

REPORT  
to the  
TASK FORCE TO STUDY VIOLENCE IN PRISON

Paul F.C. Mueller, Ph.D.  
Hans Toch, Ph.D.  
Martin J. Molof, Ph.D.

August 1965

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
STUDY METHODOLOGY	1
FINDINGS	
Violent Incidents	2
Violent Incidents Against Staff	
Violent Incidents Against Inmates	
Inmate Characteristics	4
Participants Compared to Resident Population	
Aggressors Compared to Victims	
Past and Present Violence	5
Tables (1-20)	
SUMMARY	8
RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS	9
BIBLIOGRAPHY	11

## STUDY METHODOLOGY

The task force to study violence in prison limited its study to violent incidents reported to Central Office's Administrative Statistics Section for the calendar years 1963 and 1964. Generally only the more serious incidents which have been referred to the local district attorney's office are reported to this section.

Incidents were selected which fitted the following definition of a violent act: Assault by inmates using either fists or any weapon which resulted in injury to himself or others and which was deemed serious enough by the institution to report it in an "Incident Report".

Examination of previously collected institutional incident data indicated that six institutions contributed the bulk of the incident reports. Therefore this study covers only these six institutions: San Quentin, Folsom, Deuel Vocational Institution, Correctional Training Facility, California Men's Colony-East, and California Medical Facility.

Factors leading to the violent incidents and characteristics of the participants were coded by institutional and research staff from information gained by institutional staff's, interviewing of participants and research staff's coding of official records.

The analyses described the changes between 1963 and 1964 in the kinds of incidents, the types of participants and the institutions which were involved. Incidents against staff and among inmates were treated separately. Likewise the characteristics of CDC inmates and YA wards who participated in incidents were handled separately. The characteristics of victims and aggressors were compared to those of their respective residential populations as well as with each other. More detailed analyses were made between the inmates' histories of prior violence and their role in the 1963-1964 violent incidents. Recommendations for program and further research were made from these findings.

## FINDINGS

### VIOLENT INCIDENTS

The number of violent institutional incidents in 1964 was significantly larger than in previous years. From 1963 to 1964 minor injuries to staff from blows doubled and major injuries to inmates from stabbings more than doubled. The number of CDC aggressors and victims increased by one half while the number of YA aggressors doubled and YA victims quadrupled.

Increases in violent incidents occurred at the institutions as follows:

CTF	up	150%	from 11 to 27
CMC-E	up	130%	from 9 to 21
San Quentin	up	90%	from 22 to 42
DVI	up	80%	from 12 to 21
CMF	down	20%	from 23 to 19
Folsom	down	30%	from 12 to 8

These increases in violent incidents were not accompanied by corresponding increases among the CDC residential populations' characteristics which were found to be grossly associated with violence proneness.

Only about one percent of the CDC inmates and about five percent of the YA wards participated in 1964's violent incidents.

Violent incidents were unevenly distributed over the year with Spring having more and late Autumn having fewer incidents. More than 80% of the violent incidents took place in the living and recreation areas. These are the places where there is the least organization of the men's activities and the greatest opportunity to interact at close range. By contrast the work and dining areas only accounted for about 15% of the violent incidents.

From the data on violent incidents against staff the following observations are noteworthy:

CMF although smallest in residential population had the largest number of attacks on staff.

Folsom and CTF although among the highest in residential population had the smallest number of attacks on staff.

No institution saw a decline from 1963 to 1964 in the number of incidents against staff.

CMC-East had the greatest increase in incidents against staff; from none in 1963 to ten minor assaults in 1964.

Although outnumbered in the general DVI population, YA wards participated five times as often as CDC inmates in violent incidents against staff. The use of a knife by two YA wards at DVI to kill a correctional officer was the only time during these two years that a staff member was seriously injured with a weapon in the hands of an inmate.

Most staff injuries from inmates were minor, occurring during apprehension or processing when a correctional officer got within reach of an inmate. From statistics reported by the California State Personnel Board, it would appear that employees at the six institutions had more chances of getting an accidental injury on the job than to get assaulted by an inmate.

From the data on violent incidents against inmates, the following observations are noteworthy:

Folsom had the fewest number of incidents against inmates.

At DVI, YA wards participated more than four times as often as CDC inmates in violent incidents among inmates.

Increases in violence against inmates were mainly in the more severe kinds of injuries with weapons. For all six institutions combined, major injuries of inmates with a weapon increased from 27 in 1963 to 71 in 1964. Stabbings by unknown assailants rose from zero to twelve. The institutions got tougher in 1964. More inmates went after other inmates harder with sharpened pieces of metal.

The most common identifiable cause of violence among inmates was homosexuality (25%). The next most common cause was force to get possessions from other inmates (15%). The two least common reasons for violence among inmates were for informant activities (9%) and as retaliation (7%). Violence against other inmates was mostly direct or to get revenge for a wrong done inside the institution.

Racial tensions, which lay behind 12% of the violent incidents among inmates, mushroomed from 5 in 1963 to 18 in 1964. The institutions which saw increases in racial incidents were:

DVI up 300% from 0 to 3  
CTF up 250% from 2 to 7  
SQ up 150% from 2 to 5

There were some indications that increases in the ratio of Negro inmates to inmates of other races among residential populations were slightly associated with the increase in racial incidents.

From records available it was possible to discover only a few procedural changes which had been instituted as a result of any violent incident. A few times staff were added, a couple times new equipment was added, and twice key control procedures were changed.

## INMATE CHARACTERISTICS

### Participants Compared to Resident Population

Both CDC victims and aggressors had the following characteristics significantly more often than did the resident populations from the same institutions:

- Maximum or close custody
- Incident age below thirty
- Assault and theft as commitment offenses

More CDC victims and aggressors had the following characteristics than the resident population but not at a statistically significant level of probability:

- Negro ethnic origin
- Prior institutional escape record
- Prior jail or juvenile records only
- No release to parole under this commitment

Significantly more Mexicans were found among the CDC aggressors than in the resident population.

Both CDC victims and aggressors had lower estimated average base expectancy scores. The resident population's average BE 60A score was 19.6, the victims' average BE 60A score was 18.3, and the aggressors' average BE 60A score was 16.7.

At all institutions, regardless of the average age of the CDC residents, the younger the CDC inmates, the greater their participation as aggressors in violent incidents.

Over-representation of ethnic minority groups among CDC aggressors does not occur as regularly over all institutions. Negroes are over-represented among aggressors at DVI, CTF and CMF but only negligibly over-represented at CMC-East and Folsom, while being slightly under-represented at San Quentin. Inmates of Mexican ethnic origin are grossly over-represented among CDC aggressors at San Quentin and Folsom, slightly over-represented at CMF, and somewhat under-represented at DVI, CTF and CMC-East.

Significantly more YA aggressors had been returned from parole than had either the YA victims or the YA resident population.

Although statistically not significant, YA aggressors had more of the following characteristics than did the YA resident population:

- Incident age under 20
- Assault as the commitment offense
- Negro ethnic origin
- Commitment from Los Angeles County

### Aggressors Compared to Victims

Significantly more CDC and YA aggressors had the following characteristics than did their respective victims:

- First arrest under age 15
- Inmate described in records as hostile
- Prior institutional violence
- Gang leader at time of incident

Significantly more CDC aggressors than victims had the following characteristics:

- Born in California
- Mexican ethnic origin
- Family criminal record
- Juvenile escapes only
- Never married
- High MMPI Paranoia Score (60+)
- Last imprisoned under age 25
- Incident under age 25
- Maximum or close custody status

Significantly more YA aggressors than victims had the following characteristics:

- Some prior violence
- Prior cultural violence
- Called psychopathic in record
- Low MMPI score (59-)
- Committed for robbery or assault
- Returned from parole

The approximately twenty remaining characteristics did not statistically differentiate between victims and aggressors.

### PAST AND PRESENT VIOLENCE

An examination of the past violence history of inmates involved in institutional violence shows that this group largely consists of recurrently violent persons.

A comparison of the 1964 CDC participants in violence with a 1964 segment of the CDC resident population for whom Aggressive History Profiles were available shows a disproportionately large amount of past violence among the CDC participants:

	<u>CDC Participants</u>	<u>CDC Residents</u>
Any Prior Violence	87.6%	71.9%
Prior Criminal Violence	60.9%	47.0%
Prior Institutional Violence	48.9%	12.9%
Prior Cultural Violence	44.9%	18.7%

Victims of institutional violence are almost as disproportionately violent as aggressors, although this fact is less true for YA

victims as it is for CDC victims. YA aggressors have especially striking prior violent histories. Only one of the 59 young aggressors involved could be classified as clean of prior assaultiveness.

Whereas prior cultural violence was the major differentiating criterion between YA victims and aggressors, CDC aggressors and victims tended to differ most in their histories of prior institutional violence.

~~Among other indications of the psychologically distinctive nature of institutionally assaultive inmates is their repeated tendency to become involved in any kind of institutional rule violations.~~ Similarly, the prior escape rate for our CDC aggressors is striking if one recalls that most of this group have only jail or juvenile commitments previous to this prison commitment.

The comparatively serious violence record of YA aggressors raises the question of whether this relative viciousness is a function of age, or whether YA wards in CDC institutions are a unique problem group. To help answer this question, YA wards in CTF, DVI and CMF were compared with the CDC inmates at these three institutions who fell into a roughly comparable age bracket of 20 to 24. The major finding in these comparisons is that the two groups are very much alike. The only statistically significant exceptions to this rule are: (1) proportionately more YA wards have backgrounds with personal opiate use and family criminality; (2) comparatively more YA wards have prior institutional violence recorded; while (3) fewer of the YA wards show prior criminal violence. These differences, however, may be produced by discrepancies in case history records.

Even with the gross classifications used in our survey, variations in the type of inmate involved in different types of incidents seemed to present themselves.

The victims of homosexual rivalry assaults tend to be among our most violent inmates, whereas the victims in homosexual force episodes are comparatively non-violent. Among the aggressors in these incidents, those classified under "homosexual force" proved to have been generally more violent in the past, particularly in the areas of prior criminal and institutional violence. Aggressors in homosexual rivalry incidents proved disproportionately high in past cultural, pathological and institutional violence.

~~Aggressors in pressure for possessions incidents showed the highest proportion of past institutional violence among all aggressors, but were comparatively low on prior cultural and criminal violence.~~

Among racially motivated violence, aggressors showed somewhat less prior violence in their records than did victims (86.5% for aggressors; 90.9% for victims).



Among YA aggressors, there is a difference between inmates involved in assaults against staff and those who assaulted other inmates. Nine out of ten YA wards who assaulted staff had past cultural violence histories, compared with six out of ten involved in assaults against inmates. Aggressors against staff also had proportionately more past criminal violence in their profiles. The large difference in past cultural violence lends support to the hypothesis that there exists a young group of inmates who belong to a subculture which sanctions aggression against persons in authority.

A study of how the inmate stabilizes himself and his fellow inmates to keep violence to a minimum might be of value. Some institutions have no or almost no serious violence. Some institutions are declining in the amount of serious violence. Why?

A re-examination of classification and assignment criteria might be in order. Are we making a mistake keeping the older "Honest-John Cons" in Folsom? Maybe they could be a stabilizing element if dispersed throughout the institutions like CTF and DVI where the younger "Hot-Heads" are concentrated and acting-out?

A definite must is a crash study on how the department can prevent racial tensions from building up until they boil over in our institutions. As racial violence was on the increase before Watts with its infectious influence as well as some of its participants being committed as felons to the department, we cannot afford to sit back and wait for the fire to hit us. Monies must be found to finance a study into the causes and prevention of racial violence in our institutions.

It would be desirable to see a five year, fully staffed research project on institutional violence. Its purpose would be to study the personality and behavior of inmates or staff who contribute to violence. The project would also study who and what contribute to an institutional atmosphere of non-violence. The project would try to enlist the aid of inmates and staff to set up institutional atmosphere conducive to non-violent attainment of goals and reductions of frustrations. They would implement and test the efficacy of anti-violence programs. The team could consist of a senior and an associate social research analyst, four free clerk-typists and several inmate assistants. The project could be based at San Quentin but also detach part of the team from time to time to other institutions.

Although 98% of the inmates and most of the staff do not get involved in more serious violent incidents at our institutions, there is still ample evidence from this study that we should invest time, money and staff into understanding causes and removing causes of institutional violence.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF VIOLENT INCIDENTS AND  
TYPE OF PERSON INVOLVED  
1963-1964

	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>Total 63 + 64</u>	<u>1964 ratio 1963</u>
VIOLENT INCIDENTS:	89	138	227	1.6
INMATES	71	98	169	1.4
STAFF	18	40	58	2.2
<hr/>				
INMATES INVOLVED:	190	296	486	1.6
AGGRESSORS	113	173	286	1.5
VICTIMS	77	123	200	1.6
<hr/>				
CDC INMATES INVOLVED:	163	225	388	1.4
CDC AGGRESSORS	94	133	227	1.4
CDC VICTIMS	69	92	161	1.3
<hr/>				
YA INMATES INVOLVED:	27	71	98	2.6
YA AGGRESSORS	19	40	59	2.1
YA VICTIMS	8	31	39	3.9

Crime Studies Section  
CDC Research Division  
17 August 1965

TABLE 2

NUMBER OF VIOLENT INCIDENTS WITH TYPE OF VICTIM  
BY INSTITUTION AND YEAR OF INCIDENT  
1963-1964

<u>INSTITUTION OF INCIDENT</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1963+1964 NUMBER</u>	<u>1964 RATIO 1963</u>
ALL INCIDENTS	89	138	227	1.6
against staff	18	40	58	2.2
against inmate	71	98	169	1.4
<hr/>				
SAN QUENTIN	22	42	64	1.9
against staff	4	9	13	2.2
against inmate	18	39	51	1.8
<hr/>				
FOLSOM	12	8	20	0.7
against staff	2	3	5	1.5
against inmate	10	5	15	.5
<hr/>				
D.V.I.	12	21	33	1.8
against staff	3	6	9*	2.0
against inmate	9	15	24**	1.7
<hr/>				
C.T.F.	11	27	38	2.5
against staff	1	4	5	4.0
against inmate	10	23	33	2.3
<hr/>				
C.M.F.	23	19	42	0.8
against staff	8	8	16	1.0
against inmate	15	11	26	0.7
<hr/>				
C.M.C.- EAST	9	21	30	2.3
against staff	0	10	10	10.0
against inmate	9	11	20	1.2

\*Involved in the incidents against staff were 11 YA wards and 2 CDC inmates.

\*\*Involved in the incidents among inmates were 28 YA aggressors compared to 8 CDC aggressors and 22 YA victims compared to 4 CDC victims at DVI.

TABLE 3

SEVERITY OF VIOLENCE BY TYPE OF VICTIM  
AND YEAR OF INCIDENTS  
1963-1964

<u>SEVERITY OF INCIDENT</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	
			<u>1963 + 1964</u> <u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
ALL INCIDENTS	89	138	227	—
<u>AGAINST STAFF*</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>100.0</u>
1 DEATH	1	0	1	1.7
2 MAJOR INJURY-WEAPON	0	0	0	0.0
3 MAJOR INJURY-OTHER	1	2	3	5.1
4 MINOR INJURY-WEAPON	2	3	5	8.6
5-6 THREAT OR POSS. WEAPON	0	6	6	10.4
7-8 MINOR INJURY-OTHER	14	29	43	74.2
<u>AGAINST INMATES*</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>100.0</u>
1 DEATH	6	5	11	6.5
2 MAJOR INJURY-WEAPON	27	71	98	58.0
3 MAJOR INJURY-OTHER	10	8	18	10.6
4 MINOR INJURY-WEAPON	6	9	25	14.8
5-6 THREAT OR POSS. WEAPON	2	0	2**	1.2
7-8 MINOR INJURY-OTHER	10	5	15**	8.9

\*1963 compared to 1964 =

for incidents against staff: Not tested.

Number of subjects in some categories too small for statistical tests.

For incidents against inmates: Prob. <.001

\*\*It is estimated that 950 of these minor violent incidents against inmates were not reported to Central Office.

TABLE 4  
STAFF VICTIMS BY JOB TITLE  
1963-1964

<u>JOB TITLE OF STAFF VICTIM</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>1963 + 1964</u>	
			<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENT</u>
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER	16	35	51	88.1
SERGEANT	1	1	2	3.4
LIEUTENANT	0	2	2	3.4
NURSE	1	1	2	3.4
INSTRUCTOR	0	1	1	1.7
<hr/>				
TOTAL STAFF	18	40	58	100.0

1963 compared to 1964: Not tested. Number of subjects in some categories too small for statistical tests.

TABLE 5

## VIOLENT INCIDENTS BY MONTH OF INCIDENT

MONTH	1963		1964		1963+1964	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
JANUARY	6	6.7	9	6.5	15	6.6
FEBRUARY	8	9.0	8	5.8	16	7.0
MARCH	11	12.4	14	10.2	25	11.0
APRIL	5	5.6	11	8.0	16	7.0
MAY	14	15.7	17	12.3	31	13.7
JUNE	10	11.2	17	12.3	27	11.9
JULY	7	7.9	9	6.5	16	7.0
AUGUST	9	10.1	10	7.2	19	8.4
SEPTEMBER	8	9.0	9	6.5	17	7.5
OCTOBER	3	3.4	11	8.0	14	6.2
NOVEMBER	3	3.4	9	6.5	12	5.3
DECEMBER	5	5.6	14	10.2	19	8.4
TOTAL	89	100.0	138	100.0	227	100.0

Monthly variations between years and within years are not significant.

TABLE 6

## VIOLENT INCIDENTS BY LOCATION OF INCIDENT

LOCATION	1963		1964		1963+1964	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
LIVING AREA	47	52.8	88	63.8	135	59.5
RECREATION	21	23.6	32	23.2	53	23.4
WORK AREA	9	10.1	11	8.0	20	8.8
DINING AREA	6	6.8	5	3.6	11	4.8
MISC.	6	6.7	2	1.4	8	3.5
TOTAL	89	100.0	138	100.0	227	100.0

Difference between 1963 and 1964 is not significant.

TABLE 7

## REASON FOR VIOLENT INCIDENT AGAINST STAFF

CAUSAL FACTOR	1963		1964		1963+1964	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Apprehending	10	55.6	14	35.0	24	40.4
Processing	2	11.1	14	35.0	16	27.6
Inmate Emotion	3	16.7	5	12.5	8	13.8
Inmate Psychosis	2	11.1	3	7.5	5	8.6
Retaliation on Staff	1	5.5	2	5.0	3	5.2
Miscellaneous	0	0.0	2	5.0	2	3.4
Total	18	100.0	40	100.0	58	100.0

1963 compared to 1964: Not tested. Numbers in some categories too small for statistical tests.

TABLE 8

## REASON FOR VIOLENT INCIDENT AMONG INMATES

CAUSAL FACTOR	1963		1964		1963+1964	
	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT	NUMBER	PERCENT
Homosexuality	19	26.8	24	24.5	43	25.4
Possessions	11	15.5	14	14.3	25	14.8
Racial	5	7.1	15	15.3	20	11.8
Informant	6	8.5	9	9.2	15	8.9
Retaliation	7	9.9	5	5.1	12	7.1
Miscellaneous	23	32.4	31	31.6	54	32.0
Total	71	100.0	98	100.0	169	100.0

Difference between 1963 and 1964 is not significant.



TABLE 9A

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERISTICS BY TYPE OF INMATE  
AND ROLE IN VIOLENT INCIDENTS IN SIX CDC INSTITUTIONS

CHARACTERISTIC	CDC			YA		
	RESIDENT POPULATION NO CAMPS WITH CAMPS	CDC VICTIMS	CDC AGGRESSORS	RESIDENT POPULATION	YA VICTIMS	YA AGGRESSORS
	N=27,858	N=161	N=227	N=2620	N=39	N=59
<u>STATUS OF ADMISSION</u>						
Original Commitment	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0-xxx-100.0	100.0
Parole Returnee	69.2	70.8	78.0***	45.3	48.7	20.3
	30.8	29.2	22.0	54.7	51.3	79.7***
<u>PRIOR COMMIT. RECORD</u>						
No Prior Commitment	100.0	100.0	100.0	Not Available for YA	100.0	100.0
Jail or Juvenile only	10.1	6.8	6.2	Population	12.8	20.3
One Prior Prison	43.1	53.4*	59.5***	Population	87.2	79.7
Several Prison	24.5	23.6	19.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
	22.0	16.1	14.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
<u>ESCAPE RECORD</u>						
No Escape	100.0	100.0	100.0	Not Available for YA	100.0	100.0
Some Escape	72.3	70.2	62.6	Population	66.7	52.5
	26.7	29.8	37.4***	Population	33.3	47.5

xDifference between victims and aggressors statistically significant at .05 level of probability; xx at .01 level;

xxx at .001 level.

\*Statistically significantly greater than population at .05 level of probability; \*\* at .01 level; \*\*\* at .001 level.

TABLE 9B

CHARACTERISTIC	CDC				YA				
	RESIDENT POPULATION NO CAMPS WITH CAMPS	CDC VICTIMS	CDC AGGRESSORS	POPULATION	VICTIMS	AGGRESSORS	POPULATION	VICTIMS	AGGRESSORS
	N=27,858	N=161	N=227	N=2620	N=39	N=59	N=2620	N=39	N=59
<u>COUNTY OF COMMITMENT</u>									
Los Angeles	Not Available for Resident Population Without Camps	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
9 other So. counties	41.0	42.2	41.9	49.5	38.5	54.2	49.5	38.5	54.2
San Francisco	19.4	18.0	18.1	14.5	20.5	18.6	14.5	20.5	18.6
Alameda	6.4	6.8	6.2	3.5	2.6	6.8	3.5	2.6	6.8
7 other Bay Area counties	5.5	5.6	3.5	6.1	2.6	1.7	6.1	2.6	1.7
Sacramento Valley	7.9	9.9	7.5	8.6	5.1	5.1	8.6	5.1	5.1
San Joaquin Valley	5.9	4.3	5.3	6.0	5.1	6.8	6.0	5.1	6.8
22 other No. counties	9.5	9.9	13.2	6.9	15.4	5.1	6.9	15.4	5.1
	4.5	3.1	4.4	4.9	10.3	1.7	4.9	10.3	1.7
<u>COMMIT. OFFENSE</u>									
Homicide	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Robbery	8.7	8.1	7.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0
Assault	24.2	29.8	26.4	17.4	10.3	16.9	17.4	10.3	16.9
Burglary	4.5	7.5	9.7***	8.5	15.4	27.1	8.5	15.4	27.1
Theft	16.2	18.6	15.0	21.4	17.9	22.0	21.4	17.9	22.0
Forgery & Checks	5.7	6.8	10.6***	22.6	25.6	10.2	22.6	25.6	10.2
Sex	7.8	6.8	3.1	3.9	2.6	5.1	3.9	2.6	5.1
Narcotics	9.3	6.8	7.9	7.2	7.7	3.4	7.2	7.7	3.4
Other Offenses	16.2	11.8	14.1	8.7	9.0	1.7	8.7	9.0	1.7
	7.4	3.7	6.2	9.4	20.5	13.6	9.4	20.5	13.6

xDifference between victims and aggressors statistically significant at .05 level of probability; xx at .01 level; xxx at .001 level.

\*Statistically significantly greater than population at .05 level of probability; \*\*at .01 level; \*\*\*at .001 level.

TABLE 9C

CHARACTERISTIC	CDC			YA		
	RESIDENT POPULATION NO CAMPS WITH CAMPS	CDC VICTIMS	CDC AGGRESSORS	RESIDENT POPULATION	YA VICTIMS	YA AGGRESSORS
	N=27,858	N=161	N=227	N=2620	N=39	N=59
<u>ETHNIC GROUP</u>						
White	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Mexican	55.1	54.3	42.3	51.8	56.4	42.4
Negro	17.7	18.2	26.4***	21.9	25.6	22.0
Other	25.4	25.7	30.4	24.9	17.9	30.5
	1.8	1.8	0.9	1.4	0.0	5.1
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>AGE IN YEARS</u>						
Under 20	1.1	1.0	1.3	49.5	46.2	54.2
20 - 24	19.4	18.2	42.7***	50.5	53.8	45.8
25 - 29	24.8	24.5	29.1			
30 - 34	19.7	20.5	12.8			
35 - 39	16.0	16.6	7.5			
40 and Older	19.0	19.2	6.6			
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<u>CUSTODY CLASS</u>				Not Available for YA		
Maximum	1.6	1.5	17.2 ***		0.0	8.5
Close	5.5	5.0	19.0	Population	7.7	5.1
Medium	69.9	64.2	61.5		87.1	81.3
Minimum	23.0	29.3	2.3		5.2	5.1

\*Difference between victims and aggressors statistically significant at .05 level of probability; \*\* at .01 level; \*\*\* at .001 level.

xxx at .001 level.

\*Statistically significantly greater than population at .05 level of probability; \*\* at .01 level; \*\*\* at .001 level.

TABLE 10

CHARACTERISTICS FOUND SIGNIFICANTLY MORE OFTEN  
 AMONG AGGRESSORS THAN AMONG VICTIMS  
 1963-1964 COMBINED

<u>CHARACTERISTIC</u>	<u>CDC</u>		<u>YA</u>	
	<u>PERCENT AMONG:</u> <u>VICTIMS</u>	<u>PERCENT AMONG:</u> <u>AGGRESSORS</u>	<u>PERCENT AMONG:</u> <u>VICTIMS</u>	<u>PERCENT AMONG:</u> <u>AGGRESSORS</u>
Among both CDC and YA Aggressors:				
First arrest under age 15	47.8	61.7	56.4	79.7
Inmate described in records as hostile	58.4	68.7	48.7	67.8
Prior institutional violence	46.6	59.0	51.3	69.5
Gang leader at time of incident	9.3	22.9	2.6	25.4
Among CDC Aggressors:				
Born in California	31.7	44.5	53.8	61.0
Mexican ethnic origin	16.1	26.4	25.6	22.0
Family criminal record	48.0	60.4	48.8	39.0
Juvenile escapes only	10.6	23.3	28.2	40.7
Never married	54.0	63.9	87.2	94.9
High MMPI Paranoia Score (60+)	37.3	51.5	28.2	30.5
Last imprisoned under age 25	47.8	63.9	100.0	100.0
Incident under age 25	30.4	44.0	100.0	100.0
Maximum or close custody status	22.0	36.2	7.7	13.6
Among YA Aggressors:				
Some prior violence	80.7	87.7	74.4	93.2
Prior cultural violence	46.0	48.9	38.5	66.1
Called psychopathic in record	46.6	51.6	20.5	52.5
Low MMPI Lie Score (59-)	57.1	62.1	23.1	44.1
Committed for robbery or assault	37.3	36.1	25.7	44.0
Returned from parole	29.2	22.0	51.3	79.7

TABLE 11

PER CENT OF 1964 CDC PARTICIPANTS IN VIOLENT INCIDENTS AND  
 PER CENT OF CDC RESIDENT POPULATION WITH PAST AGGRESSIVE HISTORIES  
 BY TYPE OF PRIOR AGGRESSION

	1964 CDC Resident Population*	1964 CDC Incident Participants**
NUMBER OF MEN	5,601	225
<u>AGGRESSIVE HISTORY TYPE</u>	<u>Per Cent in Each Type</u>	
CULTURAL	18.7	44.9
CRIMINAL	47.0	60.9
PATHOLOGICAL	16.2	15.1
SITUATIONAL	12.8	13.3
ACCIDENTAL	1.9	1.8
INSTITUTIONAL	12.7	48.9
ANY VIOLENCE	71.9	87.6

\* Source: Appendix 1, Table 2 of an unpublished Research Division memorandum on 1964 Aggressive History Profiles, mimeographed on 9 December 1964.

\*\* Participants includes both victims and aggressors.

TABLE 12

PER CENT OF AGGRESSORS AND VICTIMS WITH PAST AGGRESSIVE HISTORIES  
 BY TYPE OF PRIOR AGGRESSION  
 1963-1964 COMBINED

Type of Man	Incident Role	Number of Men	Per Cent of Aggressive History Type						Any Violence
			Cultural	Criminal	Patholog.	Situat.	Accident.	Institu.	
YA	AGGRESSORS	59	66.1*	40.7	8.5	23.7	8.5	69.5*	98.3*
YA	VICTIMS	39	38.5	28.2	15.4	12.8	2.6	51.3	82.1
CDC	AGGRESSORS	227	48.9	59.5	16.3	12.8	1.3	59.0*	90.7
CDC	VICTIMS	161	46.0	59.0	12.4	9.9	0.6	46.6	85.1

\* Statistically significant differences between aggressors and victims within type of subject.

TABLE 13

PER CENT OF YA AND CDC PARTICIPANTS IN VIOLENT INCIDENTS  
WITH PAST RECORDS OF VIOLENCE BY TYPE OF PREVIOUS VIOLENCE  
1963-1964

Incident Year	Type of Man	Number of Men	Per Cent of Aggressive History Type							Any Violence
			Cultural	Criminal	Pathol.	Situation.	Accident.	Institu.		
1963	YA	27	55.6	40.7	11.1	11.1	3.7	66.7	92.6	
1964	YA	71	54.9	33.8	11.3	22.5	7.0	60.6	91.5	
1963	CDC	163	51.5	57.1	14.1	8.2	0.0	60.7	89.6	
1964	CDC	225	44.9	60.9	15.1	13.3	1.8	48.9	87.6	

TABLE 14

PRIOR AGGRESSIVE HISTORIES OF INMATES INVOLVED IN  
SEXUALLY MOTIVATED INSTITUTIONAL VIOLENCE  
Combined CDC and YA; combined 1963 and 1964

CAUSE OF INSTITUTIONAL ASSAULT	NUMBER OF MEN	PER CENT OF AGGRESSIVE HISTORY TYPE							
		Cultural	Criminal	Patholog.	Situat.	Accident.	Institut.	Any Violence	
AGGRESSORS Homosexual rivalry	33	63.6%	54.5%	21.2%	21.2%	00	63.6%	93.9%	
Homosexual force	31	45.2	64.5	9.7	19.4	3.2	67.7	96.8	
VICTIMS Homosexual rivalry	25	36.0	60.0	12.0	12.0	4.0	56.0	96.0	
Homosexual force	23	34.8	39.1	8.7	00	00	34.8	69.6	



TABLE 15  
 VIOLENT INCIDENTS INVOLVING COMBINED CDC AND YA INMATES  
 1963 - 1964

SEVERITY OF INCIDENT AGAINST STAFF	Six Institutions		Reported Actual Incidents		SO		F-02		DVI		GTF		GME		GMC-E																		
	Estimated Total Incidents Percent Number	Reported Number Percent	Number 63	Percent 64	Number 63	Percent 64	Number 63	Percent 64	Number 63	Percent 64	Number 63	Percent 64	Number 63	Percent 64	Number 63	Percent 64	Number 63	Percent 64															
1. Death		1.7	1	1.0					11.1	1	1																						
2. Major injury with weapon		0.0	0	0.0																													
3. Major injury with object or body		5.1	3	1.2	7.7	1	1					20.0	1	1	6.2	1	1																
4. Minor injury with weapon		8.6	5	2.3	7.7	1	1		22.2	2	2				12.5	2	2																
5. Threat with object or weapon; possess. weapon		10.4	6	0.6	15.4	2	2								12.5	2	2	20.0															
7-8. Minor injury with object or body; verbal threat		74.2	43	14.29	69.2	9	4.5	100.0	5	2.3	6.7	6	2.4	80.0	4	4	6.8	11	6.5	80.0													
TOTAL	100.0	58	18	40	100.0	13	4	9	100.0	5	2.3	3	6	100.0	5	1	4	100.0	16	8	8	10	0	10									
AGAINST INMATE																																	
		Includes Estimated unreported																															
1. Death	1.0	11	6.5	11	6.5	5	2.3					9.1	3	1	2	11.5	3	3															
2. Major injury with weapon	8.8	98	58.0	98	27	71	74.5	38	9	27	53.3	8	5	3	6.2	15	3	12	60.7	20	5	15	46.2	12	4	8	25.0	5	1	4			
3. Major injury with object or body	1.6	18	10.6	18	10	8	5.9	3	2	1	33.3	5	5	5	12.5	3	1	2	3.0	1	1	3.9	1	1	1	25.0	5	1	4				
4. Minor injury with weapon	2.2	25	14.8	25	16	9	7.8	4	4		6.7	1	1	12.5	3	2	1	12.1	4	2	2	26.9	7	5	2	30.0	6	3	3				
5. Threat with object or weapon; possess. weapon	8.7	99	1.2	2	2	0	2.0	1	1		6.7																						
7-8. Minor injury with object or body; verbal threat	77.7	870	8.8	15	10	5						1	1	12.5	3	3		3.0	1	1													
TOTAL	100.0	1149	100.0	169	71	98	100.0	81	18	33	100.0	15	10	5	100.0	24	9	15	100.0	33	10	23	100.0	26	15	11	100.0	20	9	11	20	9	11
INSTITUTION TOTAL			22.7	89	138		6.4	22	42		20	12	8		9.8	12	21			3.8	11	27		4.2	23	19		30	9	21			

\* Estimated number of reported incidents

TABLE 16

VIOLENT ACTIONS BY YA AND CDC INMATES

1963 AND 1964

SEVERITY OF INCIDENT AGAINST STAFF	Six Institutions		S9		FOL		DVI		CTF		CMF		CMC-E																
	Estimated Total Actions Reported Percent Total	Actual Inmates Total YA CDC	Grand Total YA CDC	Percent Grand Total YA CDC	Grand Total YA CDC	Percent Grand Total YA CDC	Grand Total YA CDC	Percent Grand Total YA CDC	Grand Total YA CDC	Percent Grand Total YA CDC	Grand Total YA CDC	Percent Grand Total YA CDC	Grand Total YA CDC	Percent Grand Total YA CDC															
1. Death	3.0	2	2.0	6.2	1	3.5	1	2.0	1	1	6.2	1	1	2.0															
2. Major injury with weapon	0.0	0	0.0	6.2	1	3.5	1	15.4	2	1	12.5	2	2	16.7															
3. Major injury with object or body	4.5	3	0.3	6.2	1	3.5	1	15.4	2	1	12.5	1	1	8.3															
4. Minor injury with weapon	7.5	5	1.4	6.2	1	3.5	1	15.4	2	1	12.5	2	2	16.7															
5-f. Threat with object or weapon possess. weap	10.4	7	1.6	6.2	1	3.5	1	15.4	2	1	12.5	2	2	16.7															
2-g. Minor injury with object or body/ verbal threat	74.6	50	12.38	75.0	12	1.11	100.0	5	5	5	61.5	8	7	80.0															
TOTAL	100.0	67	16.51	100.0	14	1.15	100.0	5	0.5	100.0	13	11	2	100.0															
<p>AGAINST INMATE</p> <p>1. Death</p>															1.0	13	4.7	7.5	6	6	7.5	6	6	4.7	3	1.2	9.1	4	1.3
2. Major injury with weapon	7.5	111	34.9	55.6	35	35	44.8	1.3	12	12	38.3	18	15	3	43.8	28	5.23	27.3	1.2	3	9	16.7	5	5					
3. Major injury with object or body	1.6	22	7.9	9.5	6	1.5	17.2	5	5	5	6.4	3	2	4.7	3	3	3	2.3	1	1	13.3	4	4						
4. Minor injury with weapon	2.8	36	13.0	11.1	7	7	10.4	3	8	8	8.5	4	3	1	9.4	6	6	20.4	9	9	23.3	7	7						
5-f. Threat with object or weapon possess. weapon	8.8	123	10.9	6.4	4	4	3.5	1	1	1	2.1	1	1	6.2	4	4	4	6.8	3	1	2	3.3	1	1					
2-g. Minor injury with object or body/ verbal threat	78.3	1108	102.6	7.9	5	5	24.1	7	7	7	44.7	21	14	7	31.2	24	9	12	34.1	15	3	12	43.4	13	13				
TOTAL	100.0	1413	113.5	100.0	63	1.62	100.0	29	0.29	100.0	47	32	11	2	100.0	65	15	50	100.0	44	8	30	100.0	30	30				
INSTITUTION TOTAL		345	76.869		99	2.77		34	0.34		60	47	13		70	16.54				60	11.49				42	0.46			

\* Estimated number of unreported incidents



TABLE 17B

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FELON CHARACTERISTICS BY SIX INSTITUTIONS AND ROLE IN VIOLENT INCIDENTS OCCURRING IN 1963 AND 1964

CHARACTERISTICS	Less		TOTAL MALES		Saw Question		Follow-up			Dual		Cable		Cable		Cable		Cable		Cable		
	Pop	Q	Pop	Q	Pop	Q	Pop	Q	Pop	Q	Pop	Q	Pop	Q	Pop	Q	Pop	Q	Pop	Q		
DEFENSE	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Homeville	8.7	8.4	8.1	7.0	11.9	5.4	5.7	6.9	20.0	16.0	9.4	25.0	0.0	3.8	8.7	2.2	11.6	0.0	7.0	10.5	5.7	
Robocay	24.3	21.0	29.8	26.4	28.9	37.5	27.5	25.7	26.7	26.0	29.4	25.0	59.0	25.3	26.1	44.4	20.9	20.9	21.2	21.1	8.6	
Asbury	4.5	4.4	7.5	9.7	5.3	7.1	13.0	3.6	13.3	8.0	4.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	2.2	4.4	5.9	9.5	11.6	15.8	8.6	
Robocay	16.2	16.4	10.6	15.0	14.1	16.1	8.7	16.7	6.7	12.0	18.4	25.0	10.0	20.0	28.3	17.8	14.6	19.0	16.2	10.5	26.0	
Thrift	5.7	5.8	6.8	10.6	4.7	3.6	8.7	5.0	6.7	12.0	6.6	0.0	20.0	7.5	10.9	6.7	6.3	4.8	6.0	10.5	11.4	
Forebay and checks	7.8	8.3	6.8	3.1	7.1	3.6	1.4	8.6	0.0	0.0	10.1	0.0	0.0	8.5	2.7	4.4	10.8	4.3	8.2	10.5	2.9	
SEX	9.3	8.6	6.8	7.9	9.9	7.1	10.1	5.9	13.3	12.0	5.8	25.0	10.0	5.5	2.2	2.2	10.7	4.3	9.3	12.2	5.7	
Married	16.2	17.3	11.8	14.1	17.8	14.3	11.6	17.6	13.3	20.0	10.4	0.0	0.0	20.4	13.0	13.3	27	0.0	20	19.1	28.6	
OTHER	7.4	6.8	9.7	6.2	6.3	5.4	10.1	10.1	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	4.4	7.5	9.5	6.4	5.3	8.6	
ETHNIC GROUPS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
WHITE	55.1	54.3	52.2	42.3	49.7	48.2	30.4	52.2	33.3	24.0	63.7	50.0	50.0	50.5	55.3	48.9	74.0	57.1	56.9	68.4	57.1	
WEST MEXICAN	17.7	18.2	16.1	26.4	18.5	17.9	48.4	16.7	20.0	46.0	16.4	0.0	10.0	23.2	17.4	20.0	9.0	4.3	18.1	10.5	17.1	
Mexican	25.4	25.7	31.1	30.4	29.9	31.1	27.5	28.0	46.7	32.0	18.6	50.0	90.0	25.0	28.3	31.1	14.9	28.6	34.9	23.1	25.7	
Other	1.8	1.8	.6	.9	1.9	1.8	1.4	2.1	0.0	4.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.6	0.0	2.1	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	
AGE IN YEARS	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under 20	1.1	1.0	1.2	1.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	1.9	4.3	6.7	1.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	
20-24	19.4	18.2	29.2	42.7	8.7	16.1	37.7	0.4	6.7	8.0	54.7	50.0	100.0	30	51.7	60.0	17.9	23.8	19.1	15.8	45.7	
25-29	24.8	24.5	28.6	29.1	20.6	44.6	42.2	6.5	13.3	16.0	18.7	25.0	0.0	25.5	24.7	24.4	22.4	14.3	29.0	26.3	22.9	
30-34	19.7	20.5	20.5	12.8	20.4	23.2	14.5	28.0	26.7	32.0	3.9	0.0	0.0	14.3	10.9	6.7	19.0	38.1	21.1	15.8	8.6	
35-39	16.0	16.6	11.8	7.5	12.2	10.7	4.3	29.0	33.3	20.0	5.1	0.0	0.0	7.9	2.2	2.2	4.8	14.3	13.8	21.1	2.9	
40-49	4.1	4.4	5.6	4.8	13.1	3.6	1.4	20.5	13.3	16.0	6.6	25.0	0.0	5.7	2.2	0.0	14.9	9.5	10.9	5.3	14.3	
50-59	3.9	3.9	1.2	1.8	2.9	1.9	0.0	9.2	0.0	8.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	3.8	5.3	5.7	
60 and over	1.0	0.9	1.9	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.2	6.7	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	2.2	10.5	0.0	
Custody Classification	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Maximum	1.6	1.5	10.1	17.2	3.0	16.1	3.9	1.8	20.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.4	6.5	4.4	1.3	4.8	11.6	-	0.0	
Close	5.5	5.0	11.9	19.0	8.4	18.7	21.7	6.0	13.3	16.0	1.0	0.0	10.0	3.9	19.6	35.6	3.7	9.5	18.6	-	0.0	
Medium	69.9	74.2	72.3	64.5	51.2	64.3	37.6	14.5	66.7	32.0	79.6	100.0	60.0	58.1	67.4	53.4	57.0	76.2	69.7	84.2	94.8	
Maximum	23.0	29.3	5.7	2.3	31.4	8.9	8.6	17.1	0.0	0.0	19.3	0.0	0.0	21.6	6.5	6.6	30.0	9.5	15.8	5.3	5.8	

TABLE 18A

CHARACTERISTICS OF FELLOW POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON BY SIX INSTITUTIONS  
JUNE 30, 1963

Characteristics	Total males		San Quentin		Polson		Deuel Vocational Inst.		Corneo. Train. Facility		Calif. Medical Facility		Ivan Colony East	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Status With Reference to Parole	15,281 100.0		4,904 100.0		2,941 100.0		773 100.0		3,163 100.0		1,209 100.0		2,291 100.0	
	Not paroled since committed 67.8		3,090 63.0		1,581 53.8		666 86.1		2,454 77.6		874 72.3		1,594 74.0	
Paroled and ret. once as a violator 3.4		1,284 26.2		848 28.8		43 10.7		558 17.6		224 18.5		481 21.0		
Paroled and ret. twice as a violator 1.1		445 9.1		351 11.9		17 2.2		136 4.3		81 6.7		97 4.2		
Returned Paroled and ret. three times or more as violator 3.2		85 1.7		161 5.5		7 1.0		15 0.5		30 2.5		19 0.8		
4,922 { 1,127 } 32.2		317												
Prior Commitment Record	15,281 100.0		4,904 100.0		2,941 100.0		773 100.0		3,163 100.0		1,209 100.0		2,291 100.0	
	No prior commitments 9.9		543 11.1		68 2.3		155 16.2		313 9.9		195 16.1		263 11.5	
Prior jail or juvenile only 42.7		2,096 42.7		336 11.4		495 29.2		1,957 64.0		459 38.0		1,125 49.1		
1 prior prison commitment 28.6		1,412 28.6		858 29.2		93 12.0		641 20.3		252 20.8		570 24.9		
2 prior prison commitments 11.2		550 11.2		769 26.1		28 3.6		164 5.2		153 12.7		204 8.9		
3 or more prior prison commitments 2.2		195 4.0		476 16.2		16 2.1		55 1.7		76 6.3		72 3.1		
1612 { 290 } 10.6		722		434		16		33		74		57		
Escape Record	15,281 100.0		4,904 100.0		2,941 100.0		773 100.0		3,163 100.0		1,209 100.0		2,291 100.0	
	No record of escape 74.8		3,737 76.2		1,955 66.5		574 74.3		2,434 77.0		932 77.1		1,804 78.8	
Record of escape from jail 25.2		1,436		524 17.8		174 22.5		644 20.4		196 16.2		378 16.5		
Seems Present commitment 4.0		875 17.9		190 6.5		4 0.5		17 0.5		26 2.1		49 2.1		
Escape 198		674		272		21		66		55		60		
County of Area From Which Committed	4,904 100.0		3,063 62.4		1,752 59.6		362 46.8		1,826 57.7		626 51.8		1,641 71.6	
	Los Angeles County 41.2		2,133 43.5		1,276 43.4		207 26.8		1,127 35.6		400 33.1		1,145 50.0	
9 other counties 19.5		930 18.9		476 16.2		155 20.0		699 22.1		226 18.7		496 21.6		
San Francisco County 6.2		1,004 20.5		552 18.7		158 20.5		624 19.8		320 26.5		337 14.7		
Alameda County 5.5		346 7.1		201 6.8		41 5.3		156 5.0		107 8.9		99 4.3		
7 other counties 7.9		295 6.0		154 5.2		43 5.6		167 5.3		73 6.0		103 4.5		
10 Sacramento Valley counties 5.8		835 17.4		197 6.7		74 9.6		299 9.5		140 11.6		135 5.9		
7 San Joaquin Valley counties 9.6		1,208		637		258		713		263		313		
22 other counties 4.3		254 5.2		228 7.8		72 9.3		157 5.0		85 7.0		94 4.1		
		402 8.2		281 9.6		184 17.3		382 12.0		110 9.1		158 6.9		
		181 3.7		128 4.3		47 6.1		174 5.5		69 5.6		61 2.7		

Characteristics	Total males		San Quentin		Folsom		Dual Vocational Inst.		Correc. Train. Facility		Calif. Medical Facility		Men's Colony Inst.	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Offense</b>	15,281	100.0	4,904	100.0	2,941	100.0	773	100.0	3,163	100.0	1,209	100.0	2,291	100.0
Homeide	1,221	8.0	578	11.8	199	6.8	64	8.2	113	3.6	140	11.6	127	5.5
Robbery	3,825	25.1	1,081	22.0	731	24.9	224	29.3	752	23.8	237	21.3	480	21.0
Assault	4,000	26.2	94	4.6	54	3.2	24	3.1	105	3.3	181	6.0	72	3.1
Burglary	2,526	16.6	695	14.2	502	17.1	142	18.4	638	20.2	181	15.0	378	16.4
Thefts except auto	1,995	13.0	147	3.0	102	3.4	16	2.1	121	3.8	38	3.1	84	3.7
Auto theft	387	2.5	100	2.0	56	1.9	33	4.3	111	3.5	31	2.6	31	1.4
Forgery and checks	1,325	8.7	355	7.2	294	10.0	80	10.3	280	9.1	143	11.8	203	9.0
Other	583	3.8	209	4.3	59	2.0	27	3.5	94	3.0	49	4.1	93	4.1
Sex	1,224	8.0	257	5.2	97	3.3	16	2.1	69	2.1	101	8.3	157	6.9
Rape	531	3.5	147	3.0	56	1.9	33	4.3	111	3.5	31	2.6	56	2.4
Other sex	693	4.5	209	4.3	59	2.0	27	3.5	94	3.0	49	4.1	93	4.1
Narcotics and dangerous drugs	2,884	18.9	937	19.1	535	18.2	105	13.6	699	22.1	95	7.8	513	22.4
Escape	459	3.0	140	2.9	107	3.6	20	2.6	98	3.1	27	2.2	47	2.1
Habitual criminal	87	0.6	9	0.2	59	2.0	1	0.1	-	-	8	0.7	10	0.4
All other	501	3.3	163	3.3	106	3.6	21	2.7	73	2.3	67	5.5	71	3.1
<b>Ethnic Groups</b>	15,281	100.0	4,904	100.0	2,941	100.0	773	100.0	3,163	100.0	1,209	100.0	2,291	100.0
White	8,270	54.1	2,459	50.1	1,561	53.0	492	63.7	1,628	51.5	896	74.1	1,234	53.9
Mexican descent	3,825	25.1	928	18.9	478	16.3	137	17.7	753	23.8	107	8.8	462	19.7
Negro	3,826	25.1	1,430	29.2	843	28.7	134	17.3	737	23.3	182	15.2	560	24.4
Other	270	1.8	87	1.8	59	2.0	10	1.3	45	1.4	24	1.9	45	2.0
<b>Age in Years</b>	15,281	100.0	4,904	100.0	2,941	100.0	773	100.0	3,163	100.0	1,209	100.0	2,291	100.0
Under 20	164	1.1	8	0.2	-	-	68	8.8	72	2.3	14	.1	2	0.1
20-24	2,834	18.5	461	9.4	12	0.4	432	55.9	1,315	41.6	208	17.2	396	17.3
25-29	3,746	24.5	1,515	30.9	183	6.2	138	17.8	941	29.7	283	23.4	682	29.8
30-34	3,202	21.0	1,322	26.9	666	22.7	34	4.4	435	13.8	222	18.4	523	22.8
35-39	2,814	18.4	847	17.3	870	29.6	41	5.4	229	7.2	205	17.0	322	14.0
40-44	1,426	9.3	425	8.7	579	19.7	28	3.6	116	3.7	123	10.2	155	6.8
45-49	1,114	7.3	172	3.5	321	10.9	16	2.1	34	1.1	87	7.2	84	3.7
50-54	391	2.6	94	1.9	190	6.5	9	1.2	14	0.4	24	2.0	50	2.2
55-59	169	1.1	33	0.7	75	2.5	4	0.5	4	0.1	23	1.9	30	1.3
60 and over	131	0.9	23	0.5	45	1.5	3	0.3	3	0.1	10	0.8	47	2.0
<b>Control/Classification</b>	15,281	100.0	4,904	100.0	2,941	100.0	770	100.0	3,148	100.0	1,222	100.0	2,219	100.0
Total number of men in custody classification are not compliant with other totals for variety of reasons.	100.0	100.0	1,514	100.0	3,928	100.0	2,542	100.0	2,222	100.0	1,222	100.0	2,219	100.0
LESS CAMPS	100.0	100.0	1,514	100.0	3,928	100.0	2,542	100.0	2,222	100.0	1,222	100.0	2,219	100.0
<b>Classification</b>	15,281	100.0	4,904	100.0	2,941	100.0	770	100.0	3,148	100.0	1,222	100.0	2,219	100.0
Maximum	1	0.01	169	3.4	50	1.7	1	0.1	21	0.7	19	1.6	-	-
Crime	4	0.03	299	6.1	167	5.7	8	1.0	97	3.0	47	3.8	-	-
Medium	6	0.04	8,351	170.4	2,103	71.5	696	90.5	1,807	57.4	708	57.9	1,845	83.1
Minimum	263	1.7	1,218	24.8	222	7.5	125	16.2	292	9.3	48	3.9	374	16.9
All other	1,218	7.9	648	13.2	480	16.3	-	-	519	16.3	-	-	-	-

April 30, 1963

TABLE NA

CHARACTERISTICS OF FLOW POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON BY SIX INSTITUTIONS  
June 30, 1964

Characteristics	Total males		San Quentin		Folsom		Druid Vocational Institution		Corneo. Trln. Facility		Calif. Medical Facility		Colony East	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Status With Reference To Parole</b>	15,117	100.0	4,925	100.0	2,593	100.0	796	100.0	3,222	100.0	1,217	100.0	2,264	100.0
Not paroled since committed	10,067	66.6	2,944	59.8	1,460	54.2	679	85.3	2,384	74.0	875	71.9	1,725	76.2
Parolee { Paroled and ret. once as viol. Paroled and ret. twice as viol. Par. and ret. three times or more as violator	5,050 { 3,502 1,174 374	33.4	1,367 { 27.7 9.4	1,160 { 45.2 28.3 12.5	761 { 29.3 29.3 12.5	91 { 11.4 2.4	19 { 2.4	162 { 20.2 2.5 2.0	162 { 5.0 0.9 1.0	162 { 5.0 0.9 1.0	81 { 6.7 2.6	92 { 4.1	429 { 18.9 4.1	92 { 4.1
<b>Prior Commitment Record</b>	15,117	100.0	4,925	100.0	2,693	100.0	796	100.0	3,222	100.0	1,217	100.0	2,264	100.0
No prior commitments	1,620	10.7	518	10.5	70	2.6	123	15.5	296	9.2	207	17.0	306	13.5
Prior jail or juvenile only	6,448	42.7	2,095	42.5	342	12.7	496	62.3	1,939	60.2	470	38.6	1,106	48.9
1 prior prison commitment	3,752	24.7	1,391	28.2	769	29.3	108	13.6	661	21.1	260	21.4	523	23.1
2 prior prison commitments	1,823	12.1	595	12.1	672	25.0	33	4.1	202	6.3	138	11.4	193	8.5
3 or more { 3 prior prison commitments or more prison commitments	1,564 { 92 672	10.3	229 { 4.7 2.0	426 { 15.8 14.6	20 { 2.5 2.0	16 { 2.0	34 { 4.3	34 { 4.3	34 { 1.0	71 { 5.8	71 { 5.8	76 { 3.4	76 { 3.4	
<b>Escape Record</b>	15,117	100.0	4,925	100.0	2,693	100.0	796	100.0	3,222	100.0	1,217	100.0	2,264	100.0
No record of escape	11,422	73.7	3,724	75.6	1,695	62.9	592	74.4	2,474	76.8	947	77.8	1,710	75.5
Record of escape from: Jail or Juvenile	2,285	15.1	869	17.6	510	19.0	160	22.6	612	19.0	198	16.3	416	18.4
Home	400	2.6	107	2.2	191	7.1	7	0.9	29	0.9	22	1.8	44	1.9
Record of escape from: Prison commitment	790	5.2	225	4.6	297	11.0	17	2.1	107	3.3	50	4.1	94	4.2
<b>County of Birth</b>	15,117	100.0	4,925	100.0	2,693	100.0	796	100.0	3,222	100.0	1,217	100.0	2,264	100.0
Los Angeles County	6,165	40.8	2,173	44.1	1,155	42.9	190	23.9	1,185	36.8	470	34.5	1,042	46.0
9 other counties	2,925	19.8	890	18.1	464	17.2	165	20.7	688	21.3	212	17.4	506	22.4
San Francisco County	985	6.5	1,022	20.8	481	17.9	170	21.4	653	20.3	308	25.3	362	16.0
Alameda County	844	5.6	360	7.5	173	6.4	41	5.2	166	5.2	113	9.3	124	5.5
7 other counties	1,167	7.7	353	7.2	132	4.9	63	8.0	291	9.0	71	5.8	98	4.3
10 Sacramento Valley counties	905	6.0	640	13.0	593	22.0	271	34.0	696	21.6	277	22.8	354	15.6
7 San Joaquin Valley counties	1,420	9.4	245	4.9	194	7.2	96	12.1	150	4.7	107	8.8	113	5.0
22 other counties	706	4.7	384	7.8	267	9.9	122	15.3	301	9.3	104	8.6	162	7.1
			211	4.3	132	4.9	53	6.6	165	5.1	66	5.4	79	3.5

**TABLE 19B**  
**CHARACTERISTICS OF FELLOW POPULATION IN CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON BY SIX INSTITUTIONS**  
 June 30, 1964

Characteristics	Total males		San Quentin		Folsom		Fernal Vocational Institution		Corro. Train. Facility		Calif. Medical Facility		San Colonge Mans Dept	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<b>Offenses</b>	15,117	100.0	4,925	100.0	2,693	100.0	796	100.0	3,222	100.0	1,217	100.0	2,264	100.0
Homicide	1,345	8.9	608	12.4	168	7.0	83	10.4	132	4.1	142	11.7	192	8.5
Robbery	3,762	24.9	1,164	23.6	715	26.5	237	29.8	864	26.8	299	24.6	483	21.3
Assault	3,446	22.8	286	5.8	1,032	38.3	39	4.9	135	4.2	70	5.7	95	4.2
Burglary	1,612	10.7	690	14.0	438	16.3	146	18.4	637	19.7	174	14.3	361	16.0
Thefts except auto	944	6.2	142	2.9	84	3.1	28	3.5	131	4.1	50	4.1	59	2.6
Auto theft	3,370	22.3	75	1.5	40	1.5	27	3.4	117	3.6	35	2.9	76	3.4
Forgery and checks	1,158	7.7	343	7.0	191	7.1	79	9.9	257	8.0	118	9.7	170	7.5
Rape	569	3.8	217	4.4	56	2.1	27	3.4	103	3.2	61	5.0	105	4.6
Other sex	813	5.4	287	5.8	124	4.6	21	2.6	83	2.6	96	7.9	202	8.9
Narcotics and dangerous drugs	3,374	22.3	806	16.4	456	16.9	58	7.3	602	18.7	91	7.5	359	15.9
Frauds	453	3.0	129	2.6	110	4.1	20	2.5	87	2.7	14	1.1	73	3.2
Habitual criminal	96	0.6	15	0.3	61	2.3	1	0.1	1	0.0	10	0.8	9	0.4
All other	529	3.5	161	3.3	127	4.7	30	3.8	74	2.3	57	4.7	80	3.5
<b>Ethnic Group</b>	15,117	100.0	4,925	100.0	2,693	100.0	796	100.0	3,222	100.0	1,217	100.0	2,264	100.0
White	8,229	54.4	2,432	49.4	1,438	53.4	507	63.7	1,595	49.5	900	74.0	1,357	59.9
White, Mexican descent	2,685	17.8	889	18.0	463	17.2	121	15.2	730	22.7	111	9.1	371	16.4
Negro	3,930	26.0	1,507	30.6	732	27.2	157	19.7	861	26.7	180	14.8	493	21.8
Other	278	1.8	97	2.0	60	2.2	11	1.4	36	1.1	26	2.1	43	1.9
<b>Age in Years</b>	15,117	100.0	4,925	100.0	2,693	100.0	796	100.0	3,222	100.0	1,217	100.0	2,264	100.0
Under 20	133	0.9	1	-	-	-	46	5.8	52	1.6	10	0.8	2	0.1
20-24	2,704	17.9	393	8.0	9	0.3	426	53.5	1,175	36.5	227	18.7	474	21.0
25-29	3,476	23.0	1,450	29.4	183	6.8	156	19.6	1,008	31.3	260	21.4	637	28.1
30-34	2,000	13.2	1,285	25.7	573	21.3	27	3.4	478	14.8	238	19.6	439	19.4
35-39	2,531	16.7	945	19.2	765	28.4	39	4.9	273	8.5	203	16.7	306	13.5
40-44	1,492	9.9	479	9.7	513	19.1	40	5.0	159	4.9	133	10.9	168	7.4
45-49	759	5.0	215	4.4	305	11.3	20	2.5	52	1.6	78	6.4	89	3.9
50-54	432	2.8	106	2.2	203	7.5	12	1.5	18	0.6	31	2.5	60	2.7
55-59	198	1.3	48	1.0	86	3.2	6	0.8	7	0.2	17	1.4	34	1.5
60 and over	154	1.0	21	0.4	56	2.1	2	0.3	-	-	20	1.6	55	2.4
<b>County classification</b>	15,208	100.0	5,104	100.0	2,682	100.0	796	100.0	3,145	100.0	1,217	100.0	2,264	100.0
Less Bonds	14,183	93.3	4,706	92.2	2,597	97.0	796	100.0	3,145	100.0	1,217	100.0	2,264	100.0
Hartman	198	1.3	125	2.5	55	2.1	-	-	6	0.2	12	1.0	-	-
Close	895	5.9	510	10.0	178	6.6	8	1.0	155	4.9	44	3.6	-	-
Medium	70,613	464.4	2,712	53.1	2,144	79.9	611	76.6	1,904	59.4	706	58.0	455	20.1
Maximum	4,110	27.0	1,051	20.6	305	11.4	177	22.2	761	23.9	455	37.4	-	-
Camps	1,225	8.1	706	13.8	-	-	-	-	219	6.9	-	-	-	-

\* Total number of men in custody classification are not consistent with other totals for variety of reasons



TABLE 204  
 PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF YP CHARACTERISTICS BY FOUR  
 INSTITUTIONS AND ROLE IN VIOLENT INCIDENTS OCCURRING IN  
 1963 AND 1964

Characteristics	YOUTH VICTIMS			SAN QUENTIN Pop. Victim Aggrav.	FOLSOM	DEUEL			CALIF. TRNG. FAC.			SAN QUENTIN AND MED. FAC.			CMC
	TOTAL Popula. Victim Aggrav.	MALES	FEMALES			Pop.	Voc. INST.	Pop.	VICTIM AGGRAV.	FAC.	Pop.	VICTIM AGGRAV.	FAC.		
STATUS WITH REFERENCE TO PRELIE	2120	39	59	1,305	22	29	1,054	11	10	211	6	10	0	0	
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
NOT FULFILLED SINCE COMMITTED PAROLED AND RETURNED	45.3	48.7	20.3	42.8	59.1	23.1	50.4	45.5	30.0	82.2	14.7	0.0			
54.7	51.3	79.7	57.2	40.9	76.9	49.6	49.6	54.5	70.0	17.8	83.3	100.0			
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
NO PRIOR COMMITMENTS															
PRIOR JUVENILE ONLY															
1 PRIOR PRISON COMMITMENT															
2 PRIOR PRISON COMMITMENTS															
3 PRIOR PRISON COMMITMENTS															
4 PE RECORD															
NO RECORD OF ESCAPE															
SOME RECORD OF ESCAPE															
COUNTY OR AREA FROM WHICH COMMITTED	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
LOS ANGELES Co.	49.5	38.5	54.2	47.6	40.9	42.7	49.2	27.3	70.0	59.8	50.0	60.0			
OTHER SOUTHERN COs.	14.5	20.5	18.6	13.3	13.6	23.1	16.1	45.5	20.0	13.8	0.0	0.0			
SAN FRANCISCO Co.	3.5	2.6	6.8	4.0	4.5	7.7	3.5	0.0	10.0	1.6	0.0	0.0			
ALAMEDA Co.	6.1	2.6	1.7	6.5	4.5	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	10.0			
SAN JOAQUIN AREA Co.	8.6	5.1	5.1	8.8	9.1	7.7	8.1	0.0	0.0	9.6	0.0	0.0			
10 SACRAMENTO VALLEY Co.	6.0	5.1	6.8	6.9	4.5	2.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	3.4	14.7	30.0			
7 SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY Co.	6.9	15.4	5.1	8.3	9.1	7.7	6.0	18.2	0.0	3.4	33.3	0.0			
22 OTHER COUNTIES	4.9	10.3	1.7	4.6	13.6	2.6	5.4	9.1	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0			

TABLE 20 B

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF VA CHARACTERISTICS BY FOUR INSTITUTIONS AND ROLE IN VIOLENT INCIDENTS OCCURRING IN 1963 AND 1964

CHARACTERISTIC	VA MILES INSTITUTIONS			SAN QUENTIN			FOLSOM			DEWEL			CALLE TRING FAC.			SAN QUENTIN AND MED. FAC.			
	POPULATION	VICTIMS	AGGRESSORS	POPULATION	VICTIMS	AGGRESSORS	POPULATION	VICTIMS	AGGRESSORS	POPULATION	VICTIMS	AGGRESSORS	POPULATION	VICTIMS	AGGRESSORS	POPULATION	VICTIMS	AGGRESSORS	
TOTAL NUMBER OF MEN	2620	39	59				1305	22	39	1054	11	10	261	6	10				
OFFENSE																			
HOMICIDE	1.2	0.0	0.0				1.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0				
ROBBERY	17.4	10.3	16.9				17.6	13.6	15.4	18.8	9.1	20.0	12.6	0.0	20.0				
ASSAULT	2.5	15.4	27.1				9.1	13.6	23.1	8.0	18.2	50.0	7.7	16.7	20.0				
BURGLARY	21.4	17.9	23.0				22.8	18.2	23.1	21.4	18.2	10.0	15.0	16.7	30.0				
THEFT	22.6	25.6	10.2				22.7	31.8	12.8	21.7	9.1	10.0	25.9	33.3	0.0				
FORGERY AND CHECKS	3.9	2.6	5.1				4.4	0.0	7.7	3.8	9.1	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0				
SEX	7.2	7.7	8.4				4.8	9.1	5.1	5.2	9.1	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0				
NARCOTICS	8.0	0.0	1.7				6.3	0.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	10.0	16.1	0.0	0.0				
OTHER	9.4	20.5	13.6				11.3	13.6	12.8	11.6	27.3	0.0	11.9	33.3	30.0				
ETHNIC GROUPS																			
WHITE	51.8	56.4	42.4				51.4	54.5	43.6	49.5	63.6	30.0	63.2	50.0	50.0				
WHITE, MEXICAN	21.9	25.6	22.0				21.8	22.7	23.1	21.5	36.4	20.0	23.8	16.7	20.0				
NEGRO	24.9	17.9	30.5				25.5	22.7	25.6	27.6	0.0	50.0	10.7	33.3	30.0				
OTHER	1.4	0.0	5.1				1.3	0.0	7.7	1.4	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0				
AGE IN YEARS																			
UNDER 20	49.5	46.2	54.2				51.3	45.5	53.8	49.4	72.7	60.0	41.0	0.0	50.0				
20-24	50.5	53.8	45.8				48.7	54.5	46.2	50.6	27.3	40.0	59.0	100.0	50.0				
25-29																			
30-34																			
35-39																			
40-49																			
50-59																			
60 AND OVER																			
CUSTODY CLASSIFICATION																			
MAXIMUM																			
CLOSE																			
MEDIUM																			
MINIMUM																			

NOT AVAILABLE

## SUMMARY

Incident reports generally describe minor blows against staff or severe stabbings against inmates. The sharp rises in both of these kinds of violence in 1964 cannot be ignored, even though less than two percent of the institutions' inmates were involved.

Youth and violence are strongly related regardless of institution involved. Minority ethnic status tends to be related to violence in general but not consistently at all institutions. Variations among institutions studied in the characteristics of participants suggest that differences in institutional climate may be a factor which should be studied in greater detail.

Previous histories of violence, particularly cultural and institutional, appear to be among the inmate characteristics most prognostic of current institutional violence. This study gives promise that we can identify the hard core of inmates most likely to commit institutional violence in the future.

The study showed violence to occur mainly in living and recreation areas, where staff and inmates could interact at close range with little structured activity.

Homosexual rivalry and force, pressure for possessions and racial tensions were given as the major causes underlying violence among inmates. Because of the sizeable increase in racial violence in 1964, preventative programs and further research on racial violence were recommended. Since the Watts insurrection, such programs and research appear to have become mandatory.

We know that among staff <sup>incidents</sup> ~~actions~~ it was mainly correctional officers who were the targets of inmates during apprehension and processing, but we know very little as to the role of staff as a direct or indirect causal agent for inmate violence.

The study has provided us with some new facts about violent incidents and the inmates who get involved as either victims or aggressors, but we have only scratched the surface of the problem of institutional violence.

## RESEARCH RECOMMENDATIONS

This study collected information hurriedly and sketchily under pressure to meet deadlines. Reworking and refining data on 1963-64 incidents covered in this study would be of value.

*prior* For the current study, the past violent acts of the inmate participants were only partially classified. It is possible to classify ~~just~~ violence in more detail with particular attention to the purposefulness of the act to the inmate. This could be done in order to determine the meaning of violence to violence-prone inmates, and the behavioral signs which would be prognostic of continued institutional violence.

In the current study there was no control group of non-participants in 1963-64's violent incidents. A sample of non-participants could be drawn from the six institutions. After coding the non-participants and cleaning up the hurried coding of the participants, an institutional violence participation proneness scale or scales could be developed.

All incidents result<sup>ing</sup>ed in a major injury or death to staff from 1960 through 1965 could be re-examined in detail to determine the causal factors and suggest preventative steps. It is possible that a careful study would reveal that in most such cases the inmates were aware of staff knowledge of an illegal act, and moved in to keep the staff member from reporting the act to authorities who would in some way punish the inmates.

All participants in 1966's incidents involving staff might be immediately de-briefed in depth to determine how staff could have avoided minor injuries from inmates. A concentration on how to avoid minor incidents against correctional officers while apprehending or processing inmates in living and recreational areas would probably have some immediate preventative payoff.

There appears to be a need to study why violence occurs in situations which usually find inmates achieving their goals through non-violent means. The payoff here is the emphasizing of non-violent means to inmates for achieving goals. A trial run at reducing sexual frustrations and resultant homosexual violence by permitting conjugal visits might be attempted.

The staff contributions to institutional atmospheres which are conducive to violence or as specific stimuli to individual acts of violence could be studied. The current study didn't even scratch the surface on staff's contribution to violence in institutions.

The interaction of types of violence-prone inmates with institutional climates or types of institutional staff could be studied for purposes of program changes as well as staff and inmate assignments.