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ABSTRACT

As the number of juveniles entering into the criminal justice system increases, social scientists, criminologists and a host of other professionals are perplexed in their efforts to find some answers that might curb this increase. This thesis is an endeavor to aid those professionals and others by attempting to establish a link between the variables of self-worth and certainty of punishment. It is my hope to provide educators and others with information that may help in this cause.

The central focus of this work centers around the administration of a questionnaire to inmates of four penal institutions in Nevada and California (n=219). The questionnaire, aside from gathering some general demographic information was designed to measure the respondent’s feelings regarding self-worth and certainty of punishment. The three Nevada sites I visited were the Stewart-MoJave Detention Center located in Las Vegas; the Southern Nevada Desert Correctional Center located in Jean; and the Southern Nevada Desert Correctional Center located in Indian Springs. I also visited the California Correctional Center located in Tehachapi, California.

This work is divided into five major chapters and also includes a tables section and two appendices.
Chapter one is an introduction into the topic, where the problem and the hypothesis is stated, as well as a review of the literature. This chapter also includes the plan of the study and gives the reader some background into the enormity of the problem and the massive amount of money and effort that have been expended in an attempt to reduce crime in the United States.

Chapter two explains the concepts and reviews the literature on the subjects. Chapter two also discusses some of the studies that have been conducted relating to measuring crime, deterrence and predictor variables. Chapter three is a discussion of the methodology employed in conducting the field visits, and the design and administration of the questionnaire. Chapter four is the findings section and includes a demographic breakdown in addition to explaining the statistical significance of the findings. Chapter five is the conclusion, where some final comments are made on the results of the questionnaire, field visits, informal discussions and the literature in general. Also included in this section are some of my own criticisms, comments regarding future studies and the relevance of this thesis in terms of policy and the discipline of sociology.
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"The variables involved in seeking to comprehend crime and to cope with the machinery for its control are so extensive and complex that they embrace every major field of man’s knowledge, but especially the social sciences. A tremendous complexity results from the intricate nature of human personality as well as the interrelationships of such personalities in different cultural settings.

The best hope for improved understanding of crime and its control is by the application of the scientific method to the data of criminal behavior and to the theories and processes of law enforcement. Within the last two decades particularly, use of the scientific method has brought refined understandings from the orderly testing of hypotheses." (Donald Clemmer, Director Department of Corrections, Washington D.C. May, 1962).
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"The problems of crime bring us together. Even as we join in common action, we know there can be no instant victory. Ancient evils do not yield to easy conquest. We can not limit our efforts to enemies we can see. We must, with equal resolve, seek out new knowledge, new techniques, and new understanding."(1)

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As the title of this thesis indicates, this work is an analysis of the variables of self-worth and certainty of punishment as measured in prison populations. The problem of this study was to determine the existence and degree of relationship between these two variables and discuss their bearing on the likelihood to commit criminal behavior.

While a body of literature exists supporting one theory over another for defining and addressing the causes of criminal behavior (Nettler 1984), for the most part theorists have failed to identify valid indicators and/or predictor variables to assist in developing effective policies of social control (Sutherland and Cressey 1966; Wilson 1975; Garofalo 1977).
Theories regarding a low self-worth’s motivating effect on the likelihood of an individual to commit criminal behavior are well documented and regarded as a personality trait of some criminals (Hewitt and Jenkins 1946; Eysenck 1964; Albrow 1974; Cannon 1987; Matsueda 1989; Rosenberg, Schooler and Schoenbach 1989). The emergence of self-concept is an important feature of any social career, including a deviant one (Wood 1974). Therefore, criminal behavior is learned from contact with social definitions favorable to crime (Sutherland and Cressey 1970).

An individual’s feelings regarding certainty of punishment as a deterrent to criminal behavior is a variable considered valid by some theorists (Antunes and Hunt 1972; Tittle and Logan 1973; Zimring and Hawkins 1973; Tullock 1974; Morrison 1988; Klepper and Nagin 1989). Certainty of punishment does have a deterrent effect on the likelihood of an individual to commit certain crimes such as pre-meditated murder, arson, and robbery (Wirth 1940; Claster 1967; Abrahamson 1970; Moneymaker 1986). Certainty of punishment has been advanced as a deterrent to other forms of criminal and deviant behavior as well (Bouma 1980; Schnake 1986; Smith and Gartin 1989).
HYPOTHESES

a) The Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically significant relationship between an inmates feelings of self-worth and certainty of punishment.

b) The Research Hypothesis: There is a statistically significant relationship between an inmate’s feelings of self-worth and certainty of punishment. As self-worth increases, feelings regarding certainty of punishment increase.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The need for this study is to provide those social service professionals and others working in the fields of education, child-development or other areas where the potential to recognize and enhance upon an individual’s feelings of self-worth and certainty of punishment, with information necessary to the social well-being of society’s members. My initial concern with the issue of crime was with the rising rate of juveniles committing murder and other violent offenses. I felt that if self-worth can be demonstrated to have an impact on certainty of punishment, and that certainty of punishment actually does deter an individual from crime, then some hope exists to stem
the tide of juveniles entering the criminal justice system, by recognizing this personality deficit and enhancing one's feelings of self-worth.

Of the 2,100 death row inmates nationwide, 30 committed their crimes as juveniles (2), about 2% of the total. In 1983 there were 9,177,847 recorded arrests in the United States. Of those, 7,620,242 were for alleged offenses committed by adults, and 1,557,605 were by juveniles. Total recorded arrests increased in 1987 to 10,041,075, of which 8,378,715 were by adults and 1,662,360 were juveniles (3). This figure represents a 10% increase in adult rates and a 6.7% increase in that of juveniles. The purpose of reporting this data is to demonstrate the increase of crime, not just among adults but also the crime committed by juveniles. It is the intent of this study to find tools that may be useful in reducing the number of juveniles entering into a life of crime.

The next section is a review of the literature. I feel it demonstrates the critical need for study in this area, since prior studies have not dealt directly with the relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment. Therefore this thesis will provide other researchers with a basis for pointing out the relationship between these variables to the world at large.
PROCEDURES FOR THIS STUDY

The study consisted of interviewing 219 inmates at four different penal institutions, in the states of Nevada and California. The sample was gathered by convenience and there will be no attempt to extrapolate this data to the population from which it was drawn. Initially I wrote to prison officials of the four southwestern states of Arizona, California, Nevada and Oklahoma. I felt that since these states were within driving distance it would be feasible and cost effective for me to visit them and conduct my interviews.

After considerable negotiations and many presentations, the State of Oklahoma declined my request, citing the lack of value of the study for their purposes. The State of Arizona agreed to my request, but due to numerous in-state requests, they were not able to grant me a visit until March of 1990. I was forced to decline their offer since it would not have allowed me adequate time to analyze the data and include it in my study.

The State of California consented to my request and it was agreed upon that I would visit the California Correctional Center in Tehachapi, California to interview the inmates of the men's maximum security
facility on July 26, 1989 and gathered a sample size of 42 inmates. This site was selected by the Director for Research, Dr. Robert Dickover, as he felt it was closer for me to drive to and would provide me with a good overview of the state's prison system.

The State of Nevada permitted me to visit and conduct interviews at the Southern Nevada Desert Correctional Centers in Indian Springs (n=79), April 6, 1989 and Jean, Nevada, May 5, 1989 (n=35). Earlier, on February 15, 1989, I was granted permission to interview inmates at the Stewart-Mojave Detention Center (n=63), giving me a total sample of n=219. Not all questionnaires were completed at the time of my visits and some were left to be administered by the staff of these facilities, accounting for approximately 57% of the total.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Using the ERIC system for a literature review of abstracts, dissertations and other journal articles, I found 2,275 references to self-esteem, 675 references to deterrence of crime, 1 reference to self-worth theory with only 3 exact matches for self-esteem and criminal behavior. I found no exact matches for the relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment, but did locate several related references.
This certainly suggests the need for more study on this subject since it appears to be a relatively uncharted area.

The issue of self-esteem, as it related to juvenile offenders and rehabilitation, was reviewed by Fitts and Hamner (1969). They believed that we can force behavioral changes through external controls but that new behaviors will be short-lived unless people also change their self-concepts. Fitts (1969) stated that we should continue to search for new and better ways of changing behavior through an understanding of the self-concept, because ultimate rehabilitation and reinstatement into normal society require a positive self-concept.

Changes in self-concept associated with a period of incarceration were investigated by Hannum and Borgen (1978). Female prisoners were administered a self-concept test at the time of admission and again after a 6-month period of incarceration. It was found that, contrary to speculation, the self-concept of incarcerated females became more positive over a period of 6 months. Those inmates with higher educational levels, however, were more likely to have lower self-concepts after a period of incarceration.

To study self-esteem and multiple problems, Kahle (1980) tested the social adaptation theory by monitor-
ing adolescent boys for three years. The results indicated that low self-esteem led to interpersonal problems when the dependent variable was made up of several concerns but not when it was a single concern. The findings support the idea that low self-esteem can be reversed.

Mueller (1983) showed that research on the female offender has produced two explanations of the female criminal personality: the female offender either as a masculinized woman or as an anguished woman possessing low self-esteem and poor self-control. To investigate the applicability of each position, 144 black male and female criminals and non-criminals completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, the Rosenbaum Self-Control Schedule, a shortened form of the Quick Test (a self-esteem scale), and a demographic questionnaire. Demographically, the group had a mean age of 20.8 years, a mean educational level of 10.3 years, were unemployed or had an income below $5000, and rated 21 on an 11-77 point scale on social status. An analysis of the results showed that contrary to the masculinized woman theory, female criminals were more feminine than male criminals or male and female non-criminals. In partial support of the anguished woman theory, female criminals possessed
lower self-esteem and self-control than female non-criminals.

Pilsbury (1983) examined self-esteem in three groups of 25 adults with or without a criminal history, who completed the Self Esteem Inventory. This study provided me with the best historical framework for my study. In this study the SEI (self-esteem inventory) was administered to three groups of 25 individuals. Group 1 consisted of 25 people with no criminal history. These individuals were all probation officers. The second group consisted of 25 people with three or more convictions more serious than moving motor vehicle offenses. These individuals were all on probation or parole at the time of testing. The final group consisted of 25 people who were just leaving the courtroom following a trial in which they were found guilty of a charge or were sentenced to probation. The prior criminal history of this group was unknown.

Results showed people with three or more convictions have a lower sense of self-esteem than those with no criminal history. One criticism of this study would be the fact that it fails to measure the effect of incarceration. Even though those with three or more convictions scored lowest on measures of self-esteem, it is unclear whether incarceration is the cause of this low self-esteem or the effect.
Although all of the previously mentioned studies were helpful in understanding the role of self-esteem as it relates to negative aspects in the lives of criminals or adjudged lawbreakers, more studies with different populations are needed to clarify various concepts and assist in planning specific counseling interventions. This study was designed with this in mind.

**PLAN OF THE REPORT**

The next chapter defines the concepts used in this study and gives a review of the literature. The concepts to be examined are self-concept, self-worth, certainty of punishment, the likelihood to commit criminal behavior, and deterrence as a method of social control.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology used to complete this study. Preparation included some preliminary field work, after a review of the literature, informal discussions with Clark County District Court Judges, probation and parole officers, field visits and the administration of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was the primary data gathering instrument and was analyzed using the SPSSx format.
Chapter 4 contains the findings and results section. It is here that the data analysis will be commented upon and relationships between the variables will be discussed.

The final chapter offers a summary and conclusion of this study. Important points from the research are clarified, limitations of the study are recognized, and suggestions regarding future studies are discussed.

This next section is provided to caution the reader from accepting any view regarding our ability to effectively recognize and deter criminal behavior and to demonstrate some of the massive human and financial effort that has already gone into the problem.

**CAUSES, DETERRENTS AND OTHER POPULAR MYTHS**

If the title of this section sounds cynical, then I feel vindicated, as nothing can be more discouraging to a researcher than to look for answers that are not there. In 1964, then President Lyndon B. Johnson declared "the war on poverty", heralded by many to bring about some concrete improvements leading to his envisioned "Great Society". By 1967 President Johnson was establishing the President's Commission on Law
Enforcement and Administration of Justice, to deepen our understanding on the causes of crime and how society should respond to the challenge of the present levels of crime (Saney 1986).

With all of the resources of the United States Government at his disposal, President Johnson with the aid of 19 commissioners, 63 staff members, 175 consultants, and hundreds of advisors, conducted five national surveys, held hundreds of meetings, called three national conferences, and interviewed tens of thousands of Americans regarding crime (Quinney 1979). The culmination of this work was a general report by the commission entitled "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society", containing more than 200 specific proposals. In November of 1971, in testimony before the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of Congress, the administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), Jerris Leonard, made clear the government's objectives in the war on crime:

"For the future, reducing crime nationally will not be an easy job. It will not be cheap, in either labor or money. But it can be done, and the present LEAA program must be the major vehicle for doing it. For those without blinders, unmistakable signs of progress already are evident. Many more will become apparent if we can have unmatched dedication by local, state, and federal officials; responsible assistance from the Congress, whose Judiciary Committees gave
LEAA a remarkably sound bill of health fol­
lowing extended hearings last year.

In many ways, American citizens are saf­
er now than they were three years ago. A
year from now, they will be safer than they
are today. The decade of the 1960's ended as
the most lawless in our history. The decade
of the 1970's can end with crime long since
under control, if we are not diverted from
our task by phantoms."(5)

It could be argued that President Johnson's "war
on poverty" and "war on crime" were political ploys to
draw public attention away from the Vietnam War
(Shepard 1981). If this were true however, it would
appear that Johnson had failed equally in all three
areas of combat. The same could be said of his
successors however, who by 1973 had established 5 more
national commissions to deal with crime:

1968. National Advisory Commission on Civil
Disorders.
and Prevention of Violence.
1970. National Commission on Obscenity and
Pornography.
1972. U.S. Commission on Marijuana and Drug
Abuse.
Justice Standards and Goals.

The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of
Violence found that:

"To be a young, poor male; to be under­
educated and without means of escape from an
oppressive urban environment; to want what
the society claims is available (but mostly
to others); to see around oneself illegiti­
mate and often violent methods being used to
achieve material gain; and to observe others
using these means with impunity—all this is to be burdened with an enormous set of influences that pull many toward crime and delinquency. To be also a Negro, Puerto Rican or Mexican-American and subject to discrimination and segregation adds considerably to the pull of these other criminogenic forces... It is the ghetto slum that is disproportionately responsible for violent crime."(6)

Now in 1990, 26 years after the "war on poverty" and 23 years after the "war on crime", the criminal justice system is no closer to any answers that will deter criminal behavior. Although sociologists, criminologists, psychologists, and other social scientists continue to examine the criminal justice system and crime in general, recommendations for change come slowly and are almost always greeted with skepticism.

Perhaps this fatalistic attitude was reflected by the President's Crime Commission, when they described criminal behavior as "a response to a specific situation by a person with an infinitely complicated psychological and emotional makeup who is subject to infinitely complicated external pressures. Crime as a whole is millions of such responses."

I introduced this information to caution against those who might suggest "quick fixes" or believe there are simple solutions to the problems of crime, there are not any to be found. Those who have endeavored to
find answers to this complex societal menace called crime, have come away virtually empty-handed and perplexed. What I have attempted to do is to investigate a very narrow and limited possibility to the problem, one that certainly is not a panacea but may work as one tool towards repairing the machinery of society that produces crime.

This concludes the introductory chapter. In the next chapter, I will define the concepts used in this study and review some of the pertinent literature regarding those concepts.
ENDNOTES

CHAPTER 2: DEFINING THE CONCEPTS

SELF-CONCEPT

Any discussion of self-worth or self-esteem must begin with a short review of the nature of self-concept. William James (1890) wrote on "The Consciousness of Self" in his Principles of Psychology, but it was not until Ralmy (1948), that the first systematic empirical research appeared regarding self-concept. Since that time thousands of studies have been conducted on the subject (Gergen 1971; Rosenberg 1979), and self-concept remains one of the most popular issues in sociological and psychological journals (Ostrow 1982), with the vast majority of these studies having dealt with the issue of self-esteem (McGuire and Padawer-Singer 1976).

The terms "self" or "ego" have been used to refer to the "essential nature" of man (Fromm 1941, 1947; Maslow 1954; Moustakas 1956). Self is an organization of perceptions about who and what kind of person one is (Hess, Markson and Stein 1988). As humans we are not born with this knowledge, it is learned and developed gradually through the process of socialization (James
As a central component of personality, self-concept has, for the most part, been studied from the symbolic-interactionist perspective. Therefore, it is through language (Sapir 1949), and interaction that the self becomes a product of an ever developing process (Garfinkel 1967). Blumer explains:

"For Mead, the self is more than an internalization of components of social structure and culture. It is more centrally a social process, a process of self-interaction in which the human actor indicates to himself matters that confront him in the situations in which he acts, and organizes his action through his interpretation of such matters".(1)

There are various other distinctions used in the literature to describe the self. Turner (1976) speaks of "institutional" or "impulsive" selves; Franks and Marolla (1976) of "inner" and "outer" selves; Edelson and Jones (1954) of the "conceptual self-system"; Waterbor (1972) and Tiryakian (1968) of the "existential self" or the "existential bases of the self"; Seeman (1966) of "authentic" and "inauthentic" selves.
Further examples are Wylie (1961, 1968, 1974) and Snygg and Combs (1949) of "phenomenal" and "non-phenomenal" selves; Allport (1955) of the "proprium"; Sullivan (1947) of the "self-system"; Hilgard (1949) of the "inferred self" and undoubtedly there are other terms pertaining to the self that I have not yet discussed.

The purpose of all this however is not to belabor the point about self-concept, but to introduce the notion that personality characteristics such as self-worth are central to the development of self-concept (Rosenberg 1979; Osborne 1986), but not necessarily synonymous. The term self-concept is not intrinsically an evaluative one, although it includes self-relevant thoughts and feelings that are not inherently positive or negative (for example, "I am a student at UNLV"). However, self-concept is identical to self-esteem if the statement refers to its evaluative aspect (Brockner 1988). Other synonyms include "self-acceptance," "self-confidence," "self-assurance," and "self-efficacy."

**SELF-WORTH**

The principles of self-worth are amenable to the earlier interactionist perspectives (Cooley 1912; Mead 1934; Blumer 1975), in as much as they differentiate
from the functionalists (Parsons 1951; Merton 1957) all of whom viewed the self as a passive self (Wallace and Wolf 1986). A core proposition of the theory of self-worth is that self-worth is a fundamental human motive (Rosenberg, Schooler and Schoenbach 1989), presupposing an active self (Mead 1957), with desires for response and recognition (Thomas 1923).

Blumer presents human behavior from the traditional positon of idealism stating that the "world of reality exists only in human experience and that it appears only in the form in which human beings see that world." (Blumer 1969). This orientation stresses the large role given to meaning in social life (Weber), definition of the situation (Thomas), values (Sorokin, Znaniecki, Becker), language (Whorf, Mead) and pragmatism (Dewey, James).

Self-worth, also known as self-esteem (Brockner 1988), "self-maintenance motive" (Tesser and Campbell 1983), the "motive for self-worth" (Covington 1984), and the "self-enhancement" motive (Kaplin 1975), has been described by Maslow (1970) among others, as an essential human need. The construct of self-worth is often used synonymously with a variety of related constructs (Brockner 1988). Freud (1937) was among the first to recognize and emphasize the importance of
self-image in the individual, particularly in the development of personality.

From the interactionist perspective, the self is an active self, arising out of interaction with others (Blumer 1969). The self is also a reflective self (Cooley 1912), the individual views himself through the eyes and actions of others in his reference group. It is from the individual's frame of reference that he determines whether he is a success or failure (Brockner 1988), liked or disliked (Hackman 1986), dull or interesting (Morrison 1977), attractive or ugly (Jones 1973), and is that self-concept that is central to personal functioning. Theories regarding a low self-worth’s motivating effect on the likelihood of an individual to commit criminal behavior are well documented and regarded as a personality trait characteristic of some criminals (Hewitt and Jenkins 1946; Albrow 1974; Cannon 1987; and Matsueda 1989).

Self-worth is the basic evaluative assessment by an individual of the need to "be somebody" in a symbolic world. It is integral to one's performance. In the human sense it may begin at birth, from the praise a child receives from its' parents for a host of actions; potty-training, good eating habits, taking naps; to school-performance, obeying rules, getting along with others; to athletic performance, physical
attractiveness, and college acceptance. Self-worth is a fundamental human motive whereby the individual attempts to maximize their successes, which will enhance a sense of self-worth, and to avoid failures, which threatens to devalue their feelings of self-worth.

The source of self-worth is deeply rooted in childhood development, as is the source of self-alienation or the sense of inferiority (Osborne 1986). Self-worth has also been shown to be differentially distributed between racial groups (Franks and Marolla 1976; Gecas 1982; Gecas and Schwalbe 1983; Hughes and Demo 1989), age groups (Rosenberg 1979), gender identity (Burk and Tully 19787; Burk, Stets and Pirog-Good 1988) and social class (Festinger 1954; Rosenberg and Pearl in 1978; House 1981).

Studies regarding self-worth or self-esteem have tended to focus on the self-concept either as a social product or as a social force (Rosenberg 1981; Kaplan 1986). Rosenberg, Schooler, and Schoenbach (1989) conducted research into the reciprocal effects of the self-concept and various social and personal factors. Their study concluded that self-esteem levels depend heavily on "reflected appraisals", "social comparisons", and "self-attributions". They found that low
self-esteem fosters delinquency and that delinquency may even enhance self-esteem.

Bachman's (1970) study of 2,213 tenth-grade boys throughout the United States found the following correlations between self-esteem and a number of measures of emotional disturbance: negative affective states (-.52); happiness (+.54); somatic symptoms (-.34); and Impulse to aggression (-.34) (Bachman 1970:122). In addition, Luck and Heiss (1972) found their measures of global self-esteem to be significantly related to submissiveness, depression, psychic anxiety, somatic anxiety, autonomic anxiety, maladjustment and vulnerability among adult white males.

More recently the term "global self-esteem" has been appearing in the literature. This term refers to the idea that the self is not a mere conglomeration or addition of isolated concepts of self, but a patterned interrelationship among the components comprising the self (Rosenberg 1979). Certain "self-values", or the desirable conceptions which serve as criteria for self-judgement, afford an illustration of the structure of self-concept for the individual's global self-esteem. Put in another way, if an individual thinks of himself as smart or attractive, then he tends to think well of himself in general. This is the common
assumption made of school failures, minority groups or prison inmates, that they must have a low self-esteem.

While some researchers have examined the association between self-esteem and various social and psychological problems (Kaplan 1975), there continues to be great disparity amongst social scientists as to whether low self-esteem is the cause or the effect of criminal behavior (Berg 1971; Cohn 1978; Wells and Rankin 1983). It is also possible of course, that such a finding could be accounted for in terms of frustration-aggression theory (Bagley, Mallick, Verma, and Young 1979).

Research has shown that self-esteem is correlated with juvenile delinquency (Wells and Rankin 1983), academic performance (Wylie 1979), and psychological depression (Bachman 1970; Pearl and Lieberman 1979; Rosenberg 1985). Wells and Rankin (1983) concluded that these studies "demonstrate a consistent association between evaluative social experiences, self-evaluation, and a variety of delinquent behaviors." Kaplan (1975) also identified and described studies that showed an inverse relationship between self-esteem and delinquency. Although these relationships are usually statistically significant, they are rarely strong - usually between -.1 and -.2 (Wells and Rankin 1983).
Research also shows that self-esteem and school marks are positively and significantly related. On the basis of a review of 22 studies, Wylie (1979) concludes: "The correlations between grade point averages and the tests of over-all self-regard for which information was found are mostly around .30." Most of these relationships are statistically significant and some are based on large well-selected samples (e.g. Bachman 1970) and used well-established self-esteem measures.

One of the most firmly established findings in my review of the literature was the inverse association between self-esteem and depression (Wylie 1979; Rosenberg 1985). Studies of children, adolescents, adults and the aged all show this pattern. For example, Bachman's (1970) study of 2213 tenth-grade boys showed a correlation of -.51 between self-esteem and a measure of "depressive affect" (Rosenberg 1985). Pearl In and Lieberman's (1979) study of 2300 adults in the Chicago Metropolitan Area showed a relationship of -.49 between self-esteem and depression. Similar findings appear in Kaplan and Pokorny (1969) and Rosenberg and Simmons (1972).

Although the data from the literature review clearly demonstrates a significant relationship between self-esteem and each of these problems, it is unclear
whether self-esteem is primarily the cause or effect. There is in fact theoretical support for both views (Rosenberg, Schooler and Schoenback 1989). The purpose of this study is to measure the existence and degree of relationship between the variables of self-worth and certainty of punishment in prison populations. The next section of this thesis then is concerned with certainty of punishment.

CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT

A principle tenet of my thesis centers around the relationship between certainty of punishment and self-worth, with a secondary connection to the likelihood to commit criminal behavior. It would not be sufficient to merely establish a link between self-worth and certainty of punishment without providing the importance of this relationship to criminal behavior. Therefore it is incumbent upon me to establish, if not a causal link between the two concepts of certainty of punishment and the likelihood to commit criminal behavior, then at the very least the degree of deterrent effect of certainty of punishment with regard to criminal behavior. Failing that, I hope to establish, via prior research, a negative relationship between the variables of certainty of punishment
and the likelihood to commit criminal behavior. The key consideration here is the concept of "certainty", defined as the assurance that if one commits an illegal act, they will be caught, arrested, tried, convicted, and sentenced (Bentham 1764, Glueck & Glueck 1951, Gibbs 1968, and Fisher 1973).

Certainty of punishment must depend heavily upon consistency of punishment, since it characteristically develops a schedule of random punishments which one could not learn to predict and therefore work out his chances of "getting caught" (Newman 1978). The person considering committing a criminal act must calculate, if even in crude and simple terms, the risks involved (Willett 1951). For some those risks serve to encourage deviant behavior (Zimring and Hawkins 1973), particularly regarding sex crimes (Cameron 1966). This calculation appears most evident in the professional criminal who chooses an "occupation" that involves minimum risks and a maximum of gain (Saleilles 1968, Jensen 1978, Klepper and Nagin 1989).

As mentioned earlier, it is important to demonstrate the deterrent effect of certainty of punishment on deviant behavior. Norval Morris (1966) has pointed out; "Every criminal law system in the world, except one, has deterrence as its primary and essential postulate. It figures most prominently
throughout our punishing and sentencing decisions legislative, judicial and administrative." (2)

Certainly the debate over the deterrent effects of punishment has existed for centuries, with the primary issue being whether legal sanctions reduce or amplify criminal behavior (Smith and Gartin 1989).

It is interesting to note the shift in popularity in recent decades from rehabilitation (Lipton 1975) to that of detention or punishment (Bouma 1980). On my first visit to Jean (Southern Nevada Desert Correctional Center in Jean, Nevada), an inmate commented: "I’ve been in juvenile hall, jails and prisons for the last 19 years, but I’ve never been punished a day in my life." I gathered from this remark he meant that although society has been able to incarcerate him and keep him from mingling with those outside of prison, that he has not really been punished in any meaningful fashion.

SENTENCING

For punishment to be effective, it must also be severe enough to deter criminals (Singer 1976). According to Newman (1978), as far as experimental studies are concerned, "there is very little doubt that severity of punishment is the central parameter of
punishment." Others, including Currie (1985), argue just the opposite: "It could, of course, be argued that the problem isn't that prison is intrinsically ineffective as a deterrent, but that prison sentences simply aren't severe enough to do the job. Yet the fact that American prison sentences are typically far longer than those in most of the rest of the developed world renders this line of reasoning implausible from the start" (Currie 1985). A report by the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Criminal Sentencing (1976), concluded: "There are no comprehensive national sentencing statistics to present a full picture, but all the data that do exist demonstrate that unjustifiable disparity is a prominent result of discretionary decision making." (see Fair and Certain Punishment, p. 102)

Briefly, the difference between determinate and indeterminate sentencing focuses on who imposes the sentence while it is being served. In a determinate sentence a sentence is fixed, meaning a judge imposes it before the defendant has begun to serve it. However with an indeterminate sentence, an administrative agency imposes it while it is being served (Rubin, 1949). Therefore in a determinate sentence the judge must weigh a host of factors including the nature of the crime, the plea, the defendant's behavior in court,
the victim, public reaction, and the facts in the case. But in an indeterminate sentence, the onus falls on the penal system, parole board, and probation officers, to administer the sentence. In the latter scenario, the experienced inmate who has learned the system, also learns how to "do his time." As one inmate explained to me, there are "inmates" and there are "convicts"; with the difference being that an inmate is always making trouble and trying to escape, while a convict "just does his time and don't mess with nobody."

Available research, while contradictory, offers very little insight into the deterrent effect of punishment. Packer (1968, p.46) has suggested that: "It would be hard to imagine that offenders who escape arrest or detection would be less likely to repeat an offense than those who are processed through the legal system." However, studies involving juveniles have indicated an increase in delinquency among those who had been caught, when compared to their counterparts who had not been apprehended (Gold and Williams 1972). Further, arrest comparisons among adult males involved in domestic assault cases, showed a marked decrease in repeat offenses by those who had been punished (Sherman and Berk 1984).
SOCIETAL DEFINITION OF DEVIANCE AND PUNISHMENT

Perhaps the problem is as basic as defining that age-old phenomenon social scientists refer to as deviance. Theories regarding deviant behavior have evolved and changed, as have societies over the centuries (Cole 1979). Keeping pace with and sometimes lagging behind the theories of deviant behavior are the theories of social control (Wallace and Wolf 1986). Societal definition of what constitutes deviant behavior is both transitory and perhaps in a state of metempsychosis. Consider this passage from U.S. News & World Report:

"Statistics indicate that most Americans become lawbreakers in their automobiles. Few take traffic violations seriously. How many people think of drunk drivers or speeders as dangerous criminals? Yet, more people are killed and injured by drunken drivers and speeders than by murderers, robbers, muggers, and rapists. Auto accidents cost Americans billions of dollars a year in property damage, medical expenses, and income loss—a total many times the take of the robberies and burglaries listed in our crime rates."(3)

When we compare this statement made only 17 years ago, to the current level of public consciousness regarding drinking and driving, we see that societal definition of criminal behavior does change. With the change in perception of crime, comes the resulting change in laws as a method of social control, designed
to deter this deviant behavior and consequently a new type of criminal is created, as this newspaper article would indicate:

"CARSON CITY—The number of drunken drivers sent to prison in Nevada has soared since passage of the state’s tough drunken driving laws earlier this decade, authorities said. According to statistics provided by prison officials, 28 offenders were put behind bars in 1982 for the crime, compared with 168 people who have been sent to prison so far this year. Brenda Burns, warden of the Northern Nevada Correctional Center, said the number has climbed steadily since one-year prison terms became mandatory for third-time drunken drivers."(4)

I should note here that Nevada’s drunken driving laws are currently being reviewed by the U.S. Supreme Court to see if they fail to provide the accused with due process, since those on trial for drunk driving are not entitled to a trial by jury.

Despite the get tough policies of state and local governments, drunk driving still continues to defy deterrence. Consider the case of New Philadelphia, a small Ohio town. In response to outrage from local residents concerned about drunk drivers, Judge Edward O’Farrell has been handing out unusually strict sentences to intoxicated drivers. In drunken driving cases, O’Farrell since 1982 has routinely handed out 15-day jail sentences to first-time offenders; imposed a standard $750 fine; rejected plea bargains; and
required the vehicles of restricted drivers to be tagged with a distinctive red-on-yellow license plate. Just 40 miles south of New Philadelphia is the town of Cambridge, Ohio. Here drunken drivers usually get sentences of three days or less in special education camps.

Recently a study was conducted comparing the drunk driving statistics between New Philadelphia and Cambridge in an effort to determine if the severity of sentencing actually resulted in lower drunken driving rates. The study, funded by AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety (5), compared drunken driving statistics and interviewed drivers and law enforcement officials of both towns. Researchers reported that their surveys failed to show less drinking and driving in New Philadelphia, than in Cambridge, Ohio. The report showed motorists in the two towns had a good sense of their relative chances of going to jail if caught driving under the influence.

The report revealed that drivers were aware of the fact that jails were overcrowded and that there were a relatively small number of police on patrol at any given time. In the study, anonymous spot checks that included breath tests found a comparable number of drunken drivers in both communities. The report concluded that before changing their driving habits,
drinkers have to be convinced there is a strong likelihood of being caught and incarcerated. The report further concluded that "even a determined Judge like Edward O'Farrell is incapable of creating the needed certainty of punishment on his own."

**RELATED BEHAVIORS**

Research indicates that a variety of deviant behaviors are positively correlated with one another, particularly during adolescence and early adulthood (Akers 1984; Donovan and Jessor 1985). Some researchers have concluded that these deviant behaviors are all evidence of a general tendency as a result of the positive correlations between behaviors (Elliot and Hulzinga 1984). Other researchers urge caution for theories that treat different deviant behaviors as alternative manifestations of a single general tendency (Osgood, Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman 1988). This study revealed only one significant relationship between deviant behaviors, that being the use of marijuana and the likelihood to later use other illicit drugs.

The actual socio-psychological considerations one encounters when faced with a decision of committing a potentially deviant act are incalculable. However as Freud has suggested, as individuals we are all poten-
tially disobedient, and there exists the possibility for mass disobedience. The degree to which certainty of punishment enters into the calculation seems to be an individual phenomenon (Newman 1978), but there appears to be little argument that it does figure into the equation at some point, in most cases.

Consequently, I have attempted in my interviews with prison inmates to determine if a relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment does exist, and if so, to what extent. I do this with the hope that if self-worth can be recognized and enhanced upon at an early enough stage in development, and does in fact serve to increase an individual's feelings regarding certainty of punishment, the likelihood to commit criminal behavior can be decreased, if the relationship between certainty of punishment and criminal behavior is valid.

**PREDICTING THE LIKELIHOOD TO COMMIT CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR**

One of the primary purposes of conducting research is to enable the social scientist to develop the ability to understand human behavior (Kachigan 1986; Nachmias and Nachmias 1987). Understandably then, it is also one of the more difficult, and subjects itself
to careful scrutiny, if not outright suspicion. Calculating these predictor variables can be nearly an impossible task, particularly when one is attempting to predict human social behavior (Baron and Liebert 1971). Human behavior, especially deviant behavior, is dependent on a host of factors, including many control and extraneous variables, none of which can be isolated without regard to the other complex factors that comprise human behavior (Nettler 1984).

Prior research in the area of predicting future criminal behavior is voluminous (Burgess 1928; Mannheim and Wilkins 1955; Simon 1971; Wilkins and Hoffman 1978; Benda 1989; et. al.). Benda, in his prediction study, compared three statistical procedures for predictive accuracy, using a criterion of return to Wisconsin training schools among first-admissions to these prisons for youthful offenders. Benda compared logit analysis, predictive attributive analysis, and a Burgess method.

The purpose of this study was to compare three different statistical procedures for technical accuracy in prediction. The logit model can use nominal data, estimates weights for predictors, detects interactions, and provides a means for determining which model best fits the data (Bishop, Flenberg, and Holland 1975). Rather than using a multiplicative model (e.g. ordinary
regression) to account for interactions between predictors, logit procedures involve the use of logarithms, resulting in an additive model. The logit procedure allows examination of multiple contingency tables and suggests which main effects and interactions may be ignored while deriving expected values that are minimally different from the observed cell counts (Feinberg 1978).

The predictive efficiency of logit analysis (Greenberg 1979) was compared in this study to (PAA) Predictive Attributive Analysis (Wilkins and MacNaughton-Smith 1964) and a Burgess procedure (1928). PAA uses repeated division of a sample to produce hierarchical monothetic classes. The advantages of PAA over commonly used regression techniques include sensitivity to complex interactions, avoidance of additive linear assumptions, and simplicity for use in practice.

Despite their considerable theoretical relevance to predicting criminal behavior, these multivariate procedures do not seem to predict more accurately than the unweighted additive procedure introduced by Burgess (1928). The Burgess Method involves the use of attributive data, gives equal weight to all predictors irrespective of levels of association with outcome, and provides a simple summation of points. Each person
receives one point each time they appear in the highest recidivism category of predictors. Consequently there is no compensation for "overlapping" effects of predictors.

This study found no clear superiority in prediction among these statistics. This is the same general conclusion reached in prior research using different outcomes and samples (Simons 1971; Gottfredson and Gottfredson 1982). Benda concluded by saying "until better quality data are collected, powerful prediction tables are not feasible" (Benda 1989). Although this study was only one of the many studies involving predictive assessments, it left me with the feeling that as social scientists we are still a long way off from producing any valid indicators of crime or recidivism.

Even if we were able to predict which individuals are more likely to commit criminal behavior, it is doubtful we could do anything to deter them, merely because they have been identified as potential lawbreakers. Black (1984) has suggested imposing greater surveillance on those he describes as "potential deviants", through a method of "preventive patrol", in an effort to reduce the opportunities for deviants to victimize others. Yet others have suggested varying modes of deterrence as methods of social control. In this next section we will look at
deterrence theory from some of the leading experts and discuss the successes, failures and limitations of these methods of deterrence.

DETERRENCE

Deterrence has been described as a "primary and essential postulate" (Morris 1966) of almost all criminal law systems. In simplistic terms the theory of deterrence or "deterrence doctrine", is that threats of punishment can reduce crime by causing a change of heart, induced by the offensive nature of the specific consequences threatened (Zimring and Hawkins 1973; Currie 1985). Thus this theory of deterrence suggests that one considers their actions and on the basis of comparing the crime to the penalty, they decide whether or not to break the law.

The problem with this simple theory of deterrence is that it does not recognize the individual's personality, sense of right and wrong, or his otherwise law-abiding attitude (Zimring and Hawkins 1973). Another problem with this theory of deterrence is that it assumes the criminal always follows a rational calculation of costs to benefits. This seems quite illogical when we look at the vast amount of crime that is committed existentially. That is to say that many
crimes of violence are committed in the heat of the moment. In addition to this, if we factor in the effects of alcohol or drugs, the idea of a rational cost vs. benefits calculation seems highly unlikely.

Along with this subject of simple deterrence is the notion of "direct" deterrence, where the threat is assumed to be rather immediately followed by its effect. This is contrasted by "indirect" deterrence, which refers to policies that have the consequence of building moral commitment and reinforcing law-abiding patterns of conduct (Wood 1974). Thus indirect deterrence would appear to serve the purpose of goal solidarity by conforming deviant behavior to fit the norm.

It would seem that most professionals involved with the criminal justice system subscribe to the notion that fear of sanctions is a primary motivator and inhibitor of human conduct (Tittle 1980). However, just as these individuals hold fast to the idea that fear of punishment will cause people to obey the law, academics have been skeptical of that argument (Wood 1974; Gibbs 1975; Tittle 1980; Lauder 1985; Currie 1985), and rejecting of the means-ends perspective.

Tittle and Logan (1973) reviewed the literature regarding the deterrent effect of sanctions and concluded that "enough suggestive evidence has been
compiled to warrant systematic research efforts and to mandate serious theoretical consideration of the role of sanctions in human behavior and social organization" (Tittle and Logan 1973). They outlined what they felt to be the important questions concerning sanctions that needed to be answered and encouraged their colleagues to help resolve some of these questions. Since that time, interest in the effect of sanctions on deterrence has been one of the more popular issues in the study of deviance and social control (Tittle 1975).

Some students of deterrence have examined the problem of establishing empirically the relationship between punishment and crime rates (Andenaes 1966). Andenaes has suggested that punishment may educate the general population to the consequences of criminal behavior, thereby reinforcing social norms. This would imply that the mere knowledge of the schedule of punishments may prevent some offenders from committing illegal acts (Cramer 1987).

If the threat of punishment does serve to constrain behavior, then it would follow that as punishment increases, crime rates would decrease, which has not always been the case (Andenaes 1966; Medea and Thompson 1974; Radzinowicz and King 1977; Box-Grainger 1982; Box and Hale 1984; Currle 1985). However, Wilson and Boland (1976) demonstrated that the arrest rate was
negatively related to robbery rates, as measured by victimization data for 26 cities. This relationship held even when adjustments were made for race, employment and population.

When this deterrence theory does seem to be working there are many "non-deterrent" variables that are usually unaccounted for in the research (Gibbs 1975; Klepper and Nagin 1989). The earlier reference to the Andeneas study which suggested that by educating the general public to the consequences of crime might constrain some likely offenders, would serve as an example of non-deterrence. Another non-deterrent mechanism worth mentioning is incapacitation, or the fact that by simply removing those from society who are likely to commit offenses repeatedly, the crime rate would be reduced.

Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin (1972), in a cohort analysis of delinquency found that the chronic repeaters comprised 6% of the cohort, but were responsible for 52% of the delinquent acts. While on the surface, this argument for incapacitation makes sense in a simplistic way, others argue that simply by locking up the repeat offenders only allows other criminally inclined individuals to take their place on the streets (Zimring 1982; Currie 1985).
As I mentioned in the Introduction, criminologists and other professionals have been relatively unsuccessful in their attempts to establish any valid indicators of criminal behavior (Cohen 1973; Blumstein and Koch 1980; Floud and Young 1981). Therefore the task of identifying which criminals are more likely to become serious offenders is at the very least questionable and perhaps inconsistent with the notion of justice and fairness in sentencing (Chalken and Chalken 1982).

It is even more difficult to predict which of these repeat offenders are likely to commit violent crimes or offenses at a particularly high rate (Currie 1985). This dilemma has forced some to argue in favor of "selective incapacitation" (Greenwood and Abrahamse 1982). Despite much criticism, Greenwood and Abrahamse claim to have developed newer and better means of separating high-risk offenders from the rest. By selecting which of the repeat offenders are more likely to be involved in violent crimes or responsible for a higher incident of crimes, they assert we can achieve a better level of crime prevention by incarcerating this group for longer periods of time (Greenwood and Abrahamse 1982).

Despite whatever criticisms may be advanced against Greenwood and Abrahamse, their study is at least partially consistent with my thesis. I too am
interested in deterring criminal behavior by finding valid indicators for determining which individuals are more likely to be involved in criminal behavior. Unlike Greenwood and Abrahamse however, I have no interest in preventing crime by the incarceration of criminals, but in trying to prevent individuals from ever entering into a life of crime altogether.

This concludes chapter 2. In the next chapter I will explain and discuss the methodology employed in conducting this study, including the development and administration of the questionnaire which is central to this thesis. In chapter three I will also give some background into my interest and involvement in this study.
ENDNOTES

CHAPTER 3: THE METHODOLOGY

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This chapter deals primarily with the questionnaire used to gather the data regarding this thesis. The actual questionnaire can be found in Appendix A (p. 112).

I would like to begin by giving a background on the development of the questionnaire. As I mentioned in the introduction, my initial interest in this study began out of a concern for the number of juveniles committing serious, often violent, crimes. The original questionnaire was designed for a graduate sociology methods course project. It was my intent to interview juveniles who had been convicted of serious crimes.

Some of the literature I had read at the time suggested a significant relationship between self-worth and deviant behavior (Hewitt and Jenkins 1946; Eysenck 1964; Albrow 1974; Rosenberg 1979). Other literature suggested a relationship between certainty of punishment and deviant behavior (Antunes and Hunt 1972; Tittle and Logan 1973; Zimring and Hawkins 1973; Morrison 1988). This lead me to question whether there was a significant relationship between self-worth and
certainty of punishment, with the notion that if there was a positive correlation between the two variables, could certainty of punishment be increased by enhancing one‘s feelings of self-worth? The hypotheses then would be:

a) The Null Hypothesis: There is no statistically significant relationship between an inmate’s feelings of self-worth and certainty of punishment. Nor, do either of these two variables have any relationship to the likelihood of an individual to commit criminal behavior.

b) The Research Hypothesis: There is a statistically significant relationship between an inmate’s feelings of self-worth and certainty of punishment. As feelings of self-worth increase, feelings regarding certainty of punishment will increase. Further, though not tested by this thesis, as self-worth and certainty of punishment increase, crime rates will decrease.

Unfortunately for my project, juveniles being held in state facilities are wards of the state in which they are being held. Those officials in charge of their well-being are extremely reluctant to permit any kind of research on juveniles, particularly by graduate
students. This did not preclude me from writing directly to the juveniles (some of whom had now become adults), which I did. I wrote to eight males whose cases I had discovered through reading newspaper articles. Of the eight individuals that I wrote to, only one wrote back, but he declined to be interviewed at the advice of his attorney, fearing it could hurt his chances for appeal.

Sensing this project could become a complete washout, I decided to make some changes to the questionnaire and interview adult inmates of penal institutions. There are fewer institutional restrictions regarding interviewing adult inmates than there are for juveniles. As I mentioned in the introduction, I wrote to officials of four southwestern states: Arizona, California, Nevada and Oklahoma. These states were chosen due to their close geographical proximity to me and the fact that I was operating on a very limited budget.

Officials of the State of Arizona granted me permission, but the date they had in mind was not feasible for the timely completion of this project. Upon receiving approval from the States of Nevada and California, I then wrote to the individual institutions to set up a date to visit. Dr. Robert Dickover, Director of Prison Research for the State of California
chose the State Correctional Center at Tehachapi (maximum security), since it was within reasonable driving time from my home and would give me a feel for their prison systems in general.

Mr. Ron Angelone, Prison Director for the State of Nevada, granted me permission to visit the sites at Jean and Indian Springs, Nevada (medium security section). Also, Mr. Michael Sheldon, Director of Detention and Correctional Services for the City of Las Vegas, granted me permission to conduct my interviews at the Stewart-MoJave Detention Center (minimum security). I felt these four sites gave me a good mix of minimum, medium and maximum security facilities, although the sample sizes differed.

THE QUESTIONNAIRE CONSTRUCTION

The first portion of the questionnaire was designed to gather some general demographic information, before asking the sample members to answer a series of responses measured on a summated attitude scale. Response choices varied from strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, to strongly disagree. Responses were assigned values of strongly agree=1, agree=2, uncertain=3, disagree=4, and strongly disagree=5. By
assigning numerical values to the responses I was able to use the interval level of measurement.

Although the sample was gathered by convenience and not randomly drawn, I was still able to use a parametric test of significance because I was not attempting to infer the results of this data to the population from which the sample was drawn. The questionnaire can be viewed in its entirety in Appendix A (p.112).

Questions 1-22 were designed to gather descriptive data only and as mentioned no valid inferences to the population can be drawn due to the small sample size and the manner with which the sample has been gathered, by convenience. Questions 23-32 relate to the respondents feelings of self-worth (independent variable) and were pre-coded with scores of 1-5 respectively, depending on the intended measure of strength of the response. Questions 33-37 were designed to gather information relating to the respondent's feelings regarding certainty of punishment (dependent variable). The same scoring method was used to measure the responses to this variable as was used to measure feelings of self-worth.

Question 38, an open-ended question, was included to allow the respondents an opportunity to add any further information not already included in the
questionnaire and to discover any possible patterns for use in future questionnaires.

**QUESTIONS 1-9**

Questions 1-5 related to sex, age, education and race/ethnicity respectively. They were designed to give me a description of the sample, and for possible use in regression analysis of the data. On the original questionnaire I had broken out question 5 regarding race to include the various Hispanic combinations (i.e. Cuban, Caribbean, S. American, Hispanic and black, etc.). At the request of Mr. Angelone, this question was changed to its current format. Mr. Angelone's objection to this question centered around his feelings that the question made Hispanics look like an "other" category.

Questions 6-9 and 18-22 were left over from the original plan to interview juveniles. I decided to leave them in mostly out of curiosity and to see what kind of data would be generated. There have been numerous studies linking family size to delinquency (Hirschl 1969; Wadsworth 1979; West 1982;), with little consensus. Hirschl (1969) believed that large families were breeding grounds for delinquency because parental authority was not extensive enough to punish all the
children when necessary. Wadsworth (1979) study of British children discovered that children who come from a large family had a significantly increased likelihood to become delinquent. This was true however only for those boys whose fathers were manual workers. West (1982), concurred with Wadsworth's findings only to the extent that the relationship between delinquency and family size existed for those whose financial resources could not provide adequate living accommodations. It would appear then that income is a possible control variable in determining the relationship between family size and delinquent behavior.

**QUESTIONS 18-20**

These questions, though not directly related to my thesis, came from the earlier draft of the questionnaire designed for juveniles. The justification for questions 18-20, which dealt with physical, sexual or psychological abuse before the age of 18 years old, came out of a review of the literature regarding the effects of childhood abuse. Several prison officials and other "advisors" tried to encourage me from leaving these questions out, citing their belief that the inmates would not answer the questions, or not answer them honestly. McCann, Sakheim and Abrahamson (1988)
synthesized theoretical and empirical findings about psychological responses to traumatization across survivors of rape, childhood sexual or physical abuse, domestic violence, crime, disasters and the Vietnam war.

Self-esteem, anger, and antisocial behavior were among the post-traumatic reactions to childhood victimization that this study looked at. They determined that decreased self-esteem was a universal response to victimization, a response that may be associated with the experience of oneself as helpless and vulnerable. Regarding anger, they found that the anger of victims typically involved the need to find someone to blame for their misfortune. They found that there is no empirical evidence for aggressive or antisocial behavior patterns among female victims of rape or victims of domestic violence, crime, and disasters, but that some child victims exhibit aggressive or antisocial patterns (McCann, Sakheim and Abrahamson 1988).

In a 40-year follow-up study of men who were treated as part of the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study, 50% of those men with childhood abuse histories had been convicted for more serious crimes (McCord 1983). In a nonrandom retrospective study of psychiatric inpatients, men with childhood abuse
histories were more likely to have abused others and to have had more criminal involvement than women with a similar history (Carmen, Recker, & Mills 1984). In this same study, male victims were also more likely to express anger-aggression directly, while female victims were more likely to direct anger-aggression at themselves.

Widom (1989), conducted a cohort study of 908 cases involving abuse and neglect in which the victim was 11 years of age or less. She used a control group matched as closely as possible on the basis of sex, age, race and approximate family socioeconomic status during the time period under study (1967-1971). The findings concluded that abused and neglected children have a higher likelihood of arrests for delinquency, adult criminality and violent criminal behavior than the control group. In comparison to the control group, abused and neglected children overall have more arrests as juveniles (26% vs. 17%), more arrests as an adult (29% vs. 21%), and more arrests for any violent offense (11% vs. 8%). Further it was determined that early childhood victimization has demonstrable long-term consequences for delinquency, adult criminality, and violent criminal behavior (Widom 1989).

Again, while this information was not used for testing my thesis, I felt it would make for interesting
analysis and provide me with some raw data regarding
the prevalence of abuse in my sample.

QUESTIONS 10-17. 21-22

Questions 10-17 were used to gather a sense of
transition from juvenile delinquency to adult
criminality. Surveys of the literature on this
transition (Langan & Farrington 1983; Blumstein et al.
1986) are unanimous in reporting that, with samples of
different nature and origin, from 30% to 60% of
adolescents arrested by the police or convicted by a
court will have a criminal record as adults. Le Blanc
& Frechette (1989), found that based on convictions,
there exists a clear connection between juvenile
delinquency and adult crime.

Questions 21 and 22 are again related to the
original plan to interview juveniles. I was curious to
know something about the respondent's school
experiences with regard to grades and popularity, in
order to gain some insight into the respondents sense
of global self-esteem. School performance and
popularity are considered indicators of a juvenile's
self-esteem (Coopersmith 1967; Purkey 1970), and
likelihood to be involved in deviant behavior (Stevens
1956; Williams & Cole 1968; Osborne 1986).
QUESTIONS 23-32 SELF-WORTH

The statements designed to measure self-worth came from a variety of sources. The first source is the Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Scale (RSE), one of the more widely used measures of self-esteem. Using the RSE, respondents are asked to strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following items:

1. On the whole I am satisfied with myself.
2. At times I think I am no good at all.
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
4. I am able to do things as well as most people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I certainly feel useless at times.
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

Another reference source used for designing measures of self-worth was the Coopersmith (1967) Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI). This test uses 58 questions related
to the respondent’s feelings regarding how others perceive him, particularly parents, teachers and peers.

The respondent is given a choice of "like me" or "unlike me", for responses to the statements. The following are just a few samples of the SEI:

1. My parents expect too much of me.
2. My teacher makes me feel I’m not good enough.
3. Most people are better liked than I am.
4. I can’t be depended on.
5. I’m often sorry for the things I do.
6. My parents and I have a lot of fun together.
7. I’m a failure.
8. I’m popular with kids my own age.

A third source of reference I used in developing measurements of self-worth was the Revised Janis-Fleld Self-Esteem Scale (1973). The typical procedure consists of having subjects evaluate themselves on a number of dimensions pertinent to the self-concept. Respondents are given the following instructions:

Write 1 if the statement describes you very often.
Write 2 if the statement describes you fairly often.
Write 3 if the statement describes you sometimes.
Write 4 if the statement describes you once in a great while.
Write 5 if the statement describes you practically never.

The following are a sample of some of those statements:

1. How often do you feel you are a successful person?
2. How often do you feel confident that some day people will look up to you and respect you?
3. How often do you have the feeling that there is nothing that you can do well?
4. How often do you feel inferior to most people you know?
5. How often do you feel that you dislike yourself?

Following the rationale behind the design of these questions and using information gained through a review of the literature (Coopersmith 1967; Rosenberg 1979; Mack and Ablon 1983; Osborne 1986; McDaniel and Bielen 1986; Brockner 1988), I designed the following 10 questions to measure self-worth in prison inmates:

1. I would describe myself as normal.
2. My teachers thought very highly of me.
3. I did a lot of things that could have gotten me arrested.
4. My parents never thought very much of me.
5. I get into more trouble than most people.
6. People who know me think I am basically a good person.
7. When I get out of prison, I will probably get arrested again within a few years.
8. People who know me think I am a trouble maker.
9. Most people think I will never amount to anything.
10. I believe I could be of help to society.

The questions appear as numbers 23-32 on the questionnaire. Although a few of the questions differ slightly in content from the resource material, I wanted questions that dealt more directly with prison inmates.

QUESTIONS 33-37 CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT

Questions 33-37 were designed to measure feelings regarding certainty of punishment. Previous studies chose to measure certainty of punishment by attempting to demonstrate a negative relationship between crime rates and the certainty and severity of punishment (Gibbs 1968; Tullock 1974; Tittle 1975).

Of the literature on this subject, I was able to find only one questionnaire that I felt attempted to measure certainty of punishment by asking respondents
to record their feelings regarding certain statements. The questionnaire was used by the National Evaluation Design for the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offender Program (1975). The questions were designed to determine if a juvenile was suitable for release into other programs or required more strict institutional care on the basis of their feelings regarding punishment. The remainder of the questions are a synthesis of ideas from the literature, informal discussions with district court judges, police probation and parole officers.

The following questions appear on the questionnaire as questions 33-37 and are designed to measure feelings regarding certainty of punishment:

1. It is okay to break the law if you have a good reason.
2. Most people who commit minor violations never get caught.
3. The only people who get caught for doing something illegal are stupid.
4. If you are careful, you could commit almost any crime and not get caught.
5. Only poor people go to jail.
FIELD VISITS

The questionnaire was pre-tested at the Stewart-Mojave Detention Center, located in Las Vegas, Nevada. The questionnaires were given to inmates (n=15) by the staff at intake and were self-administered. I dropped off the questionnaires on February 1, 1989 and picked them up on February 3, 1989. I returned to this site on February 15, 1989 and dropped off 100 questionnaires. Approximately one week later I called to pick-up the completed questionnaires (n=63).

Several months prior to receiving permission to administer the questionnaires at the sites of Jean and Indian Springs, I requested and was granted permission to visit and tour the two facilities several times. On September 28, 1988 I visited the Southern Nevada Desert Correctional Center, located in Jean, Nevada. I was granted permission to visit the site by then Warden Walter Luster.*

* As a side note to those who might be interested in visiting this institution, even though it is located in Jean, "jeans" are not permitted to be worn by visitors. This is because blue-jeans are the attire of the inmates. Needless to say, when I arrived wearing blue-jeans, I was sent back home (30 miles) to change clothes and returned later that same day.
On October 19, 1988, I visited the Southern Nevada Desert Correctional Center located in Indian Springs, Nevada. Permission for this visit was granted by Assistant Warden Phillip Smith. Visits to both sites proved informative and helpful and permitted me to see first-hand what prison life was like. Another advantage of visiting the sites prior to receiving permission to administer the questionnaires, was the ability to network and gain contacts for future visits. Further by visiting the sites, I was able to talk informally to the inmates about prison life and about what caused them to be incarcerated. This information proved useful in "fine-tuning" the questionnaire and in evaluating the data.

On April 6, 1989, I returned to Indian Springs to administer the questionnaires. Prior to this visit I sent flyers announcing my intentions. No remuneration was offered nor asked for and no special favors were granted to inmates for completing the questionnaires.

Using a small room near the library, I handed out the questionnaires to the inmates as they came in. Only a few of them needed help in completing the questionnaire, although some wanted to use this time to lobby their individual cases. On this visit I stayed a total of 6 hours and only 58 questionnaires were completed. The remaining questionnaires were left
behind for those who might complete them at a later time. This proved very worthwhile since another 21 were completed with the help of the staff in less than one week, giving me an \( n = 79 \) for this site.

On May 5, 1989 following the same procedure used for the visit to Indian Springs, I visited the site at Jean to administer the questionnaires. I was permitted to use a small room in the gymnasium and after four hours I had only gathered 35 completed questionnaires. As before, I left the remaining questionnaires to see if any would be completed at a later time. I checked back two weeks later, but no more had been completed. The total sample for this site was \( n = 35 \).

On July 26, 1989 I drove to the California Correctional Center in Tehachapi to administer the questionnaires. Originally it was determined that I was to be given a room to use in the men's maximum security facility, but because of a recent incident the officials felt they could not guarantee my safety. As a result of this I was not able to administer the questionnaires that day, but used this time to tour the facility and talk informally to the inmates. The questionnaires were left behind and completed by the inmates over the period of two weeks (\( n = 42 \)), with a total sample size for the four sites of (\( n = 219 \)).
All of the inmates were guaranteed complete anonymity as no names or other identifying information was requested, although two respondents wrote in their names anyway. As mentioned earlier, no remuneration of any kind was offered for completing the questionnaire, but one assistant warden suggested I offer five dollars to increase the sample size, which I declined as requested by the warden.

This concludes this chapter regarding the methodology used to design and administer the questionnaire. In the next chapter I will discuss the findings and results of the data. Also, in the next chapter I will describe the statistical analysis used to conclude the relationship between the variables of self-worth and certainty of punishment. Furthermore, I will give some of the demographic information and discuss some of the crosstabulation results.
CHAPTER 4: THE FINDINGS

This chapter contains the findings of my research involving the administration of questionnaires to inmates of four penal institutions. The data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). As mentioned earlier, values were assigned to the summated attitude responses, allowing for the use of an interval-level of measurement. The entire frequency distribution for the data can be found in Appendix B (p. 119), also the data can be reviewed by using the tables section (p. 92).

DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN

The sample consisted of 44 females and 175 males. The mean age of the sample was 29 years, with a range of 17 years old to 67 years old. The mean educational level was 11.7 years, with the mode being 12 years of education. Racially the sample broke down accordingly; American Indian=14, Asian=4, Black=80, Hispanic=28, White=76, and Other=17. The sample reported a mean family size of 3.23, with 3 family members being the mode. A total of 59% of the sample were serving a sentence of 2 years or less, while 19% of the sample were serving a sentence of from 2-5 years.
The greatest percentage of the inmates, comprising 22% of the sample, were in prison for narcotics related offenses. However, those charged with attempted robbery made up the next largest percentage of the sample (14%). This group was followed closely by those charged with attempted murder (13.5%) and prostitution (7%). Also of interest was the fact that 11% of the sample were in prison for multiple offenses, usually consisting of prostitution, theft, or an act of assault coupled with drug use. In fact, 38% of the sample admitted to using drugs at the time of their last arrest. Of this group 35% reported using alcohol, 18% cocaine, and 35% reported multiple drug use at the time of their last arrest.

I was cautioned about using the questions relating to sexual, physical and psychological abuse, by several individuals inside the penal system and from members of the academic community. However despite their objections that the inmates would not answer these questions, a sizable response was received. A total of 12% of the sample reported being the victims of sexual abuse before the age of 18, 22% of the sample reported being the victims of physical abuse, and 22% of the sample reported being the victims of psychological abuse before the age of 18.
The sample reported an average annual income of between $10,000 and $15,000, this figure was also the mode and the median reported income. I should note here that much income derived from street crime, particularly income received from drug use goes unreported or underreported by inmates to avoid detection by the Internal Revenue Service and others in the law enforcement community (Sudman and Ferber 1974, Weltz and Wright 1979, Warshaw 1980). Further considering the sizable number of inmates who were in prison for drug related offenses, it is reasonable to assume this figure would probably be much higher than was reported and is another reason why this data and any data relating to an inmates "reported" income should be viewed with skepticism.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The most appropriate statistical analysis for the data was a Pearson’s r, after having plotted the relationship between the variables on a scatter diagram. To obtain a value of r, I used the compute command to create two new variables labeled Factor1 and Factor2. Factor1 consisted of the sum of the variables normal, teacher, gotten, parnev, trouble, goodp, getout, trblmkr, anythin and society (questions 23-32).
These variables are the keyword abbreviations for the responses designed to measure self-worth, consequently their summation gave me a value for the variable self-worth. Factor2 consisted of the sum of the variables reason, minor, stupid, careful, and poor (questions 33-37).

These variables are keyword abbreviations for the responses designed to measure certainty of punishment, and their summation gave me a value for that variable. The next step in this procedure called for producing a correlation coefficient for the two variables Factor1 (self-worth) and Factor2 (certainty of punishment). That coefficient resulted in a Pearson's r=.47, a moderately strong positive relationship between the variables. This finding indicates that as feelings of self-worth increase, feelings regarding certainty of punishment increase.

The next question to be answered was, does the correlation coefficient represent a real correlation, or is it due to chance variation? To answer this it was necessary to convert the value of r into a z score. Using the requisite formula for this computation and keeping in mind the fact that the null hypothesis was non-directional, I computed a z score of z=6.82. The critical value for r at the .01 level of confidence would require a z=2.58 or greater to reject the null
hypothesis. Since my calculated z of 6.82 was greater than 2.58, I can safely assume that there is a statistically significant relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment.

The next step to be examined regarding these findings would be to determine if the relationship was spurious, that is due to extraneous variables. To analyze this aspect I used a multiple regression technique. Using as my dependent variable the same variables that were summed together to get a value for certainty of punishment, I entered the variables of education, income, race, and age, in that order as my independent variables, even though race is a nominal level variable.

One of the more significant findings was the relationship between "education" and the variable "reason". You will recall the variable reason comes from the statement "it is okay to break the law if you have a good reason". I discovered a relationship between these two variables of r=-.17, indicating that as education increases feelings of certainty of punishment might decrease slightly. However this finding did not hold up when education was compared with the summated variable of certainty of punishment, revealing an r=.14. No other findings surfaced from this technique that would indicate to me the spurious
effect education, income, race or age might have on the relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment.

I computed coefficients between the variables and within the variables to examine their relationship. The strongest relationship was between "reason" (it is okay to commit a crime if you have a good reason), and "getout" (when I get out of prison I will probably get arrested again within a few years) $r=.39$. This was followed by the relationship between "trbimkr" (people who know me think I am basically a troublemaker) and "stupid" (the only people who get caught for something illegal are stupid), with an $r=.38$.

When measuring within the variable of self-worth, I discovered some interesting relationships between the variables comprising self-worth. The relationship between "trbimkr" and "anythin" (most people who know me think I will never amount to anything) was $r=.55$. The relationship between "trbimkr" and "getout" was $r=.51$, and the relationship between "anythin" and "getout" was .48. I concluded from this that those individuals who felt others viewed them as troublemakers or that they would never amount to anything, also felt strongly that they would return to prison again soon.
CROSSTABULATION

I then used crosstabulation between the variables to control for such factors as age, education, race, sex, and family size to determine their effect on the relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment (see crosstabulation tables in tables section, p.92). The most salient observation from this technique is the pattern that arises from this procedure. If you look in the tables section, you will see that in most cases, the lowest number of the respondents fall within the self-worth low/certainty of punishment high quadrant. This is generally followed by self-worth low/certainty of punishment low, self-worth high/certainty of punishment low. The category garnering the highest overall response in terms of respondents was self-worth high/certainty of punishment high. In most cases this quadrant contained about 70% of the response.

Table 4 demonstrates the relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment. Cutting points for high and low were determined by computing the total score one could receive for self-worth (10-50) and the total score for certainty of punishment (5-25) and dividing by two. I chose this procedure since the simple logic of it best served my purpose and was also
used in several other studies using self-worth (Coopersmith 1967; Rosenberg 1985).

These findings demonstrate that the majority of those having a high self-worth (80%), felt that if they had committed a crime they were certain of punishment. As mentioned earlier this relationship remains relatively unchanged as I control for the different variables. While the pattern remains the same, the greatest disparity between them occurs in Table 11 (self-worth by certainty of punishment, controlling for age). This can be seen in the age group 53-68, where 63% of the sample demonstrating high self-worth also expressed a high certainty of punishment. Furthermore, 100% of those scoring low in self-worth demonstrated a low certainty of punishment. I attribute this disparity to the small sample size of this age group (n=10), which accounts for less than 5% of the total sample size of 219. However this finding might demonstrate the need for further research into the affect age might have on certainty of punishment.

This disparity is again seen in Table 12, where family size is the control variable. All of the family size groups demonstrate approximately the same pattern as mentioned earlier, except when we come to the category of family size 9 or more. Although the same basic pattern remains unchanged, the quadrant of
self-worth high/certainty of punishment high only reaches 57% of this group. Again this may be explained by the small n=9, but other factors may also be a consideration. It occurred to me that with so many family members in a household it is quite likely that one's deviant behavior could escape detection or punishment simply because parental control is spread so thin. This would be consistent with the findings of Hirshi (1969), relating family size to deviant behavior, mentioned earlier in the thesis. Hirshi concluded that as family size increased above a certain level, family members would be more likely to engage in delinquent behavior.

Another table I would like to draw your attention to is Table 13, where the control variable is length of time in custody. Again the pattern remains relatively unchanged, except for those individuals who have been in custody more than 16 years of their life. All of those with a low self-worth (100%) also demonstrated a low certainty of punishment. This group represents about 11% of the total sample so it would not be natural to assume the disparity can be attributed to low sample size (n=24). Furthermore, this finding is consistent with other studies (Hannum and Borgen 1978, Mueller 1983, Pillsbury 1983), which measure the negative effect incarceration has on self-esteem.
Further research would be required on this age group, with a much larger sample size, in order to accurately determine the effect of incarceration on the variables of self-worth and certainty of punishment.

Education is the control variable in table 14, where the sample is divided into two groups, 10 years of education or less and more than 10 years of education. While both groups had a majority (80%) demonstrating a high self-worth/high certainty of punishment, of those scoring low in self-worth/low certainty of punishment, 67% had less than 10 years of education and 80% of those with more than 10 years of education showed a low self-worth/low certainty of punishment. The group with more than 10 years of education contained 78% of the total sample size. 10 years of education or less was used as the cutting point based on similar studies linking education to deviance (Elliot and Huizinga 1984; Hirshi 1984).

I also compared the independent variable of self-worth by education, gender, race and age to see how the groups differentiated. The variable of self-worth was split between high and low measures, with similar patterns emerging as in the other comparisons, with very little deviation. Of those groups scoring high in self-worth, blacks and whites scored the highest (38% and 36% respectfully), followed
by hispanics (12%). When comparing high self-worth by age, the highest percentage was recorded by the age group 17-34 (76%), followed by 35-52 (21%), while the age group 53-70 made up only 3% of the group scoring high in self-worth. Again, this might be explained by the low sample size or the incarceration effect as mentioned previously. However, of those scoring low in self-worth, the majority 85% were in the age group 17-34.

Some notable distinctions were made in the comparison of self-worth with education. The majority of those with a high self-worth (80%), had more than 10 years of education and 20% with 10 years of education or less. When comparing self-worth by gender, we see that the majority of those demonstrating a high self-worth, 81% were males and 19% females. However, 72% of those scoring a low self-worth were also males.

OPEN-ENDED QUESTION

Question 38 was an open-ended question which asked the respondent to answer why they felt they were in prison now. As mentioned earlier this question was included to allow the respondent a chance to air out their feelings in addition to providing me with some possible future questions.
The respondents were permitted to list as many statements as they desired, with most putting one or two responses and some as many as 5. As you might imagine the responses were not only quite interesting but varied from each respondent. I managed to put the nearly 500 responses into 42 major categories, ranging from poor legal counsel, drugs, associates, to upbringing, with a mix of categories in between. The most often cited reason was an admission of guilt for having disobeyed the law listed 57 times, followed by drug use listed 42 times. Responses related to low self-worth were listed only 8 times, although in informal discussions with inmates they were more apt to cite their feelings of low self-esteem.

To conclude this chapter on the findings, I would like to stress the relationship between the variables of self-worth and certainty of punishment, particularly as they were presented in the crosstabulation tables. There does appear to be a significant relationship between these two variables, even when other factors such as age, education, race and gender are controlled for. These findings demonstrate a positive relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment, with the conclusion being that as feelings of self-worth increase feelings of certainty of punishment increase proportionately.
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The data presented in chapter 4 shows some evidence for my thesis that there is a relationship between the variables of self-worth and certainty of punishment. Further the data suggests there is a positive relationship between these two variables. In trying to understand the relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment, I have concluded that the two are not just related but in fact may influence the likelihood of an individual to get involved with deviant behavior, given previously cited research (Andeneas 1966; Maslow 1970; Rosenberg 1979; et. al.).

If, however, I were only to establish a link between the two variables, the information would have been relatively meaningless. However, as mentioned earlier, other studies have shown certainty of punishment to be a deterrent to criminal behavior (Antunes and Hunt 1972; Tittle and Logan 1973; Zimring and Hawkins 1973), therefore any demonstrable relationship between certainty of punishment and self-worth could provide criminologists with a tool to reduce the rising crime rate.

The information provided by this work shows some evidence for the notion that the two variables are
related in a positive fashion, and any efforts that might increase self-worth should also increase certainty of punishment. This thesis demonstrates the need for further research into this relationship. This paper has explored the effect of self-worth on certainty of punishment utilizing inmates of penal institutions and the data does suggest certain policy relevance.

CRITICISMS

The first criticism I want to extend toward this study is the manner with which the sample was gathered, that being by convenience. Of course it would have been desirable to have a larger sample size, randomly gathered, containing significantly representative age, racial and gender groups, but it was not possible given my resources. I expect those who are well versed in quantitative methods to attack this study from the question of statistical power - the power of a test to correctly reject the null when the null is false and should be rejected. These tests are generally the parametric tests, such as the t test or F ratio, which require the sample to be randomly drawn and the use of interval-level data. Again, I want to remind the reader that I make no attempt to extrapolate the
information to the larger population from which it was
drawn.

The greatest criticism I can extend about the
questionnaire is the same one I have of every measuring
instrument - that being the question of validity. Does
it really measure what it is supposed to measure? To
answer that question as it applies to my questionnaire,
I would like to address it in sections. To reiterate,
the questionnaire calls for a measure of two variables,
1) an inmate’s feelings of self-worth (independent
variable), and 2) certainty of punishment (dependent
variable).

Statements 23-32 were designed to measure feelings
of self-worth and 33-37 were designed to measure
certainty of punishment. While I was able to find a
plethora of information pertaining to measuring
self-worth, there was a paucity of information for
measuring certainty of punishment. Any future studies
into this relationship should include more statements
designed to gather an individual's feelings about
certainty of punishment. Hopefully some of the
information provided by my experience can be used by
other researchers interested in examining the
relationship.

Question 33 (it is okay to break the law if you
have a good reason) should be dropped from any future
questionnaires as a measure of certainty of punishment, since it relates more to lawbreaking than it does to punishment. I would replace it with more direct questions such as: "people who commit crimes are usually punished", or "for the most part I have been punished for almost every crime I have ever committed", or "no crime ever goes completely unpunished." I feel these questions are a better measure of certainty of punishment because they deal more directly with the issue of punishment as it relates to crime.

The pragmatist in me, after gathering the sample, had to ask if I could believe the respondents. After all, these were people in prison, many of them convicted of some very serious offenses. Are they believable? Could they just be saying what they think I or somebody else may want to hear?

While this same criticism could be made of respondents to any questionnaire, my experience in field visits taught me that most convicts spend a great deal of time figuring out how they can get back outside. They were always calculating methods to profess their innocence, and seldom missed an opportunity to do so. It is highly conceivable then that their responses were biased by the fact that although they were assured anonymity, they could not be sure whose eyes would be seeing their responses.
Hence, any chance to proclaim their innocence and worthiness should not be passed up. Conversely, they should not risk self-incrimination regarding questions related to drug use, prior convictions or personality flaws, particularly if it could jeopardize their chances for parole.

One final criticism of the questionnaire centers around the fact that approximately 57% of them, or 126 questionnaires, were administered by the staffs of the respective penal institutions. While I do not question the integrity or qualifications of these staff members, I would suspect that some respondents might have felt pressured to answer questions differently than if staff members were not present. Also, since I was not available for any questions respondents might have had regarding the questionnaire, I have to trust the staff was able to correctly answer them.

FUTURE STUDY

It is my hope that this thesis has laid the groundwork for future studies into the relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment. In the literature review of chapter 1, I discussed my surprise at not being able to find any studies that directly addressed the relationship between these two variables.
Certainly with the massive volume of literature on self-esteem, there should be more research on the effects of self-esteem on other psychological imperatives such as certainty of punishment.

The data I have presented suggests the importance of further examining the relationship between these two variables, if only to validate the existence of a relationship. But beyond that, we need to know the effect incarceration plays on an individual in terms of assessing self-worth and certainty of punishment. To accomplish this it would be desirable to have a control group, or even two control groups. One group would consist of individuals outside of the prison system, having no record for prior arrests. The other group would consist of short-term, first time offenders. The experimental group would contain prison inmates with a long history of incarceration. By comparing the data from the two control groups and the experimental group, the researcher should be able to ascertain if length of incarceration plays any role in an individuals feelings about self-worth and certainty of punishment.

Another future study might involve a pre-test/post-test study to determine the effect of incarceration. This would consist of administering the questionnaire to a sample as they begin their sentence and then retesting the same group approximately five or
ten years later, providing they are in prison for that length of time, to determine the effect of incarceration on self-worth and certainty of punishment.

**POLICY RELEVANCE**

In 1986 the California Legislature voted to establish a State Task Force to Promote Self-Esteem, and Personal and Social Responsibility (State of California 1986). One of the primary purposes of this Task Force was to "promote public and personal awareness of the role of developing healthy self-esteem as a way of preventing social problems", according to the preliminary report. Among the social problems identified were violence and crime, alcoholism, drug abuse, academic failure, and failure of responsible citizenship.

It is clearly implied by this Task Force that low self-esteem is the cause of these social problems and not the effect, to imply otherwise would make their efforts pointless. Whether low self-esteem is the cause of all of these social problems is unproven, but data from other studies indicates that it does contribute to the occurrence of delinquency (Rosenberg, Schooler and Schoenbach 1989). Therefore, efforts to raise a juvenile's self-esteem would be deemed
justified and necessary if we are to curb incidences of juvenile delinquency.

The California Commission also addressed the problem of academic failure when they voted to establish the Task Force. The policy relevance of this thesis would be to introduce changes into the school system that would enhance self-esteem, and identify those students who suffer from a poor self-esteem. Some researchers have questioned the effectiveness enhanced self-esteem efforts have had on improving academic performance (Sheirer and Kraut 1979), while others have encouraged more radical changes to the educational system that would ensure better academic performance by enhancing self-esteem (Glasser 1969; Gold 1978).

Finally, by testing juveniles who are just beginning to get involved with problems of delinquency (i.e. runaway, truancy, curfew, petty theft, etc.), counselors can identify which individuals may benefit from programs designed to enhance self-esteem. It is my hope that by doing so we may be able to stem the ever-increasing tide of young people entering into the criminal justice system or beginning what will become a lifetime of crime.
SOCIOLOGICAL RELEVANCE

So much of the body of literature in sociology seems to be filled with explanations about deviance. The French sociologist Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) laid the groundwork for all of the social scientists who followed with his contributions to the study of deviance, particularly with his concept of social facts. While Durkheim had his share of critics, few others had the same impact in the field of deviant behavior, at least until the prominence of the early American sociologists of the Chicago School. It was at this point in time that a different sociological approach to studying deviant behavior, social pathology, was advanced. Work by Robert Park and Ernest W. Burgess (2), W. I. Thomas (3), George Herbert Mead (4), and others began to shift the focus of their study to a middle-level of sociological analysis.

Lewis Coser (b.1913) followed Durkheim, Thomas, Mead, and even Marx, in studying deviance, particularly from the conflict perspective. His contributions to the study of deviant behavior include the cross-cutting allegiances that can both bind a society together and generate conflict and struggles. This approach was another advance in the study of deviance in that it allowed for the opinion that internal conflict can
actually increase a group's survival and cohesion.

Coser argued that a group's opposition to and conflict with deviants would make apparent to the members of the group what behavior was appropriate.(6)

All of this leads us to modern day criminological thought. Just as modern day tools and machinery have advanced the production of materials and agricultural products, so too have the efforts of all those who came before advanced the field of criminological thought.

But that is where the comparison ends, and the criticism begins. Although we have come a long way from Durkheim's social facts in our ability to identify, categorize, label and theorize about deviance, we have really only just scratched the surface of the problem when it comes to solving the issue of deviance, with particular respect to the methods of social control.

Certainly there are many crimes committed purely out of deprivation, by those individuals who are poor, cold and hungry and just want to survive. But I assert that these individuals and their crimes make up a very small minority of those people entering the criminal justice system. If they were the majority, the problem could be easily solved by instituting programs that provide employment training, programs that offer assistance in the way of food and housing, the very
same programs that have been around at least since the reform movement of the 1920's in the United States.

I have learned from this study that the causes of crime are many and varied, and to suggest that all crime will suddenly come to a screeching halt if we were able to instill high levels of self-esteem into every one is ludicrous. Further, I believe many crimes are committed on an existential level. That is to say an individual may only intend to rob a house, but when faced with the occupant of that house, he may decide to rape and/or kill the occupant even though that was not his original intent. Then upon leaving the house, he may even burn it down in the hopes of destroying evidence. So what we have is someone who starts out to commit a robbery and ends up committing rape, arson and murder. This may well be the justification by many judges when determining sentences. They are examining not just the end result of some criminal act, but the importance of that particular instance when the crime is actually committed, without regard to the abstractions.

I also believe, if only at an empirical level, that self-worth does play a role in determining whether or not an individual will commit certain types of deviant behavior. From my interviews with inmates and field visits, I have heard many individuals express this
concern about the bulk of the inmates who now make up our ever-growing prison population. These individuals have long since given up on society and themselves to recognize their worth as people capable of contributing positively to society. Instead they seek to identify themselves with that element of society we have labeled deviant and unworthy of participating in society on a level of equality with those who regard themselves as the norm or morally superior.

Once while standing in the prison yard in Jean, Nevada, the guard and I were just looking out into the yard watching the inmates interact, and he said to me; "Look around this yard. You see all those guys? They’re the same way in the joint as they were on the outside! If they were fuck-offs and hang-arounds on the outside, that is what they are here. If they were the kind to keep to themselves, or work, or take classes, that is what they do on the inside. The joint doesn’t change anybody."

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

While the criticisms of this study will certainly extend far beyond those that I have offered here, I feel it is only fair to mention that much of the work I spent on this project has been edited out because it is
irrelevant to this thesis. Nonetheless, I have learned a great deal about the workings of the criminal justice system and something about what makes convicts tick.

The importance of my findings demonstrate three fundamental issues of interest: 1) the need for more research into the relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment; 2) the importance of establishing early intervention methods, both at home and at school, for the identification and enhancement of self-esteem; and 3) the need for educators, counselors, and others to apply these methods in order to make a significant contribution to eliminating the problems of crime in society.

It is my sincere hope that those who will read this thesis, especially those who are interested in the field of education, or working with youngsters, will try to make every effort to find the worthiness in each person, as an individual, even the bad children. And beyond this, to help those who seem to have lost their way with regard to their own self-worth.

The time has come for sociologists to brush off the "dirt" from the seats of our pants, in the same fashion that Robert Park encouraged his students when he said:

"Go sit in the lounges of the luxury hotels and on the doorsteps of the flop-
houses; sit on the Gold Coast settees and on the slum shakedowns; sit in Orchestra Hall and in the Star and Garter Burlesk. In short, gentlemen, go get the seats of your pants dirty in real research." (7)

The day has come for sociologists to apply the knowledge we have gathered from doing "real research", and to make others listen to what we have to offer. I feel I have found an important, albeit unsubstantiated, relationship between self-worth and certainty of punishment. It is my wish that others will use this new knowledge to further their own research into the problems of crime and social control.

Surely, in this last decade of the 20th Century, social scientists have more to offer humanity than just theory. If in fact qualitative research began as a precursor to the reform movement in the United States, in the first decade of this century, then perhaps applied sociological techniques will begin to dominate the last decade of this century. If one of those techniques should be the identification and enhancement of self-worth in the individuals of society, I will take great pride in knowing I had some small part in the process.
ENDNOTES


TABLE 1: Coefficients for variables of self-worth and certainty of punishment. Variables across the top are Certainty of punishment, variables down the side are self-worth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>MINOR</th>
<th>STUPID</th>
<th>CAREFUL</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOTTEN</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARNEV</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROUBLE</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODP</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GETOUT</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRBLMKR</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANYTHIN</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIETY</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2: Coefficients for self-worth variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NORMAL</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>GOTTEN</th>
<th>PARNEV</th>
<th>TROUBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOTTEN</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARNEV</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROUBLE</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODP</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GETOUT</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRBLEMKR</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANYTHIN</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIETY</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GOODP</th>
<th>GETOUT</th>
<th>TRBLEMKR</th>
<th>ANYTHIN</th>
<th>SOCIETY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOTTEN</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARNEV</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TROUBLE</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOODP</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GETOUT</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRBLEMKR</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANYTHIN</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIETY</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3: Coefficients for certainty of punishment variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REASON</th>
<th>MINOR</th>
<th>STUPID</th>
<th>CAREFUL</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REASON</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUPID</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREFUL</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CROSSTABULATION TABLES

TABLE 4: Self-Worth by Certainty of Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>SELF-WORTH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=153)</td>
<td>(n=7)</td>
<td>(n=160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=39)</td>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td>(n=59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=192)</td>
<td>(n=27)</td>
<td>(n=219)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 34.78 p < .01

TABLE 5: Self-Worth by Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>SELF-WORTH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 YEARS</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR LESS</td>
<td>(n=31)</td>
<td>(n=19)</td>
<td>(n=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 YEARS</td>
<td>(n=125)</td>
<td>(n=44)</td>
<td>(n=169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=156)</td>
<td>(n=63)</td>
<td>(n=219)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 2.70 p < .01
### TABLE 6: Self-Worth by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>81% (n=157)</td>
<td>72% (n=18)</td>
<td>80% (n=175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19% (n=37)</td>
<td>26% (n=7)</td>
<td>20% (n=44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (n=194)</td>
<td>100% (n=25)</td>
<td>100% (n=219)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 1.11 p < .01

### TABLE 7: Self-Worth by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American-Indian</td>
<td>6% (n=12)</td>
<td>8% (n=2)</td>
<td>6% (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2% (n=3)</td>
<td>4% (n=1)</td>
<td>2% (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38% (n=74)</td>
<td>24% (n=6)</td>
<td>37% (n=80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12% (n=23)</td>
<td>20% (n=5)</td>
<td>13% (n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>36% (n=70)</td>
<td>24% (n=6)</td>
<td>35% (n=76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6% (n=12)</td>
<td>20% (n=5)</td>
<td>8% (n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (n=195)</td>
<td>100% (n=25)</td>
<td>100% (n=219)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 9.48 p < .01
### TABLE 8: Self-Worth by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SELF-WORTH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-34</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>(n=130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-52</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>(n=36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-70</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(n=171)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 11.20 p < .01

### TABLE 9: Self-Worth by Certainty of Punishment: Controlling for Race.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>SELF-WORTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 1.36 p < .01
### Asian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=0)</td>
<td>(n=0)</td>
<td>(n=0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 0.33 p < .01 (Yates Correction)

### Black

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=62)</td>
<td>(n=0)</td>
<td>(n=62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=74)</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>(n=80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 22.95 p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>(n=28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 2.55 p < .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>(n=52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
<td>(n=53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td>(n=23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(n=70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td>(n=76)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 8.67 p < .01
### Table 10: Self-Worth by Certainty of Punishment: Controlling for Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH</strong></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=10)</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
<td>(n=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW</strong></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=13)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{chi-square} = 3.62 \ p < .01 \]

### MALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH</strong></td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=120)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=122)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW</strong></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=37)</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=157)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
<td>(n=175)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{chi-square} = 32.65 \ p < .01 \]
### Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certainty of Punishment</th>
<th>Self-Worth</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>89% (n=33)</td>
<td>43% (n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11% (n=4)</td>
<td>57% (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (n=37)</td>
<td>100% (n=7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 8.53 p < .01

### Table 11: Self-Worth by Certainty of Punishment: Controlling for age.

#### Age Group 17-34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certainty of Punishment</th>
<th>Self-Worth</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>79% (n=117)</td>
<td>23% (n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21% (n=32)</td>
<td>77% (n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100% (n=149)</td>
<td>100% (n=22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 29.22 p < .01
### Age Group 35-52

**SELF-WORTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{chi-square} = .07 \ p < .01
\]

### Age Group 53-68

**SELF-WORTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\text{chi-square} = 1.50 \ p < .01 \text{ (Yates Correction)}
\]
TABLE 12: Self-Worth by Certainty of Punishment: Controlling for family size.

**Family Size 0-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>81% (n=72)</td>
<td>17% (n=1)</td>
<td>77% (n=73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>19% (n=17)</td>
<td>83% (n=5)</td>
<td>23% (n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100% (n=89)</td>
<td>100% (n=6)</td>
<td>100% (n=95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 13.03 p < .01

**Family Size 3-5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>82% (n=67)</td>
<td>27% (n=4)</td>
<td>73% (n=71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>18% (n=15)</td>
<td>73% (n=11)</td>
<td>27% (n=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100% (n=82)</td>
<td>100% (n=15)</td>
<td>100% (n=97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 19.59 p < .01
### Family Size 6-8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH</strong></td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=14)</td>
<td>(n=0)</td>
<td>(n=14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td>(n=1)</td>
<td>(n=18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 3.76 p < .01

### Family Size 9 or more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH</strong></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td>(n=0)</td>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=7)</td>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td>(n=9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 2.05 p < .01
TABLE 13: Self-Worth by Certainty of Punishment: Controlling for length of time in custody.

### 0-5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>SELF-WORTH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>(n=127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>(n=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(n=152)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 26.23 p < .01

### 6-15 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>SELF-WORTH</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>(n=13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 3.62 p < .01
More than 16 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>SELF-WORTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=10)</td>
<td>(n=0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=4)</td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=14)</td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{chi-square} = 12.26 \; p < .01\]

TABLE 14: Self-Worth by Certainty of Punishment: Controlling for education.

10 years or less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>SELF-WORTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=33)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=8)</td>
<td>(n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=41)</td>
<td>(n=9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{chi-square} = 8.14 \; p < .01\]
More than 10 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=123)</td>
<td>(n=3)</td>
<td>(n=126)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=31)</td>
<td>(n=12)</td>
<td>(n=43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=154)</td>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td>(n=169)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 25.80 p < .01

TABLE 15: Self-Worth by Certainty of Punishment: Controlling for income.

$0-10,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=50)</td>
<td>(n=5)</td>
<td>(n=55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=7)</td>
<td>(n=10)</td>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=57)</td>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td>(n=72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 19.49 p < .01
### $10,001-20,000

#### SELF-WORTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>78% (n=39)</td>
<td>0% (n=0)</td>
<td>75% (n=39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>22% (n=11)</td>
<td>100% (n=2)</td>
<td>25% (n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100% (n=50)</td>
<td>100% (n=2)</td>
<td>100% (n=52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = 6.24 p < .01

### $20,001-30,000

#### SELF-WORTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>78% (n=14)</td>
<td>0% (n=0)</td>
<td>78% (n=14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>22% (n=4)</td>
<td>0% (n=0)</td>
<td>22% (n=4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100% (n=18)</td>
<td>100% (n=0)</td>
<td>100% (n=18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

chi-square = .08 p < .01 (Yates Correction)
### $30,001-40,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 4.54 p < .01

### $40,001 AND ABOVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAINTY OF PUNISHMENT</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 4.32 p < .01

### TABLE 16: Education by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>FEMALES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 10 YEARS</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=135)</td>
<td>(n=36)</td>
<td>(n=171)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 YEARS OR LESS</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=32)</td>
<td>(n=16)</td>
<td>(n=48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=167)</td>
<td>(n=52)</td>
<td>(n=219)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square = 3.12 p < .01
TABLE 17: Key words used for the variables matched with the question number from which they were derived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE NAME</th>
<th>QUESTION #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dob</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marital</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lastof</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firsof</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firsage</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drugyes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>druguse</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifecus</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexabus</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phyabus</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psyabus</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grades</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gotten</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parnev</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trouble</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goodp</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>getout</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trblmkr</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anythin</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>society</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reason</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stupid</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careful</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

a (denotes the final copy after adjustments from pre-testing were made)

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY. AFTER EACH QUESTION, CIRCLE THE NUMBER CORRESPONDING WITH YOUR RESPONSE.

(EXAMPLE ONLY) WHAT IS YOUR HAIR COLOR?
1. BLACK
2. BLONDE
3. BROWN
4. RED
5. GRAY

1. WHAT IS YOUR SEX?
1. MALE
2. FEMALE

2. WHAT IS YOUR AGE? __________

3. WHAT IS YOUR DATE OF BIRTH? MONTH______ DAY______
   YEAR______

4. CIRCLE THE HIGHEST GRADE OF SCHOOL YOU HAVE COMPLETED?
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 MORE
   (grade school) (high school) (college)

5. WHAT IS YOUR RACIAL OR ETHNIC ORIGIN?
   a. 1. AMERICAN-INDIAN
      2. ASIAN
      3. BLACK
      4. HISPANIC
      5. WHITE
      6. OTHER (EXPLAIN)_____________________________________

6. HOW MANY FAMILY MEMBERS ARE CURRENTLY LIVING AT HOME?
   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 OR MORE

PLEASE GO TO THE NEXT PAGE
7. WHAT WAS THE TOTAL ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME AT THE TIME OF YOUR SENTENCING?
   1. $0-5,000
   2. 5,001-10,000
   3. 10,001-15,000
   4. 15,001-20,000
   5. 20,001-30,000
   6. 30,001-40,000
   7. 40,001-50,000
   8. 50,001-65,000
   9. 65,001-80,000
   10. MORE THAN 80,000

8. HOW MANY OF YOUR PARENTS ARE STILL LIVING?
   1. BOTH
   2. ONE
   3. NEITHER

9. WHAT WAS THE MARITAL STATUS OF YOUR PARENTS WHEN YOU LIVED WITH THEM?
   1. MARRIED
   2. DIVORCED
   3. SEPARATED
   4. SINGLE

10. WHAT IS THE LENGTH OF THE SENTENCE YOU ARE CURRENTLY SERVING?
    1. 0-24 MONTHS
    2. 2-5 YEARS
    3. 6-10 YEARS
    4. 11-15 YEARS
    5. 16-20 YEARS
    6. 21-30 YEARS
    7. MORE THAN 30 YEARS
    8. LIFE WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE
    9. LIFE WITHOUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAROLE
    10. DEATH PENALTY

11. IN WHAT STATE WERE YOU LAST SENTENCED? ____________________

PLEASE GO TO THE NEXT PAGE
12. FOR WHAT OFFENSE WERE YOU LASTED SENTENCED? (YOU MAY CIRCLE MORE THAN ONE IF IT APPLIES)
1. NARCOTICS (PLEASE CIRCLE A, B OR C)
   A. SELLING
   B. POSSESSING
   C. USING
2. AUTO THEFT
3. PROSTITUTION
4. THEFT
5. ARMED ROBBERY
6. ASSAULT
7. BATTERY
8. BURGLARY
9. RAPE
10. KIDNAPPING
11. MANSLAUGHTER
12. MURDER
13. OTHER (EXPLAIN) ________________________________

13. WHAT IS THE FIRST CRIME YOU REMEMBER COMMITTING?
1. NARCOTICS (PLEASE CIRCLE A, B OR C)
   A. SELLING
   B. POSSESSING
   C. USING
2. AUTO THEFT
3. PROSTITUTION
4. THEFT
5. ARMED ROBBERY
6. ASSAULT
7. BATTERY
8. BURGLARY
9. RAPE
10. KIDNAPPING
11. MANSLAUGHTER
12. MURDER
13. OTHER (EXPLAIN) ________________________________

14. WHAT AGE WERE YOU WHEN YOU COMMITTED YOUR FIRST CRIME?
1. UNDER AGE 10
2. 11-13
3. 14-16
4. 17-20
5. 21-24
6. 25-29
7. 30 YEARS OLD OR OLDER

PLEASE GO TO THE NEXT PAGE
15. AT THE TIME OF YOUR LAST ARREST, WERE YOU UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF ANY DRUGS? (INCLUDING ALCOHOL)
   1. YES
   2. NO

16. IF YOU ANSWERED YES TO THE LAST QUESTION, WHAT DRUG OR DRUGS WERE YOU USING? (YOU MAY CIRCLE MORE THAN ONE IF IT APPLIES)
   1. ALCOHOL
   2. COCAINE
   3. CRYSTAL
   4. HEROIN
   5. LSD
   6. MARIJUANA
   7. PCP
   8. QUALUDES
   9. SPEED
   10. OTHER (SPECIFY) ______________

17. HOW MANY YEARS OF YOUR LIFE HAVE YOU SPENT IN CUSTODY, INCLUDING PRISONS, JAILS OR JUVENILE DETENTION CENTERS?
   1. 0-2 YEARS
   2. 3-5 YEARS
   3. 6-10 YEARS
   4. 11-15 YEARS
   5. 16-20 YEARS
   6. 21-30 YEARS
   7. MORE THAN 30 YEARS

18. PRIOR TO THE AGE OF 18, WERE YOU THE VICTIM OF SEXUAL ABUSE?
   1. YES
   2. NO

19. PRIOR TO THE AGE OF 18, WERE YOU THE VICTIM OF PHYSICAL ABUSE?
   1. YES
   2. NO

20. PRIOR TO THE AGE OF 18, WERE YOU THE VICTIM OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE?
   1. YES
   2. NO

21. WHAT KIND OF GRADES DID YOU USUALLY GET IN SCHOOL?
   1. A
   2. B
   3. C
   4. D
   5. F

PLEASE GO TO THE NEXT PAGE
22. HOW POPULAR WERE YOU IN SCHOOL?
   1. VERY POPULAR
   2. POPULAR
   3. LIKED BY SOME/DISLIKED BY OTHERS
   4. UNPOPULAR
   5. VERY UNPOPULAR

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER CORRESPONDING WITH THE ANSWER THAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS.

23. I WOULD DESCRIBE MYSELF AS NORMAL.
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

24. MY TEACHERS THOUGHT VERY HIGHLY OF ME.
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

25. I DID A LOT OF THINGS THAT COULD HAVE GOTTEN ME ARRESTED.
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

26. MY PARENTS NEVER THOUGHT VERY MUCH OF ME.
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

27. I GET INTO MORE TROUBLE THAN MOST PEOPLE.
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

PLEASE GO TO THE NEXT PAGE
28. **PEOPLE WHO KNOW ME THINK I AM BASICALLY A GOOD PERSON.**
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

29. **WHEN I GET OUT OF PRISON I WILL PROBABLY GET ARRESTED AGAIN WITHIN A FEW YEARS.**
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

30. **PEOPLE WHO KNOW ME THINK I AM A TROUBLE MAKER.**
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

31. **MOST PEOPLE THINK I WILL NEVER AMOUNT TO ANYTHING.**
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

32. **I BELIEVE I COULD BE OF HELP TO SOCIETY.**
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

33. **IT IS OKAY TO BREAK THE LAW IF YOU HAVE A GOOD REASON.**
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

**PLEASE GO TO THE NEXT PAGE**
34. MOST PEOPLE WHO COMMIT MINOR VIOLATIONS NEVER GET CAUGHT.
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

35. THE ONLY PEOPLE WHO GET CAUGHT FOR DOING SOMETHING ILLEGAL ARE STUPID.
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

36. IF YOU ARE CAREFUL, YOU COULD COMMIT ALMOST ANY CRIME AND NOT GET CAUGHT.
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

37. ONLY POOR PEOPLE GO TO JAIL.
   1. STRONGLY AGREE
   2. AGREE
   3. DISAGREE
   4. STRONGLY DISAGREE
   5. UNCERTAIN

38. WHY DO YOU FEEL YOU ARE IN PRISON NOW?
   (list as many reasons as you like)

FINAL PAGE-THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
APPENDIX B

The following set of data are frequency tabulations made on the twenty-two general demographic and informational questions entered for analysis. Frequencies were tabulated on all of the variables, although as you might expect their meaning is not useful for purposes of inferential statistics, but to provide the researcher with a descriptive picture of this particular sample.

SEX
FEMALES= 44
MALES= 175

AGE
MEAN=29 years
MEANIAN=28 years
MODE=25 years
RANGE=17.5-67.5 years
STD DEV=8.76 years

EDUCATION
MEAN=11.72 years
MEDIAN=12 years
MODE=12 years

RACE
American Indian=14
Aslan=4
Black=80
Hispanic=28
White=76
Other=17

FAMILY SIZE
MEAN=3.23
MEDIAN=3
MODE=3

INCOME
MEAN=$10,001-$15,000
MEDIAN=$10,001-$15,000
MODE=$10,001-$15,000

PARENTS (Number of parents still living)
BOTH=117
ONE=71
NEITHER=24
MISSING CASES=7

MARITAL (Marital status of parents)
MARRIED=118
DIVORCED=47
SEPARATED=25
SINGLE=22
MISSING CASES=7

CURRENT (Length of sentence currently serving)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-24 months</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 30 YEARS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE WITH PAROLE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFE WITHOUT PAROLE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEATH PENALTY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING CASES</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATE (State of sentencing)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LASTOF (Last offense)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARCOTICS</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO THEFT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSTITUTION</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEFT</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMED ROBBERY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATTERY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIDNAPPING</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANSLAUGHTER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTEMPTED ROBBERY</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTEMPTED MURDER</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE OFFENSES</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING CASES</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIRSOF (First offense)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NARCOTICS</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO THEFT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROSTITUTION</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEFT</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMED ROBBERY</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATTERY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANSLAUGHTER=2
MURDER=3
ATTEMPTED ROBBERY=32
ATTEMPTED MURDER=16
MULTIPLE OFFENSES=11
MISSING CASES=24

FIRSAGE (Age when committed first offense)
UNDER AGE 10=19
11-13=34
14-16=37
17-20=58
21-24=23
25-29=15
30 OR OLDER=16
MISSING CASES =17

DRUGYES *(Drugs used at time of last arrest)
YES=84
NO=122
MISSING CASES=13

*It is important to note here that many respondents might feel a hesitency to list drug use for reasons pertaining to parole.

DRUGUSE (Of those who answered the contingency question regarding drug involvement in last offense)
ALCOHOL=33
COCAINE=17
CRYSTAL=1
HEROIN=4
MARIJUANA=2
PCP=1
OTHER=2
MULTIPLE DRUGS=33
MISSING CASES=126

LIFECUS (Number of years respondent has spent in custody)
0-2 years=115
3-5 years=24
6-10 years=30
11-15 years=13
16-20 years=1
21-30 years=3
MORE THAN 30 YEARS=2
MISSING CASES=31

SEXABUS (Sexually abused under the age of 18)
YES=26
PHYABUS (Physically abused under the age of 18)
YES=49
NO=157
MISSING CASES=13

PSYABUS (Psychologically abuse under the age of 18)
YES=49
NO=158
MISSING CASES=12

GRADES (Usual grades in school)
A=18
B=73
C=100
D=12
F=7
MISSING CASES=9

POPULAR (Regarding popularity in school)
VERY POPULAR=26
POPULAR=88
LIKED BY SOME/DISLIKED BY OTHERS=78
UNPOPULAR=15
VERY UNPOPULAR=4
MISSING CASES=8

All of the previously listed data was gathered for the express purpose of achieving some descriptive information about the respondents used in the sample. As I have stated before, I make no attempt to analyze this information beyond the empirical scope of such descriptive data, and to list solely as frequency data. If I had acquired a sample of 300 respondents, I might have used some of the information to establish a comparison profile regarding some of the variables (i.e. race, income, family size, education, etc.), but again this would not have been inferential in nature but only to help me gain some insight into the "average" inmate from this sample. The following variables were used to test the hypothesis regarding the relationship between a respondent's feelings regarding self-worth and the relationship, if any, to feelings regarding certainty of punishment.

NORMAL (Describing oneself as normal)
STRONGLY AGREE=87
AGREE=100
UNCERTAIN=11
DISAGREE=10
STRONGLY DISAGREE=4
MISSING CASES=7

TEACHER (Teacher's felt highly about respondent)
STRONGLY AGREE=41
AGREE=110
UNCERTAIN=25
DISAGREE=27
STRONGLY DISAGREE=8
MISSING CASES=8

GOTTEN (Did a lot of things that should have gotten them arrested)
STRONGLY AGREE=43
AGREE=61
UNCERTAIN=17
DISAGREE=59
STRONGLY DISAGREE=30
MISSING CASES=9

PARNEV (Parent's never thought highly of respondent)
STRONGLY AGREE=18
AGREE=17
UNCERTAIN=16
DISAGREE=76
STRONGLY DISAGREE=82
MISSING CASES=10

TROUBLE (Respondent gets into more trouble than most people)
STRONGLY AGREE=19
AGREE=29
UNCERTAIN=24
DISAGREE=81
STRONGLY DISAGREE=55
MISSING CASES=11

GOODP (Respondent describes self as a good person)
STRONGLY AGREE=92
AGREE=107
UNCERTAIN=2
DISAGREE=5
STRONGLY DISAGREE=3
MISSING CASES=10

GETOUT (Respondent will return to prison soon after getting out)
STRONGLY AGREE=11
AGREE=13
UNCERTAIN=25
DISAGREE=58  
STRONGLY DISAGREE=99  
MISSING CASES=13

TRBLMKR (Respondent describes self as a troublemaker)  
STRONGLY AGREE=5  
AGREE=14  
UNCERTAIN=14  
DISAGREE=78  
STRONGLY DISAGREE=97  
MISSING CASES=11

ANYTHIN (Respondent will never amount to anything)  
STRONGLY AGREE=6  
AGREE=20  
UNCERTAIN=21  
DISAGREE=76  
STRONGLY DISAGREE=83  
MISSING CASES=13

SOCIETY (Respondent could be of help to society)  
STRONGLY AGREE=86  
AGREE=101  
UNCERTAIN=13  
DISAGREE=1  
STRONGLY DISAGREE=7  
MISSING CASES=11

REASON (Okay to break the law for a good reason)  
STRONGLY AGREE=18  
AGREE=28  
UNCERTAIN=25  
DISAGREE=84  
STRONGLY DISAGREE=52  
UNCERTAIN=12

MINOR (Most people never get caught for minor violations)  
STRONGLY AGREE=22  
AGREE=63  
UNCERTAIN=28  
DISAGREE=63  
STRONGLY DISAGREE=32  
MISSING CASES=11

STUPID (Only stupid people get caught)  
STRONGLY AGREE=8  
AGREE=23  
UNCERTAIN=18  
DISAGREE=90  
STRONGLY DISAGREE=69  
MISSING CASES=11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Missing Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAREFUL (Could get away with any crime if careful)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR (Only poor people go to jail)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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