Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Volume 50
Issue 5 *January-February*

Article 5

Winter 1960

Relationships of Scores and Education to Adjustment

Rodney M. Coe

RELATIONSHIPS OF SCORES AND EDUCATION TO ADJUSTMENT

RODNEY M. COE*

The author was formerly a research associate at the Woodward State Hospital and School at Woodward, Iowa. After a two year tour of duty with the U. S. Army, he accepted an appointment with the Rehabilitation Institute at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois where he is now located. —EDITOR.

In discussing his concept of "prisonization," Clemmer[1] outlined the factors which he felt were important in determining the degree of assimilation into prison life. From this concept, it has been inferred that inmate intelligence as determined by psychometric evaluation and level of educational attainment play an important role in inmate adjustment to institutional routine. Elsewhere, it has been shown that other factors, e.g., family interest, number of associates, length of present sentence, etc., are at least of equal, if not more importance than intelligence and level of education.[2] The discussion in this paper, however, will be limited to psychometric scores and levels of education and their relationship to prison adjustment.

The inference from Clemmer's hypothesis can be tested by data available from a larger study now in progress. The samples consist of two groups of one hundred inmates each. One group is considered best adjusted to institutional routine and the other the most poorly adjusted as determined by a panel of prison officials acting as judges.[3] It is assumed that adjustment to institutional routine runs on a continuum from poor to good[4] and that the two groups selected represent the extreme ends of the continuum.

Specifically, this paper is concerned with the relationships of (1) psychometric scores to level of education within each group, (2) psychometric scores to adjustment *and* level of education to adjustment between the two groups, and (3) the combined factors of psychometric scores and level of education to adjustment to institutional routine between the two groups.

The respective null hypotheses are (1) there is no relationship between psychometric scores and level of education within each group, (2) there is no significant difference between the well adjusted group and the most poorly adjusted group in either psychometric scores or amount of education, and (3) there is no relationship between the combined factors and adjustment to institutional routine.

Basic data for the statistical analysis are presented in Tables I and II. To test the first hypothesis, a product-moment correlation was computed for the well adjusted group and for the poorly adjusted group. The resulting correlation coefficients were +.60 and +.45, respectively. Both coefficients were significant at the one per cent level.[5] Thus the first hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between psychometric scores and level of education is rejected for both groups. Secondly, to determine the relationship of psychometric scores to adjustment, and level of education to adjustment between the two groups, the chi square method was used. The resulting chi squares were 9.86 and 6.98, respec-

* The writer is indebted to Dr. Albert J. Shafter, Assistant Director, Rehabilitation Institute, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, for general suggestions and helpful criticisms and to Dr. Eugene D. Fitzpatrick, Chairman, Guidance Department, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, for assistance with statistical work.

[1] DONALD CLEMMER. THE PRISON COMMUNITY. 2nd ed., New York: Rinehart and Co., 1958, p. 300.

[2] Cf., ERNEST W. BURGESS. FACTORS DETERMINING SUCCESS OR FAILURE ON PAROLE, in A. A. BRUCE, A. J. HARNO, E. W. BURGESS, AND J. LANDESCO, THE WORKINGS OF THE INDETERMINITE SENTENCE LAW AND PAROLE SYSTEM IN ILLINOIS. Springfield, Illinois: Illinois State Board of Parole, 1928; SHELDON AND ELEANOR T. GLUECK. FIVE HUNDRED CRIMINAL CAREERS. New York: A. A. Knopf and Sons, 1930; LLOYD E. OHLIN. SELECTION FOR PAROLE. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1951.

[3] Good adjustment is defined as a lack of disciplinary violations, long time on a preferred job, infrequent changes in cell assignments, etc. Poor adjustment is defined as receiving many disciplinary reports resulting in punishment, frequent changes in cell and work assignments, etc.

[4] Cf. SANFORD BATES, quoted in CLEMMER, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

[5] FRANCIS G. CORNELL. THE ESSENTIALS OF EDUCATIONAL STATISTICS. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1956, Table 9.1, p. 179.

TABLE I

DISTRIBUTION OF PSYCHOMETRIC SCORES*

Rating and	Score	Well Adjusted Group	Poorly Adjusted Group
Extremely Superior.	139 and up	0	0
Very Superior.....	127–138	9	2
Superior.....	115–126	16	9
High Average.....	107–114	11	9
Average.....	86–106	25	24
Low Average.....	80–85	8	13
Dull Normal.....	58–79	20	27
Borderline.....	44–57	7	9
Mental Defective...	Below 44	4	7
		N = 100	N = 100

* For a comparison of the entire population of an earlier date, see Table II, in Clemmer, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION OF LEVELS OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Level	Well Adjusted Group	Poorly Adjusted Group
College Graduate.....	1	0
Some College.....	2	3
High School Graduate....	7	3
Some High School.....	21	23
Eighth Grade Graduate..	36	23
Less than Eighth Grade..	31	44
None.....	2	4
	N = 100	N = 100

tively.[6] Neither is significant. Thus the second hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the well adjusted group and the poorly adjusted group in either psychometric scores or level of education can not be rejected.[7] To test the third hypothesis, that there is a relationship between the combined factors and adjustment to institutional routine, Fisher's z transformation was used. In this case, $z = 1.45$ which is non-significant at the five per cent level. The hypothesis, therefore is tenable and any differences could be attributed to chance.

In summary, a significant relationship was established between psychometric scores and level of educational attainment. However, there does not appear to be a significant relationship between psychometric scores and adjustment or between level of education and adjustment. Again, when the two factors are combined and compared to adjustment to institutional routine, no significant relationship is in evidence for these data. Thus, the findings of this study fail to substantiate the inferences made from Clemmer's concept of "prisonization," that intelligence as measured by psychometric scores and level of educational attainment, are related to adjustment to institutional routine.

[6] The one percent level of significance for 7 d.f. and 6 d.f. is reached at 18.5 and 16.8, respectively.

[7] It may be of interest to note that when the psychometric scores were tested by the t-test method, the difference was significant at the one percent level. However, this information was not used due to the reduced N's of the groups (N = 59 for well adjusted group and N = 71 for poorly adjusted group).