that individuals whose initial misbehavior involved Property offenses, tend not to engage in further institutional misconduct, and those inmates whose first misbehavior has been classified as Drug Related or Other (Manipulative) tend to exhibit an average amount of continued misconduct.

The overall results of this disseration, in addition to refuting the concepts of habituation, importation, and deprivation, tend to give credence to the concepts put forth and developed in the Opportunity and Classical theories. No pattern of misbehavior by category appears to exist either between the crime of conviction and instititutional misconduct, or between the first incident of institutional misbehavior and any subsequent incidents of misbehavior. In light of the refutation of the Importation, Deprivation, and Integrated Models of inmate behavior, further investigation of alternate concepts such as Classical and Opportunity theories is strongly recommended.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, H.E. & Simonson, C.E. (1986). Corrections in America (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

American Correctional Association. (1985). Standards for adult correctional facilities. Washington D.C.: American Correctional Association.

Bowker, H. L. (1977). Prisoner subcultures. Lexington, Mass. and Toronto: D. C. Heath and Company.

Brown, B. & Spevacek, J. (1971). Disciplinary offenses and offenders at two correctional facilities. Correctional psychiatry and journal of science therapy, 17, 48-56.

Chapman, W. (1981). Adjustment to prison. Albany, N.Y.: Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation, N.Y. State Department of Correctional Services.

Clemmer, D. (1958). The prison community (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cloward, R. A. (1960). Social control in the prison. In Theoretical studies in social organization of the prison, Pamphlet 15. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Cloward, R. A. & Ohlin, L.E. (1960). Delinquency and opportunity: A theory of delinquent gangs. New York: The Free Press.

Coe, R.M. (1961). Who is the inmate? Characteristics of well adjusted and poorly adjusted inmates. Journal of criminal law, criminology and police science, 52, 178-284.

Cole, G. F. (1986). The American system of criminal justice (4th ed.). Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Durkheim, E. (1933). The division of labor in society. New York: The Free Press. (Original work published 1893.)

Ellis, D., Grasmick, H. and Gilman, B. (1974). Violence in prison: A sociological analysis. American journal of sociology, 80, 16-43.

Flanagan, T. J. (1983). Correlates of institutional misconduct among state prisoners. Criminology, 21, 29-39.

Garabedian, P. G. (1963). Social roles and processes of socialization in the prison community. Social problems, 11, 139-52.

Garabedian, P. G. (1964). Social roles in a correctional community. Journal of criminal law, criminology and police science, 55, 338-47.

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. (1956). Physique and delinquency. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Goetting, A. & Howsen, R. M. (1986). Correlates of prisoner misconduct. Journal of quantitative criminology, 2, 49-67.

Goffman, E. (1961). Asylums. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Hayner, N. & Ash, E. (1939). The prisoner community as a social group. American sociological review, 4, 362-69.

Irwin, J. & Cressey, D. R. (1962). Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture. Social problems, 10, 142-55.

Jaman, D. R. (1972). Behavior during the first year in prison, Report III: Background characteristics as predictors of behavior and misbehavior. Sacramento, California: Research Division, California Department of Corrections.

Johnson, E. (1966). Pilot study: Age, race, and recidivism as factors in prison infractions. Canadian journal of corrections, 8, 268-83.

McCorkle, L. W. & Korn, R. (1954). Resocialization within walls. The annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 293, 88-91.

Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. American sociological review, 3, 672-82.

Myers, L. & Levy, G. (1978). Description and prediction of the intractable inmate. Journal of research in crime and delinquency, 15, 214-28.

New York State Department of Correctional Services. (1983). Standards of inmate behavior. Albany, N.Y.: New York State Department of Correctional Services.

Petersilia, J. and Honig, P. (1980). The prison experience of career criminals. Rand Report Series R-2511-DOJ. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

Ramirez, J. (1984). Prisonization, staff and inmates. Criminal justice and behavior, 11, 423-60.

Reimer, H. (1937). Socialization in the prison community. Proceedings of the American Prison Association, 151-55.

SAS Institute. (1985). SAS user's guide: Statistics. Cary, N.C.: SAS Institute.

Schrag, C. (1961). A preliminary criminal typology. Pacific sociological review, 4, 11-16.

Schrag, C. (1954). Leadership roles among prison inmates. American sociological review, 19, 37-42.

Schrag, C. (1961). Some foundations for a theory of correction. In Carter, Glaser, & Wilkins (Eds.). (1977). Correctional institutions, (2nd ed.). New York: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Schwartz, B. (1971). Pre-institutional vs. situational influence in a correctional community. The journal of criminal law, criminology, and police science, 62, 532-42.

Sykes, G. (1974). The society of captives (3rd ed.). Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Shiloh, A. (1968). Sanctuary of prison responses to life in a mental hospital. Transaction, 6, 28-35.

Thomas, C. W. (1977). Theoretical perspectives on prisonization: a comparison of the importation and deprivation models. The journal of criminal law, criminology, and police science, 68, 135-45.

Thomas, C. W. & Foster, S. C. (1973). The importation model perspective on inmate social roles: an empirical test. The sociological quarterly, 14, 229-39.

Thomas, C. W. & Foster, S. C. (1972). Prisonization in the inmate contra culture. Social problems, 20, 229-39.

Toch, H. (1978). Social climate and prison violence. In Carter, Glaser, & Wilkins (Eds.). (1985). Correctional institutions. New York: Harper and Row.

Weinberg, S. K. (1942). Aspects of the prison social structure. American journal of sociology, 47, 722.

Wheeler, S. (1961). Socialization in correction communities. American sociological review, 26, 697-712.

Wolfgang, M. E. (1961). Quantitative analysis of adjustment to prison community. Journal of criminal law, criminology and police science, 51, 608-18.