

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA

St. John's Road, Tyler's Green

High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-13,657

GOODSTEIN, Lynne Irene, 1948-
INMATE ADJUSTMENT TO PRISON AND POST-
RELEASE OUTCOME.

City University of New York, Ph.D., 1977
Sociology, criminology

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

INMATE ADJUSTMENT TO PRISON AND POST-RELEASE OUTCOME

by

LYNNE GOODSTEIN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfill-
ment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy, The City
University of New York.

1977

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

June 21, 1977
date

Barbara S. Dohrenwend
Chairman of Examining Committee

January 23, 1977
date

Flourence L. Penmark
Executive Officer

Barbara S. Dohrenwend

Morton Bard

Robert Martinson
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It would be impossible for me to thank personally every individual who has in some way helped me to complete this project. There have been literally hundreds of people involved. The data for this study could not have been gathered without the gracious cooperation of prison administrators Hewitt, Steinert, and Robinson and their friendly and interested staffs of corrections officers, counselors, educators, clerks, and student interns. I learned a great deal from these people, both during the execution of the present research project as well as during the spare moments in which we had a chance to discuss the problems of corrections in general. I am greatly indebted to the correctional systems of Connecticut and Pennsylvania for the opportunity to meet and work with these people.

I would also like to thank my advisors and the readers of my dissertation: Morton Bard, Stanley Milgram, Robert Martinson, and Florence Denmark for their interest, criticism, and extremely helpful suggestions. A special thanks goes to Barbara Dohrenwend, my principal advisor, for the consistent and conscientious help and support she has provided over the three-plus years this project has been in the making. My husband, R. Lance Shotland, also deserves a special thanks for his seemingly unending professional counsel and emotional support.

Finally, I would like to thank the inmates of the correctional institutions at Huntingdon, Somers, and Enfield for their cooperation and interest.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
 <u>Chapter</u>	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Inmate Typologies	3
The Effects of Incarceration on Inmates	13
A Theory of the Effects of Total Institutions	27
The Institutionalizing Effects of Mental Hospitals and Other Total Institutions	30
Prison Research with Implications for Institutionalism	39
II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TYPOLOGY OF INMATE ADJUSTMENT TO PRISON--STUDIES I AND II	54
Introduction	54
Study I--Development of the Instrument	54
Method	55
The Instrument	55
Subjects	56
Procedure	56
Results and Discussion	57
Study II--Establishing Construct Validity of the Typology . .	59
Method	60
Subjects	60
Procedure	60
Results and Discussion	60
The Somers Sample	61
The Enfield Sample	65
Summary	66
Discussion of Studies I and II	67
The Four Modes of Adjustment	70
The Somers Sample	74
The Enfield Sample	77
Conclusions	80
III. STUDY III--FURTHER VALIDATION OF THE TYPOLOGY OF INMATE ADJUSTMENT	82
Introduction	82
Behavioral Correlates of the Modes of Institutional Adjustment	82
Institutional Behavior	85
Orientation to the Outside World	85

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Determinants of the Modes of Institutional Adjustment . .	85
Background Characteristics	86
Institutional Experience	86
Comparing Modes of Adjustment across Institutions	87
Method	89
The Research Setting	89
Huntingdon	90
Enfield	90
Somers	91
The Instruments	92
The Correctional Institution Environment Scale	92
The Inmate Attitude Scale	93
Background Information and Current Events	
Questionnaires	94
The Supervisor's Rating Scale	94
Subjects	95
Huntingdon Sample	95
Enfield Sample	96
Somers Sample	96
Procedure	97
Results	101
Comparisons of the Three Institutions	101
The Inmates	101
The Social Climates	104
The Attitude Scales--Determining Reliability	109
Comparison of the Four Adjustment Types	113
Institutional Behavior	115
Recreational activities	115
Treatment activities	117
Disciplinary record	119
Supervisors' ratings	119
Type of institutional job	119
Skill level	121
Rehabilitation potential	121
Attitudes toward the Institution	121
Orientation to the Outside World	124
Background Characteristics	127
Institutional Experience	134
Discussion	134
IV. STUDY IV--INMATE ADJUSTMENT AND POST-RELEASE OUTCOME	144
Introduction	144
Method	147
Subjects	147
Huntingdon Sample	147
Enfield Sample	148
Somers Sample	149
Procedure	149

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
Results	151
The First Month	154
Warnings--Months Two through Six	166
Employment Status--Months Two through Six	166
Formal CJS Contacts--Months Two through Six	166
Addiction--Months Two through Six	168
Absconding from Supervision	168
Discussion	169
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	179
APPENDIX	187
REFERENCES	232

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Phase of Institutional Career and Conformity to Staff Expectations (in Percent)	16
2. Mean Scores for Variables Measured in Study #2 by Mode of Adjustment--Somers Sample	75
3. Mean Scores for Variables Measured in Study #2 by Mode of Adjustment--Enfield Sample	78
4. Hypothesized Behavioral and Attitudinal Characteristics of the Four Inmate Types	83
5. Mean Age, Age at First Arrest, and Highest Grade Achieved for Inmates at the Three Prisons	102
6. Marital Status and Race of Inmates in the Three Prisons . . .	103
7. Distribution of Types of Offenses Committed by Inmates in the Three Prisons (in Percents)	105
8. Mean Inmate Scores and F-Ratios for Nine CIES Scales for the Three Prisons	107
9. Percentage of Inmates Employing the Four Modes of Adjustment at the Three Prisons	108
10. Correlations between Satisfaction with Prison and Release Orientation Scales and Selected Background Variables for the Three Prisons	111
11. Distribution of Inmates by Mode of Adjustment at the Three Prisons	114
12. Mean Recreational Activities Participated in by Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment for Three Prisons	116
13. Mean Treatment Activities Participated in by Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment for Three Prisons	118
14. Mean Infractions Per Month Committed by Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment for Three Prisons	120
15. Mean Supervisors' Ratings for Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment for Two Prisons	120
16. Percent of Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment with Skilled Jobs for the Three Prisons	122

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
17. Percent of Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment Holding Jobs with Rehabilitation Potential for the Three Prisons	122
18. Percent of Inmates Reporting Adjustment to Prison by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	123
19. Percent of Inmates Reporting Being Upset Upon Admission by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	125
20. Mean Scores on the Outside World Contact Index by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	125
21. Mean Scores on the Current Events Test by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	126
22. Mean Inmate Grade Level by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	128
23. Mean Score on Occupational Index by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	128
24. Mean Scores on the Family Status Index by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	129
25. Mean Inmate Age by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	129
26. Mean Age at First Arrest by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	131
27. Percent of Inmates with Reformatory Experience by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	131
28. Percent of Inmates with Mental Hospital Experience by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	132
29. Percent of Inmates with Experience in the Armed Forces by Mode of Adjustment for Two Prisons	132
30. Percent of Inmates Reporting Themselves as White by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	133
31. Mean Scores on the Prison Experience Index by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	135
32. Mean Proportion of Term Served by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons	135

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
33. Percent of Parolees Who Had Not Absconded or Been Returned to Prison Receiving Informal Warnings for each Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	155
34. Percent of Parolees Who Had Not Absconded or Been Returned to Prison Who Were Unemployed for Each Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	157
35. Percent of Parolees Who Had Not Absconded or Been Returned to Prison with Negative CJS Contacts for Each Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	158
36. Percent of Parolees Who Committed One or More Technical Violations Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	160
37. Percent of Parolees for Whom Parole Violation Warrants Were Issued Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	161
38. Percent of Parolees for Whom One or More Misconduct Reports Were Filed Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	162
39. Percent of Parolees Arrested One or More Times Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	163
40. Percent of Parolees Whose Paroles Were Revoked Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	164
41. Percent of Parolees Who Had Not Absconded or Been Returned to Prison Who Were Addicted for Each Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	165
42. Percent of Parolees Who Absconded Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment	167

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Matrix of Sykes' Four Social Types	10
2. Revised Typology of Inmate Adjustment to Prison	71

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Crime has become a significant problem in American society. Within the last decade, the rates of most categories of crime have increased significantly (FBI, 1973). In addition, as a recent Gallup poll demonstrated, the threat of crime and fear of victimization have become increasing concerns of the American people (Gallup, 1972).

Furthermore, it appears that institutions designed for the purpose of reforming criminals are not working. Recidivism rates have been estimated at anywhere from 33 percent (Glaser, 1964) to over 50 percent (Ward, Kassebaum, and Wilner, 1971), with rates rising even higher among some types of criminals in the younger age brackets (Wilkins, 1969). There is little disagreement even among most correctional administrators that prisons fail to rehabilitate. Indeed, many individuals argue that if prisons have any effect on their inmates at all, it is to turn them a step further in the direction of future criminality (Bondeson, 1974).

A number of sociologists have explored the effects of incarceration on inmates, commonly concentrating on the presumed anti-social impact of the inmate subculture (cf. Clemmer, 1940; Wheeler, 1961; Schrag, 1961). Other sociologists, notably Erving Goffman (1961), have speculated on the potential negative effects that the routinized, predictable style of institutional life which is sanctioned by the staff and administration may have on inmates. The research to be described in this dissertation was designed to test the validity of Goffman's theory of the effects of total institutions on inmates. In addition,

it was designed to relate the experience of institutional living to post-release outcome in an attempt to substantiate the adverse effects of inmate conformity to the formal institutional routine. A typology describing four modes of inmate adjustment to prison was developed, and an attempt was made to apply the typology to predict inmate post-release performance. In the context of the present research, the following questions were addressed: Will those inmates who conform to the expectations of the staff members do well upon release? On the other hand, how would those inmates who rebel against the authoritarianism of the institution be expected to adjust? These as well as related questions concerning institutional behavior and post-release outcome were dealt with and at least partially answered as part of the present research.

To provide an historical and theoretical perspective for the present research, it is necessary to review the literature on inmate adjustment to at least two different types of institutions, prisons and mental hospitals. A number of authors have developed typologies to describe the various ways that inmates adjust to prison; these will be discussed and their similarities and differences to the typology presented here will be noted. Other corrections researchers have focused on the impact of several institutional and individual background variables, particularly time served in prison, on the development and change of inmate attitudes. Since attitudes to prison can be said to have a direct relation to adjustment, selected studies from this group will also be reviewed. It has primarily been the researchers in the mental hospital field who have attempted to

demonstrate Goffman's theory most directly; thus, the relevant studies in this area will be discussed.

Inmate Typologies

The development of typologies or classification schemes has a long history in criminology, dating at least as far back as Lombroso, often called the father of modern criminology, who attempted to predict criminal behavior on the basis of physical characteristics (see Quinney, 1970; Clinard and Quinney, 1967). It is probable that the popularity of classification schemes over the years relates to the potential predictive value of these typologies in identifying who will and who will not commit crimes in the future. For the most part, attempts to employ the various typologies of inmate adjustment to prison for predicting future criminality have been rather unsuccessful (see Simon, 1971). Therefore, attempts to classify different patterns of behavior and social roles employed by inmates within a correctional institution have turned away from an emphasis on prediction to a description of the inmate social system within the prison, an area of study which has been of interest to sociologists in and of itself.

Probably the most widely used typology of prison inmates was developed by Clarence Schrag (1961). Essential to his typology is the assumption that in every correctional institution an inmate subculture exists whose attitudes, values, and behaviors are contradictory to the norms of the broader society. To maintain and reinforce the inmate subculture, a system of interdependent roles evolved which govern a wide range of inmate interactions. Schrag's role types concern the social relations among inmates, inmates' contacts with

staff members, and their contacts with the civilian world, since these factors are most salient in describing the adjustments which inmates must make to incarceration. Schrag's typology also relates these inmate role types to pre-institutional factors such as family background and criminal history as well as making predictions for post-prison adjustment. The labels Schrag used to describe the role types were derived from popular prison argot and thus are also commonly referred to as argot roles. The following are brief descriptions of Schrag's hypothesized social types.

The square John incumbents are the least criminally experienced of the four major role types. They tend to be convicted for violent crimes such as homicide or assault, or naive property offenses such as forgery, having begun their criminal careers rather late in life. In prison, their activities further the maintenance of their prosocial identities, since they maintain close ties with their families, have more than average contact with correction officers, and actively participate in staff-sponsored treatment programs. In general, square Johns attempt to conform to the expectations which staff members and the administration legitimate authority figures hold for their behavior.

In contrast to the square John, the right guy has had extensive criminal experience, having begun criminal activity early in life. Because his crimes of robbery and burglary are his major mode of livelihood, the right guy tends to be highly recidivistic. His personal history often includes a family with other delinquent members, and he often comes from an underprivileged urban neighborhood. Right guys tend to have had unstable educational, marital, and occupational adjustments, although they often maintain close ties with family

members. In prison, they continue to interact with other inmates who define themselves as criminal, viewing their role requirements in terms of the norms of the inmate subculture.

The third type, the politician, is most likely incarcerated for sophisticated offenses such as embezzlement or fraud. This type of inmate often comes from a middle-class background and has had a stable occupational record, although there are often instances of family disturbance during his early years. The prison politician takes a pragmatic perspective on his incarceration. He often acts as a moderator between inmates and officers, placing himself in a favorable position with each group. His conception of his role incorporates both legitimate and illegitimate expectations.

The last type is the outlaw who is known for bizarre and often apparently irrational crimes, high recidivism, and behavior disorders. His early background often includes both early parental rejection and childhood institutional care. In prison, he is a troublemaker, often the instigator of a riot or escape plan. However, the outlaw fails to become emotionally involved with other inmates or staff; instead, he rebels against both legitimate and illegitimate norms for behavior.

Schrag's typology has been shown to have a certain degree of validity. For example, Schrag found that participation in staff-sponsored activities varied as a function of inmate social type. Square Johns, the most active participants, frequented therapeutic activities, while politicians and right guys, the next two most active types, preferred to participate in expressive or recreational activities. Outlaws were least active in any type of staff-sponsored activity. In addition, a sociometric analysis of inmate friendship patterns

showed that except for the Square John, who preferred politicians, every inmate type preferred to associate with similar role incumbents (Schrag, 1961).

The major problem with Schrag's typology was that he failed to specify the means by which he identified inmates as belonging to each of his various categories. Thus, it was not possible to determine the numbers of inmates who did not correspond to any type, nor is it possible to rule out the existence of bias in his interviews with inmates. Also, because Schrag reported relationships in qualitative rather than quantitative terms, it is not possible to determine the magnitude of the behavioral differences among social types. Finally, Schrag's predictions for post-release adjustment were not borne out by follow-up data, thus raising questions concerning the utility of the typology for applied purposes and demonstrating its low level of predictive validity (Strinden, 1959; reported in Schrag, 1961).

Garabedian's (1959, 1963) study did attempt to bring the strength of quantitative methods to bear on the problem of inmate categorization. He developed an attitude scale for classifying inmates by role type using Schrag's typology. He added a fifth type, called the ding, "whose responses to focal issues and deprivations lack the consistency to be assigned to one of the (other four) roles" (p. 144). For each of the five social types, he developed three statements designed to reflect the cognitive orientation of that type. For example, a statement reflecting the square John orientation would be: "I generally feel guilty when I'm wrong," and a statement reflecting the politician's perspective would be, "You've got to have confidence in yourself if you're going to be successful." He administered the composite scale

of 15 items to a sample of 345 inmates from a maximum security state institution. He reported that he was able to classify 251, or 73 percent of the total sample, implying that Schrag's typology was applicable to three-quarters of the inmate population. However, the three-item subscales were apparently not validated nor were reliabilities determined, so it is not clear that the scales were, in fact, measuring Schrag's types. One indication that Garabedian's method did not accurately reflect Schrag's types is the proportion of inmates reported as politicians (32%). Since politicians were said to receive favored treatment from officers and played a mediator role vis-à-vis officers and other inmates, it is unlikely that this label would apply to one-third of all inmates. In addition, Garabedian's method of allocating inmates to types is subject to some question. A given inmate was represented by five scores, one score for each subscale measuring a specific inmate type. Garabedian determined an inmate's social type by categorizing him by the role for which he had the highest positive score of the five. If an inmate had tied highest scores, he was classified in favor of the score which was farthest from the absolute mean of its distribution. Therefore, it would be possible for an inmate with a score of five on the right guy items to be labeled a politician if he scored a six on those items, while another inmate with the highest score of four on the right guy items would have been labeled as such. Despite its problems, Garabedian's scale was an attempt to operationalize Schrag's categories for classification purposes.

Garrity (1956) attempted to classify inmates by Schrag's social types by employing inmate record data. He reported that he was able

to classify 73 percent of the inmates at Washington State Reformatory and 64 percent at the Washington State Penetentiary using only such variables as offense type, institutional work record, etc. In a later study of a California correctional institution, Kassebaum, Ward, and Wilner (1971) applied Garrity's technique to a sample of 1180 inmates and were able to classify only one-fourth of the sample population. After trying other schemata, the authors concluded that classifying inmates by social type was unworkable due to the consistently large number of unclassifiable inmates. These studies raise questions concerning the validity of Schrag's typology in describing inmate institutional behavior. It appears doubtful that many inmates consistently conform to specific roles while in prison. Rather, they may maintain certain attitudinal perspectives to incarceration while they adapt and change their behaviors to conform to the demands of specific situations.

Although Schrag's typology is the best known, other systems of inmate classification have also been developed. Gresham Sykes (1956) conceptualized inmate behavior as varying along two dimensions: manipulateness and proneness to violence. According to Sykes, inmates high on manipulateness escape the frustrations of imprisonment by taking advantage of fellow inmates. Merchants, as they are called, show skill at "figuring the angles," are stingy, customarily "gyp" other inmates in transactions, and "brown nose" other inmates for personal gain. The violence-prone inmate or tough manifests arrogant behavior, often makes a show of physical strength, and is known to use force to start fights with other inmates. Sykes developed attitude scales to measure the two inmate types mentioned above. He administered these

to correction officers of a maximum security institution, requesting them to characterize 115 selected inmates. Crossing two levels, high and low, of the two dimensions, a four-celled matrix was developed (see Figure 1).

Sykes found that, according to the correction officers, inmates high on the violence dimension were likely to side with inmates in a riot, but yet would inform on fellow inmates, and would commit offenses in prison. In addition, they were thought to be feared by other inmates. Inmates high on either manipulativenness or violence, or both, were thought by officers to have a low prognosis for success upon release. Only the inmates low on both dimensions were viewed favorably by the responding correction officers. This inmate type, the real man as labeled by Sykes, was viewed as an individual who was unlikely to side with inmates in a riot, was highly respected by most inmates, and had a good chance of "going straight" upon release. Sykes characterized the "real man" as an inmate who maintained his sense of personal dignity and worth, while concerning himself with helping other inmates in prison. Sykes admitted that this role was adhered to by relatively few inmates.

While Sykes' typology had the advantage of objectivity in classification, it relied on the perceptions of the staff members rather than the attitudes or behaviors of the inmates themselves. From this study it is impossible to determine whether Sykes' categories correlate with inmate behavior, either during the prison term, before incarceration, or after release. There is some evidence that staff members' and administrators' perceptions of inmates are at variance with inmates' perceptions of themselves (Hazelrigg, 1967;

		VIOLENCE	
		High	Low
MANIPULATIVENESS	High	Merchant and Tough	Merchant
	Low	Tough	Real Man

Figure 1. Matrix of Sykes' Four Social Types.

Reckless, 1971) so that Sykes' findings should probably be regarded with caution.

Another typology of inmate behavior was developed by Hayner, a parole officer who attempted to systematize the observations he had made during his 15 years of direct experience with inmates (Hayner, 1961). His system consisted of the following five categories: the con forger, the alcoholic forger, the rapo, the heavy, and the graduate. Aside from the similarity of some of his types to Schrag's social types, Hayner made no attempt to empirically validate his typology, nor did he devise an objective system for classification of inmates.

The preceding typologies stressed the indigenous origin of inmate social types as a response to the conditions of imprisonment. On the other hand, the next two typologies emphasized the effects of extra-prison influences on the inmate social structure. Heffernan (1972) challenged the notion of a single inmate adaptive system, and argued that the inmate society was composed of "multiple subsystems of goals, codes of acceptable behavior and means of mutual support" (p. 25). Moreover, which of these subsystems a particular inmate chose was dependent upon that person's normative background, operationally defined by criminal history.¹ The square subsystem was composed of essentially noncriminal inmates convicted of homicide, assault, and "white-collar crimes." The cool subsystem derived its membership from professional criminals, whose offense histories included burglary, robbery, forgery, and check stealing. The third subsystem, labeled the

¹Her research was carried out in an institution for female offenders, but her findings are applicable to both male and female inmates.

life, referred to so-called habitual offenders commonly incarcerated for drug-related offenses or prostitution. Heffernan classified 100 percent of her sample by the above criteria and compared the three subsystems on a number of variables including differential orientations to prison, disciplinary rates, and job performance. She found, for example, that the majority of cools rejected the need to have close friendships among other inmates, while the squares were ambivalent, and the majority of the life agreed that inmate friendships were necessary for "survival" in prison. In terms of inmate job performance, work supervisors evaluated the majority of squares as excellent workers, while members of the life were assessed as good workers, and the cools were rated least favorably of the three types. Heffernan concluded that whether an inmate would become a cool, a square, or a life was determined to a large extent by the type of lifestyle she was accustomed to before imprisonment.

In the same vein, Irwin and Cressey (1962; Irwin, 1970) posited the existence of three inmate subcultures existing side by side in the prison community. These three subcultures, the thief, the convict, and the legitimate, maintain different orientations to imprisonment, different institutional behaviors, and so on. The authors stressed the importance of such factors as latent culture, latent identities, and pre-prison experiences in their interpretation of the development of the inmate social system.

In summary, the inmate typology has been a popular means for characterizing the inmate culture of correctional institutions. Most of the efforts, however, have not fulfilled the criteria for good typologies described by Gibbons and Garrity (1959). They argued that a

good typology should account for a major part of the inmate population and should describe the developmental history, etiology, and prognosis of each type. A typology should also be clear and unambiguous so that actual inmates can be reliably classified within the system; and it should be parsimonious, such that the number of types are few. Most important, like any theory, a typology is meaningful only if its validity has been empirically demonstrated. When judged against these criteria, most of the typologies reported in this section must be found lacking. Some appeared to be inapplicable to large segments of inmate populations, others were not validated at all, while none was shown to be useful tools in the prediction of inmate post-release behavior. The fact that several authors were able to demonstrate expected relationships between inmate social types and various measures of institutional behavior is, nevertheless, highly significant. It implies that inmates do use different strategies for adapting to prison life, and these strategies may very well have implications for adjustment beyond the confines of the institution.

The Effects of Incarceration on Inmates

Another question addressed by a large number of sociologists in the field of corrections concerns the impact of institutional living on the inmate. Clemmer (1940) was one of the first sociologists to deal with this question systematically, and his theoretical contribution to the field was the concept of prisonization. He postulated the existence of an inmate society or subculture whose roles, values, norms, and behaviors were distinctly antithetical to the process of rehabilitation. The unifying force of the inmate society was the inmate code, which

required loyalty to inmates and opposition to staff members who were supposedly viewed as representatives of legitimate society. The process by which inmates developed allegiance to the inmate code was called prisonization, or as Clemmer wrote, "the taking on, to a greater or lesser extent, the folkways, mores, customs, and general culture of the penitentiary" (Clemmer, 1940, p. 299). The prisonized inmate held distinctly antisocial attitudes, and presumably the more prisonized an inmate was, the less favorable were his chances of success upon release from prison. Clemmer argued that prisonization occurred to some extent to every incarcerated individual, but some factors mediated the degree to which prisonization affected an inmate. The extent of an inmate's contacts and allegiance to legitimate society, a shorter exposure to prison, and relative uninvolvedness in the inmate subculture were viewed as factors which might minimize the effects of prisonization.

Stanton Wheeler's well-known study empirically tested the validity of the prisonization concept (Wheeler, 1959, 1961). He developed an index of prisonization which consisted of five hypothetical moral dilemmas whose solutions reflected either allegiance to the inmate code or conformity to staff expectations for inmate behavior. This scale was administered to 259 inmates at a western maximum security state institution, and for the majority of inmates the results did not support Clemmer's theory.

He analyzed his data by dividing his inmate respondents into three groups: the early phase (up to six months in prison), the middle phase (more than six months served and more than six months to serve), and late phase (six months or less to serve) and determined

percentages of high, medium, and low conformity to staff norms for each group. Instead of finding a consistent decline in the percentage of inmates who showed high conformity to staff norms, as the prisonization theory would predict, he found a U-shaped distribution. That is, inmates were more likely to show high conformity to staff norms during the early and late phases of their incarceration than during the middle phase. To explain his results, Wheeler argued that instead of conformity to legitimate norms decreasing in a linear fashion as an inmate's time in prison increased, it varied with the inmate's perception of the psychological distance between himself and the outside community. The more removed the inmate felt himself to be from the outside world, the less likely for him to conform to staff norms, thus showing more "prisonization" during the middle phase of their incarceration. According to Wheeler, inmates tend to "shed the prison culture before they leave it." It should be added that Clemmer's hypothesis was sustained among the proportion of inmates who reported low conformity to staff norms. There was a consistent increase in the proportion of inmates reporting low conformity from the early to late phase of incarceration (see Table 1).

Wheeler did find support for Clemmer's hypothesis that the speed and degree of prisonization appeared to be a function of involvement in the inmate social system.² He found that during the first prison phase, involvement with other inmates was unrelated to an inmate's

²Intensity of involvement was measured by the degree to which inmates said they spent their free time together or by themselves; extensiveness of involvement was assessed by the number of close friendships reported.

Table 1. Phase of Institutional Career and Conformity to Staff Expectations (in Percent).^a

Institutional Career Phase	<u>Conformity to Staff Expectations</u>			N
	High	Medium	Low	
Early	47	44	9	77
Middle	21	65	14	94
Late	43	33	25	40

^aTaken from Wheeler (1961).

degree of conformity to staff norms. However, during the middle phase of incarceration, inmates who were highly involved in the inmate social system tended to show less conformity to staff norms, while inmates who were uninvolved tended to remain highly conforming. This finding indicated that involvement with other inmates appeared to mitigate against pressures to conform to staff norms.

Wheeler interpreted these results in terms of the theory that the inmate culture operates as a problem-solving response to the adjustment problems and deprivations posed by imprisonment (Sykes, 1958; Sykes and Messenger, 1960). Sykes and Messenger argued that aside from the lack of liberty due to incarceration, inmates are deprived of (1) social status, (2) material goods and services, (3) heterosexual relations, (4) autonomy, and (5) security in relation to other inmates. In an attempt to partially compensate for these deprivations, some inmates develop a cohesive social group which serves to lessen the "pains of imprisonment." Wheeler attempted to explain his U-shaped results by arguing that the pains of imprisonment and, conversely, the impact of the inmate culture would be greatest during the middle of the inmate's stay, when he is farthest removed from the outside world. Thus, conformity with the inmate code would be most intense during that period. The latter phase of his incarceration should be viewed as a period of resocialization, when the inmate shifts his reference group from the inmate subculture back to the outside world community.

Seven years after the publication of the Wheeler study, Atchley and McCabe (1968) presented a replication of Wheeler's original prisonization research. They gathered their data from a maximum

security federal reformatory in the southwest and used the same methods as Wheeler. The significance of their study is that they entirely failed to replicate Wheeler's results. They found no relationship, either linear or curvilinear, between time served in prison and conformity to staff norms; nor did they find a relationship between involvement with other inmates and conformity to staff norms. In an attempt to explain their results, they cited the strong inverse relationship found by Wheeler between the amount of inmate interaction and conformity to staff norms especially during the middle phase. Since their data showed a much weaker relationship between these variables, they hypothesized that the crucial determinant of inmate conformity or nonconformity to staff norms was the degree of involvement with other inmates, not the phase of their institutional career.

Tittle's (1972a) research in a federal narcotics hospital supported Atchley and McCabe's results. The relationship between phase of institutional career and subscription to the inmate code was found to be nonsignificant, and no relationship was found between involvement with other inmates and inmate code subscription. Hautalouma and Scott (1973), in a study of values and sociometric choices of juveniles, also obtained results in contradiction to Wheeler's findings. They found a linear rather than curvilinear relationship between time served and antisocial values, giving some substantiation to Clemmer's original prisonization construct.

The contradictory findings reported above allow for few conclusions concerning the effects of time served or involvement with other inmates on the tendency for inmates to conform to staff norms. One factor which may account for the lack of replication of Wheeler's findings is the

noncomparability of the prisons studied. Atchley and McCabe studied a federal institution, where almost half of the inmates had been convicted of auto theft, while Tittle studied a narcotics hospital for criminal offenders,³ not a prison, and Hautalouma and Scott worked with juveniles.

One finding which was common to most of the above studies is that for the vast majority of inmates, imprisonment does not cause them to leave prison with more antisocial attitudes than when they entered. The majority of inmates may not be affected by their apparent shift from pro- to antisocial and back to prosocial attitudes over the course of their sentences. However, it is possible that a minority of inmates are adversely affected by never returning to a prosocial orientation; that is, they remain antisocial. Wheeler's findings suggested this fact. He found that a small percentage of inmates with low conformity to staff norms did become more antisocial as a result of their incarceration.

Since Wheeler's research, other investigators have employed his basic paradigm to study the relationship between inmate attitudes and a wide range of variables associated with imprisonment. Research has demonstrated that antistaff attitudes are influenced by such factors as the social role the inmate plays (Garabedian, 1963, 1964; Thomas and Foster, 1973), the inmates' self-concept (Faine, 1973; Tittle, 1972), the amount of time incarcerated (Garabedian, 1963; Wellford, 1967), the degree of alienation from the larger society and the institution (Tittle

³Tittle studied both voluntary and involuntary commitments to the hospital.

and Tittle, 1964; Thomas and Zingraff, 1975), and differences in the social environments of the institutions (Zald and Street, 1964; Sarri and Vinter, 1965; Street, 1965; Street et al., 1966; Berk, 1966; Cline, 1968; Mathieson, 1971). A few of these studies that have particular relevance to the present research will be reviewed in detail. Most have assumed that incarceration affects inmates differentially and have attempted to determine inmate characteristics which may enhance adverse effects of imprisonment.

Garabedian (1959, 1963) studied the relationship between time served and conformity to staff norms for different inmate social types. He categorized 380 inmates of a maximum security Western prison by social type, using the scale previously discussed, and administered Wheeler's prisonization scales. His results indicated grossly different patterns of conformity to staff norms for different inmate social types. The square Johns and right guys appeared to conform to Wheeler's U-shaped finding; they were prisonized during the middle phase and "deprisonized" during the late phase of their incarceration. Those inmates categorized as outlaws, however, appeared to experience prisonization since they manifested increasing nonconformity to staff norms with increased time to the institution. Politicians tended to conform to staff norms throughout their institutional career, while dings showed increasing conformity to staff norms over time.

These findings should be regarded cautiously for at least two reasons. First, as mentioned previously, the validity of Garabedian's instrument for inmate classification was not demonstrated, and second, the number of inmate respondents in the late phase of incarceration was quite small. Garabedian's conclusions were drawn on the basis of

responses from two outlaws, five square Johns, and seven right guys who were in the late phase of their incarceration. Clearly, further research should be undertaken to demonstrate the relationship between role type and conformity to staff norms over time.

Faine (1973) attacked the problem of prisonization by focusing on the self-concept of inmates, specifically whether the inmate viewed himself as primarily legitimate or primarily deviant. He argued that an inmate who defines himself in terms of socially acceptable roles, e.g., businessmen, Mason, hard worker, etc., would be unlikely to view himself as part of the inmate subculture, while inmates with highly deviant self-concepts, e.g., drug users, ex-cons, "losers," etc., would view other inmates as a meaningful reference group. Length of time in prison should not affect the tendency for either of these groups to view themselves as part of the inmate subculture, since their identities are well formulated. On the other hand, inmates with weak self-concepts, that is, inmates who see themselves as a mixture of legitimate and deviant, should experience the greatest attitude reorganization as a consequence of imprisonment.

To test his assertions, he administered the Kuhn and MacPartland Twenty Statements Test (Kuhn and MacPartland, 1954) to a sample of 268 inmates from medium and maximum security institutions and analyzed the responses in terms of legitimate deviant self-concept. He also administered questions regarding inmate reference group identification, which he measured by asking respondents whether or not they liked to associate with "law breakers."

As expected, he found that inmates with a legitimate self-concept did not wish to associate with "law breakers" throughout their three

phases of incarceration. On the other hand, inmates with a deviant self-concept saw themselves as more similar to other inmates and preferred more association with "law breakers" over the course of their institutional careers. As predicted, inmates with weak self-concepts showed the most fluctuation in their willingness to associate with "law breakers." They were slightly more likely to identify with other inmates and prefer association with "law breakers" during their middle career phase than early or late in their incarcerations, although this difference was not statistically significant.

Results from Faine's study supported the position that the effects of incarceration on inmates are not uniform. Instead, Faine suggested that the impact of prison is mediated by the self-concepts men have when they enter prison. However, due to the cross-sectional nature of his design, it cannot be assured that the self-concepts themselves do not change over time. Nevertheless, it appears that those inmates with legitimate self-concepts were able to maintain their prosocial identities while inmates with deviant self-concepts became more criminalized over their prison career. Those inmates without a strong identification with either the criminal or legitimate worlds (weak self-concepts) demonstrated a trend reflecting the Wheeler socialization-resocialization pattern.

Wellford (1967) undertook a further test of Wheeler's findings, this time in a medium security institution serving the District of Columbia. He was interested in the effects of the length of time an inmate spends in the institution, the phase of his institutional career, and his criminal social type on prisonization. Like Wheeler, he presented the inmates with a series of moral dilemmas, assuming that

agreement with staff responses to the dilemmas implied low prisonization, while disagreement implied high prisonization. He also characterized respondents by their social type, either prosocial, antisocial, or unclassified, but did not specify how these classifications were made. In analyzing his results, Wellford found no relationship between time served and prisonization but did find a significant relationship between phase of institutional career and prisonization. That is, inmates were most prisonized during the middle phase of incarceration, a finding which supports Wheeler's work. He also found a significant relationship between inmate social types and prisonization; antisocial inmates tended to be more prisonized than prosocial or unclassified inmates.

Wellford noted that though these two variables were found to be related to prisonization, phase of career and social type were found to be independent of each other. To explain this situation, Wellford argued that Sykes and Messenger's deprivation theory was not sufficient to explain normative prisonization. Echoing the arguments of Hefferman and Irwin, he contended that a significant determinant of an inmate's socialization to prison is his lifestyle prior to incarceration, specifically whether or not he has been involved with other criminals. He concluded that the degree of normative socialization to prison is affected by at least two major variables which are not necessarily related: (1) the situational characteristic, that is, the depriving nature of the institution, and (2) the actor characteristic, the inmate social type.

Thomas and Foster (1973) also questioned the power of the deprivation model to explain the development of the antisocial inmate

subculture. They argued that Sykes and Messenger's problem-solving approach to imprisonment implied a closed-system paradigm and thus failed to take into consideration that the type of response made by the inmate to prison may be influenced by both his past experiences and his anticipation of the future. They argued that inmates are adults who have already been socialized to subscribe to certain norms and values on the outside, which are to a large extent not that different from the norms and values held by the inmate subculture (see Miller, 1958; Ohlin, 1956). In addition, a person's orientation to imprisonment should be affected by various dimensions of contact he maintains with the outside world. If his expectations for his post-prison life are favorable and if he maintains supportive contacts with family and friends on the outside, he will feel less isolated and thus the pressures for involvement in the inmate subculture should be mitigated. To test these assertions, Thomas and Foster conducted a study at a large southeastern maximum security prison. They developed and administered to 442 inmates a prisonization scale which consisted of items relating to physical toughness, manipulative relations with the prison staff, importance of inmate loyalty, and exploitative sex relations. They also collected data on social class, previous criminal experience, number of contacts with persons outside prison, and post-prison expectations.

Thomas and Foster found that inmates from the lowest social class were considerably more prisonized than inmates from the highest social class, thus supporting the relationship between pre-prison experiences and prisonization. The extent of an inmate's prior experience with the criminal subculture was also related to prisonization, since the inmate's age at his first conviction was inversely related to the degree of his

prisonization. Not only were pre-prison life experiences important correlates of prisonization, extra-prison relationships (defined by the number of letters received per week) and post-prison expectations were shown to be important as well. Thomas and Foster demonstrated that the more contacts an inmate received from the outside world and the more favorable his post-prison expectations, the less likely he was to become prisonized. Zingraff (1976) reported highly similar findings for incarcerated juveniles.

These studies add an important perspective to the literature on inmate socialization in that they demonstrate that not all inmate behavior or attitudes are determined by the immediate context of the institution. Many of the determinants of an inmate's degree of prisonization exist before the inmate ever enters the institution and depend on factors beyond the control of institutional staff or administrators. The results from Thomas and Foster's study indicate that the importation model of inmate socialization, which characterizes the inmate subculture as being influenced by inmates' pre-prison experiences and values, must be considered along with the deprivation model in explaining the development of the inmate social system.⁴ Recently, several articles have been published which support the argument that the deprivation and importation models should both be considered in attempting to explain the development of the inmate social system (Huff, 1974; Zingraff, 1976; Jacobs, 1976).

⁴Giallombardo's (1966) book on women in prison provides an account of how an extra-institutional variable, sex-role socialization, alters the nature of the inmate subculture.

From the studies reviewed, little can be concluded about the long-term effects of imprisonment on inmates. Several studies have demonstrated an increase in prisonization during the middle phase followed by a decrease at the end. Only a small minority of inmates manifest a steady increase in prisonization, and it is quite possible, although it cannot be proven due to the cross-sectional nature of these studies, that these inmates were the most "criminal" to begin with. Incarceration does give criminally oriented individuals the chance to interact with like-minded persons, establish friendships, and reinforce each other's attitudes over the course of their prison terms. Thus, it might be more appropriate to speak of prison as a "criminalizing" environment for a small minority of inmates rather than a "prisonizing" environment for all inmates. For the majority of inmates, no pattern of either prisonization nor criminalization has been determined.

More important, the available data do not allow inferences to be drawn concerning the relationship between antisocial attitudes expressed in prison and post-release success or failure. Investigators seem to assume that these attitudinal variables, supposedly descriptive of inmate behavior, will be valid predictors of the behavior of inmates after release. The fact that this is only an assumption and has not been proven drastically weakens the power and utility of this body of research.

Following Clemmer's example, most investigators have studied the inmate social system as the source of all negative socializing influences that can be said to occur in prison. Countless articles have described the competitive relationship between inmates and staff, stressing that each inmate must ally himself with either the inmate

subculture, representative of the criminal world, or the staff, representative of the legitimate world (cf. Wheeler, 1961; Cloward, 1960; Sykes, 1958). The responsibility for the assumed negative influences of prison is generally attributed to the antisocial inmate subculture, not to the formal system of rewards and punishment which is explicitly part of the prison routine. In fact, the proponents of the above position imply that if the prosocial values which are fostered by the staff and administration were allowed to prevail, inmates would not be harmed and, indeed, might even be helped by their prison experience.

A Theory of the Effects of Total Institutions

Erving Goffman (1961) developed an analysis of total institutions which viewed the formal and routine treatment of inmates as damaging in itself and presumably inhibitory to rehabilitation. In other words, Goffman viewed the institution itself as harmful, not the inmate subculture as the previous authors have suggested. Total institutions, be they prisons, mental hospitals, convents, or to some extent even the armed forces, possess many common characteristics which affect the self-perceptions of the inhabitants of these establishments in similar ways. Total institutions are characterized in the following manner according to Goffman:

First all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the members' daily activity is carried out in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing. Third, all phases of the day's activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally the various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution (p. 6).

Another important feature of the total institution is that there is always a split between a large managed group, often called inmates, and a small supervisory staff whose major responsibility is surveillance. For inmates, all basic physical needs are provided; one can "get by" doing virtually nothing and still receive food, clothing, and shelter. Thus, the usual incentives for work in "normal" society lose their significance in a total institution.

Goffman described how an inmate in a total institution undergoes a process of mortification of self in which he is "stripped" of his identity and is forced to develop a radically new view of himself and significant others. He undergoes a series of abasements, degradations, humiliations, and profanations of self which begin with the admissions procedure and may not end even after the inmate is finally released. One of the most obvious ways that an inmate's self-perception changes is simply that he is shut off from his previous life; he cannot perform the same activities he is used to, nor can significant others in his life perform customary activities with him. The prison walls, cages, bars, and the like are physical reminders of the psychological self-abasements the inmate is forced to endure. Admissions procedures often "strip" the inmate of his usual appearance through haircutting, shaving, and replacing his personal clothing with institutional garb which is usually ill fitting and drab. The inmate must often submit to humiliating deference requirements, both physical and verbal, such as eating all food with a spoon, addressing all staff members as "Sir" or "Mr.," and bending over for the strip search. Physically, his personal space is often violated; he may be forced to eat unclean food; he is never alone but is always available for surveillance. The inmate cannot

maintain any real control over his personal history; information given upon admission is recorded in files which are usually available to all institution staff. In summary, through various routine procedures of the total institution, the inmate is required to engage in activities which allow him minimal control over his environment and are incompatible with his former conception of self. The consequence is that the inmate, in Goffman's words, "fails to retain [the] kind of executive competency" that demonstrates to an individual that "he has some command over his world, that he is a person with 'adult' self determination, autonomy and freedom of action" (p. 43). Through exposure to a condition of forced dependency, the inmate develops a sense of "personal inefficacy" which may irreversibly change his self-concept, making his reintegration into society more difficult.

In viewing total institutions from this framework, Goffman provided yet another perspective to account for the possible negative impact of incarceration on inmates. In the case of prisons, he concerned himself not with the dysfunctional inmate subculture, but rather with the formal structure of the organization. He described processes whose end it is to mold a compliant, rule-abiding, institutionalized inmate, not necessarily an individual who will be prepared for release but who will fit comfortably into the institutional routine. Goffman labeled him "colonized" because, as he stated, "a stable, relatively contented existence is built up out of the maximum satisfactions

procurable within the institution" (p. 62).⁵ The "colonized" or "institutionalized" inmate views the institution as "home" and attempts to act in such a manner as to make life in the institution as pleasant as possible. Institutionalism may be thought of as the process by which an inmate adjusts favorably to a total institutional environment, operationalized as holding positive attitudes toward the institution, identifying with the institution, and taking the role of "good inmate." This "gradual acquiescence to a state of life which precludes participation in the community outside the institution may even lead to a resistance to discharge" (Wing and Brown, 1970, p. 80).

Although no researcher has specifically related Goffman's theories to prison inmates, several theorists and researchers in the mental hospital field have attempted to document and explain the development of institutionalism among long-term mental patients. Since correctional institutions and mental hospitals have most of the structural conditions of total institutions, it is conceivable that there are similarities in the adjustment patterns of mental patients and prisoners.

The Institutionalizing Effects of Mental Hospitals and Other Total Institutions

The mental hospital as a breeding ground for institutionalism has

⁵Goffman also noted several other "lines" of adaptation to the pressures of the total institution. Some inmates take the tack of "situational withdrawal," in which the inmate withdraws apparent attention from everything except events immediately around his body. Some take the "intransigent line" by frequently refusing to cooperate with the staff. Others take over the official or staff view, thus manifesting "conversion." However, Goffman argued that most inmates combine all of the above patterns at one time or another into the tack of "playing it cool."

become a popular subject of study among sociologists. Sommer and Osmond (1960) concerned themselves with the process of "deindividuation" that occurs when patients no longer make independent decisions but instead passively accept the institutional routine. In a similar vein, Coser (1956) discussed the general hospital, which she called, "a home away from home." She argued that patients are relieved of the burden of decision making through "the formal rationality of organizational life." She further asserted that although the acceptance of the passive role may be functional for ward adaptation, it is uniquely dysfunctional for the return to "civilian" life.

Barton's (1959) construct of "institutional neurosis" dealt with the result of long-term institutionalization. Features of the institution such as lack of contact with the outside world, enforced idleness, authoritarian staff members, deindividuation through loss of personal possessions and friends, drug treatment, and loss of opportunities in the outside world lead to the development of a state of apathy and disinterest in the world beyond the institution. Barton's construct aptly describes the behavior of institutionalized schizophrenics, although it is also applicable to the behavior of other institutionalized inmates, notably prisoners.

Gruenberg's "social breakdown syndrome" (1967) differs from institutional neurosis in that causes of the syndrome are attributed to conditions outside as well as inside the institution. Gruenberg traced the syndrome's development through a series of phases which begin with the individual's loss of confidence in his ability to function in the world, continue with his being labeled as "sick" by family or officials, his commitment to a hospital where he is "morally relieved of his failures,"

his subsequent internalization of the sick role, and his final adjustment to the hospital routine in an attempt to become a "good patient." Although Gruenberg made no attempt to test hypotheses concerning the specific causes of the syndrome, his work is important in theoretically relating intra- and extra-institutional factors to a phenomenon similar to institutionalism.

In his study of the psychiatric hospital, Caudill (1958) also found that patients became dependent on the hospital and often felt ambivalent about "the problem of leaving." Moreover, he uncovered an interesting set of attitudes held by many supervisory staff members. When questioned about the advisability about particular patients leaving the hospital, the nurses tended to be rather conservative in their judgments, often emphasizing the need for the patient to remain in the hospital. This finding, implying that staff members may actually encourage dependency among patients, was also supported in a study by Mikulic (1971).

Shiloh (1968) addressed the problem of institutionalism directly in his interview study of Veterans Administration mental patients. In the course of his talks with patients, Shiloh determined that there were "two strikingly different kinds of patients," those who did not wish to leave the hospital and those who did. The first group, which he labeled institutionalized, consisted of 40 percent of the total patient population, while the second group accounted for 25 percent. The remaining patients conformed to neither category. The differences between the institutionalized and the motivated-to-leave groups encompassed virtually every possible area, including background characteristics, clinical and institutional behavior, and attitudes toward the institution.

During their interviews, institutionalized patients were passive and silent or gave rambling and disjointed answers while the non-institutionalized group were more articulate, giving full, coherent responses. Institutionalized inmates tended to come from poor urban centers, rarely having finished high school. Before entering the hospital, they held jobs with little security and experienced unstable family lives. On the other hand, non-institutionalized patients were more likely to have held better jobs, received a high school diploma, and enjoyed a stable family life. They also tended to be younger than institutionalized patients.

With regard to hospital behavior and attitudes, institutionalized patients closely resembled the "good inmate" referred to earlier. They "engaged in all that was required of a patient," occupying themselves with minimal chores and remaining uncritical of the hospital, even of the notoriously dismal closed wards. They viewed the hospital as their home. Non-institutionalized patients viewed their stay in the hospital as a temporary affair and tended to be much more critical about the way the hospital was run, having positive comments only about the advantages of therapy.

Shiloh did not specify his criteria for designating patients as institutionalized or not, and due to the open-ended interview format, it is possible that interviewer bias occurred. Also, the information was presented descriptively, omitting "hard" data, so the reader could not ascertain the magnitude of the differences between groups. Despite its shortcomings, the study provides a rich description of the two strategies for institutional adaptation; and it deals with pre-institutional factors related to patient strategies of adaptation. As

one institutionalized inmate commented when asked how he felt about the hospital, "It's still better than skid row."

Braginsky, Braginsky, and Ring (1969) explored the modes of adaptation of patients to a mental hospital and demonstrated empirically that "many patients may prefer to remain in the hospital and will act in such a way as to justify their status as 'mentally ill'." They argue that contrary to current psychiatric theory, mental patients are adept at impression management and are able to manipulate their self-presentations to obtain desired ends, which in many cases, is to remain in the hospital. One particularly illustrative study was conducted with 30 long-term male schizophrenics, randomly selected from an open ward. Two days prior to the experiment they were told that they had been scheduled for interviews with the staff psychologist. On the day of the interview, each patient was escorted by an assistant who casually informed him of the purpose of the interview; the content of this message was the experimental manipulation. One-third of the patients were told that they were being interviewed to see if they were ready for discharge. Patients in the open ward condition were informed that the purpose of their interview was to determine whether they should be placed on an open or closed ward. The third group, the mental status condition, was simply told that they were being interviewed to "see how they were doing." Each patient had a two-minute conversation with a "blind" interviewer, who asked him how he was feeling physically and mentally and then disclosed the real purpose of the interview. Three staff psychiatrists unacquainted with the patients rated tape recordings of these interviews, assessing the degree of psychopathology and the amount of hospital control needed for each patient.

The investigators hypothesized that since all subjects were "old timers" who would be motivated to stay in the hospital and maintain the privileges of open ward living,⁶ the subjects in the open ward condition would present themselves as less mentally ill than the patients in the other two conditions. Results strongly supported this hypothesis. The psychiatrists' ratings of the open ward group showed them to be significantly less mentally ill and in need of less hospital control than patients in either the discharge or mental status conditions. It was also found that subjects in the open ward condition presented themselves in a significantly more positive manner, determined by a simple frequency count of positive and negative self-references.

This study, along with the many others presented in the research monograph, Methods of Madness, support the contention that "mental patients want to live in their own community--that is they can be expected to try to satisfy their needs and, to a considerable extent, are able to do so" (p. 73).

The desire to remain in the mental hospital should not be considered a universal phenomenon. On the contrary, there are factors, both situational and personal, which play a part in determining how a person will react to his incarceration in a total institution. Wing (1961) has identified three parameters: the social pressures which are brought to bear on an individual, the susceptibility or resistance of the individual to these pressures, and the length of time over which these pressures act. Individual susceptibility to institutionalism may be increased by various pre-institutional conditions, so that

⁶They had data to support this assumption. See page 36.

institutionalism may be greater among patients who have not built strong ties to the outside world through family or work, among those who are poor or old, or simply among those who find taking personal responsibility or interacting with others aversive. There is evidence of the selective effects of certain social factors; for example, Brown (1960) has shown that mental patients who were visited during the first two months after admission had a greater probability of leaving the hospital than those not visited.

Time spent in the hospital also appears to relate to the development of institutionalism. Braginsky reported that "newcomers," or patients hospitalized for less than three months and for the first time, were primarily motivated to leave the hospital, as evidenced by the fact that 80 percent were released within the first three months of hospitalization. Old timers, hospitalized three years or longer, had a 17 percent discharge rate during any one year, and thus it might be inferred that they want to remain. The above differences might be partially accounted for by some of the factors discussed earlier; however, these data were not reported. That pre-institutional differences did exist is quite likely, since investigators have demonstrated that such variables as father's occupation, social class, and marital status influence the probability that a patient will remain in the hospital (Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958; Cooper, 1961).

In their study of three British mental hospitals, Wing and Brown (1970) attempted to ascertain the adverse effects of prolonged institutionalization on schizophrenics. They hypothesized that irrespective of a patient's susceptibility to institutionalism, both increased time in the hospital and poverty of the social environment would independently

contribute to an indifference about leaving the hospital. Their subjects had been institutionalized two years or more, thus minimizing the effects of pre-institutional factors on early discharge rates. Among their subjects, they found no relationship between factors such as marital status or social class on length of stay or other attitudinal or behavioral variables measured.

Their results indicated that "a substantial proportion, though by no means all, of the morbidity shown by long stay schizophrenic patients is a product of their environment" (p. 177). Those patients who experienced "environmental poverty," that is, who were regarded pessimistically by the nurses, were most cut off from the outside world, and who spent most time doing nothing, tended to manifest the most pathological symptoms. They were characterized by flat affect, poverty of speech, and social withdrawal. Moreover, the relationship between psychiatric symptoms and the environment was upheld both within each of the three hospitals and among them: the hospital with the richest social environment contained patients with the fewest pathological symptoms. No differences could be found among the three hospitals in the severity of patients' illnesses upon admission.

Wing and Brown also found that even when factors such as age, severity of illness, and the environment were controlled for, attitudes to discharge were strongly related to length of stay. With increased time in the institution, patients developed a gradual indifference or even resistance to thought of leaving. The authors conclude that "the longer a person persists in one form of activity, or undergoes one form of experience, the more difficult it will be for him to choose any other and the less he will want to do so . . ." (p. 86). "The

longer a patient stays, the less likely he is to practice everyday social roles and any ability that he originally had may atrophy from disuse. The patient, who originally had no intention of staying in the hospital gradually changes his attitudes and may not wish to leave" (pp. 22-23).

Not only is an institutionalized patient less likely to practice everyday social roles in the hospital, but his self-attitudes with respect to these roles also appear to change with increased hospitalization. Karmel (1970) was concerned with the relationship between self-identity and social roles, assuming that when an individual is barred from participation in certain social roles, he will "lose" these roles as part of his social identity. To replace these "lost" outside world roles, a mental patient would be expected to internalize his current deviant role as part of his new social identity.

To test these assumptions, she administered the Kuhn and MacPartland Twenty Statements Test to a sample of mental patients varying in length of hospitalization. Categorizing only those statements relating to social interaction, she assigned them to two categories--home world and hospital world--and designated each subject high or low on each measure. Her results strongly supported her first assumption; there was a definite decrease in outside world identification during the first two years of hospitalization. In fact, the entire effect appeared to occur during the first two years, since the level of home world identification remained consistently low among patients hospitalized from 2 to 20 years. Data relating to patients' internalization of hospital roles did not support Karmel's second hypothesis, since the level of deviant role identification remained rather low even among the very long-termers.

These results indicate that most mental patients who remain in the hospital longer than two years simply give up their social identity completely; they do not think of themselves as they were on the outside. Surprisingly, they also do not internalize their hospital roles. Karmel attributes this finding to the particular social organization of the mental hospital in which patients reject the labels given them by staff while never organizing themselves into a viable subculture (cf. Wulbert, 1965). Karmel overlooked another possible interpretation which deals with the interaction of social desirability and the particular instrument used. Patients may, in fact, define themselves by the roles they play within the hospital, but since these roles are considered deviant by the larger society, they may be reluctant to admit to them on a paper-and-pencil test.

In summary, theorists have asserted and researchers in the mental hospital field have demonstrated the negative effects of long-term institutionalization on the attitudes and behavior of mental patients. This is not to discount the fact that certain predisposing factors such as social class and family contacts are important in determining which patients became long-termers. However, the Wing and Brown studies in particular proved that among those who do stay past two years, the hospital environment and the amount of time the patient is exposed to it are in themselves important determinants of patient deterioration and institutionalism.

Prison Research with Implications for Institutionalism

Prison researchers (Thomas, 1973; Irwin and Cressey, 1962) have identified several predisposing factors which appear to keep inmates

from becoming "prisonized" and several of those characteristics are, indeed, the same as "premorbid" factors which limit mental patients hospital stays, such as social class and family contacts. There are other striking similarities between prisoners and mental patients. A large proportion from both groups occupy low-status positions before institutionalization, have unstable family backgrounds, poor educational histories, and poor employment records (Hollingshead and Redlich, 1958; The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967). In addition, the social environments of the mental hospital and prison are remarkably similar in many ways. It would seem worthwhile to investigate the existence of institutionalism in prisons since prisoners are subjected to many of the same conditions as mental patients and many share similar background characteristics.

Although recidivism studies focusing on mental patients have not been discussed in this paper, it seems logical that those patients who are resistant to discharge would tend to do poorly on the outside, should they ever be released. If institutionalism exists in prison, the same would be expected of the institutionalized inmate. In prison, he might appear to be the "model inmate," but his compliant, acquiescent behavior may be dysfunctional for post-release success. The release problem may not be crucial for mental patients, since many can and do live their entire lives within the institutional borders. However, the vast majority of prison inmates are eventually released; and if the above argument is valid, prisons may be failing to prepare the segment of the inmate population who appears to be best adjusted to institutional life for successful release into the community.

References to the "institutionalizing" nature of prisons can be found in the literature as early as 1940 (Hayner and Ash). The authors argued that the structural and social characteristics of the prison were completely unlike those in the outside world and that successful adjustment to institutional life had little or no carry-over to the problem of post-release integration. They mentioned the demoralizing nature of "sex starvation, lack of self direction, and isolation from law abiding culture patterns" implying that rehabilitation was virtually impossible in this context. Furthermore, they pointed out that the major function of the prison was self-maintenance, a goal which takes priority over effective release preparation for inmates. Clemmer's (1940) original construct of prisonization was conceptualized to refer to the effects of formal institutional regimentation as well as the informal effects of the inmate subculture. The "universal factors of prisonization" enumerated by Clemmer, such as being addressed by a number and wearing prison clothing, can be more appropriately thought of as conditions which lead to institutionalism. However, most researchers who have subsequently studied prisonization have operationalized it simply in terms of conformity to the inmate code, ignoring its broader implications. Thus, prisonization and institutionalism as defined here can be said to refer to two different concepts: prisonization occurs as a result of the negative effects of the inmate subculture, while institutionalism occurs as a result of the adverse effects of the formal institutional routine.

Several authors have described inmates who view the correction institution as home. According to Heffernan (1972), an inmate who is in "the life" centers her concern within the institution, orienting her

perspective toward existence in the institution and ignoring the outside world. Irwin and Cressey (1962) speak of "the convict" who has found a home in prison. Often an older version of the "state-raised youth," he seeks status through obtaining a good prison job and wearing special clothes, generally "prospering" in the prison world.

In a laboratory simulation of a prison, Haney, Banks, and Zimbardo (1973) observed stereotypic prisoner and guard behaviors manifested by "normal" middle-class college-student subjects who had been randomly assigned to play the inmate or guard roles. They found that 90 percent of all conversations among inmates centered around prison-related topics such as the food, guard harrassment, and escape plans, indicating that inmates had a lessened concern for outside world affairs. The "typical prisoner syndrome" was characterized by passivity, dependency, depression, helplessness, and self-depreciation, with very few inmates openly rebelling against the guards. Since their study was actually a role-playing demonstration, it is possible that the subjects were acting out their stereotypes of how "real" prison inmates and guards would act. However, the authors emphasized the realism of the situation, insisting that the subjects actually internalized their roles to the point that two "inmates" had to be released early from the study due to psychological breakdowns. They argue that since college students could be made to be either sadistic and aggressive or passive and dependent through the manipulation of a few situational variables, the power of a "real" prison to mold inmate and guard behavior is formidable.

Miller (1973), a prison psychiatrist, provided a vivid description of the process by which inmates develop a favorable response to the prison experience. After an initial period of escape fantasies and

denial, an inmate orients himself to the prison community, attempting to "make the prison environment as much like his home as possible" (p. 18). During the middle phase of his prison term, the inmate concentrates almost entirely on the prison community, making friendships, securing goods and services, and finding means for raising his self-esteem. The most interesting phase Miller describes is the terminal phase, where the inmate often experiences apprehension about leaving, or "the short time syndrome." Miller states that, "The inmate feels that he is losing something and he may not be sure that he wants either the loss or the gain. While he is losing a harsh and punitive community he is also losing structure and often the first stable relationships he has had in his lifetime. While he is gaining freedom he is also gaining responsibility and the chance to make further mistakes" (p. 25). Although Miller's account is no more than a description of his observations as a treatment staff member, it supports the argument that prison can be an institutionalizing agent for some inmates.

Several researchers have investigated the relationship between time served in prison and self-esteem (Bennett, 1974; Bennett, Sorunson, and Forshay, 1971; Fichtler, Zimmerman, and Moore, 1973; Cohen, 1965; Simpson, Eynon, and Reckless, 1963; Kerns, 1958). Fichtler et al., using a cross-sectional design and operationalizing self-esteem as the discrepancy between the actual and ideal self, found a correlation of .53 between time served and lowered self-esteem. This finding was explained in terms of the dehumanizing nature of prison life which is presumably "destructive of the sense of individual worthiness" (p. 40). Other researchers, notably Cohen (1965) and Bennett (1974), have

arrived at the opposite conclusion regarding the relationship between time served and self-esteem. Using a longitudinal design and more reliable measure of self-esteem, Bennett reported an increase in self-esteem for a large number of inmates over time. This finding suggests that, to quote Bennett, "there are aspects of institutional life that are psychologically supportive of many individuals" (p. 14).

A series of studies was designed to measure the psychological effects of long-term imprisonment (Banister, Smith, Heskin, and Boulton, 1973; Heskin, Boulton, and Smith, 1973; Boulton, Smith, Heskin, and Banister, 1976). Using both cross-sectional and longitudinal designs and measuring both cognitive and personality variables, the researchers concluded that imprisonment did not result in intellectual deterioration; in fact, verbal intelligence showed a significant increase over time. No consistent personality changes were found, although the longitudinal study showed a decrease in hostility which was associated with increasing emotional maturity.

Driscoll (1952) designed a study to measure the personality characteristics that distinguished well-adjusted from poorly adjusted inmates. He stated that he wished "to investigate the possibility that the special environment of the prison may produce demands on the individual which favor modes of conduct, [that were] in terms of the standards of the general social environment, essentially maladjustive in character" (p. 593). By correlating inmate scores on an adjustment scale to their scores on a widely used personality inventory, the MMPI, he found that the "worst" adjusted inmates scored significantly closer to the norms on the Depression, Masculinity-Femininity and Paranoia scales than did the inmates rated as best adjusted to the institution. Driscoll

suggests that the environment of the prison favors inmate behaviors which would be considered maladaptive outside of prison. Other researchers (Horsch and Davis, 1938; and Walker, 1941) have also found that those inmates characteristically labeled as troublemakers within the prison environment tend to score closer to general population norms than "well-adjusted" inmates on a variety of personality inventories. A more recent study (Jaman, 1971), however, found that inmates who were below average on adjustment to the institution scored higher than above average inmates on five MMPI subscales, indicating that they were more out of contact with reality (Sc), somewhat more impulsive (Ma), somewhat more hostile (AH), more defensive (F), and more concerned with bodily functions (HS) than well-adjusted inmates. The differences in interpretation between the last study reported and the previous ones might be accountable to the fact that the previous studies might be outdated or that the measures of institutional adjustment and the personality dimensions are not comparable. Nevertheless, the findings reported do suggest that for some institutions, at least, the well-adjusted response to prison is not always the psychologically healthy response.

Another study dealing with the attributions about the institution made by well and poorly adjusted inmates was conducted by Wood (1966). He found that inmates designated as "high consensus troublemakers" perceived the institution as providing them with less opportunity, being run by a less sympathetic and reasonable staff, and being less predictable than inmates designated as "non-troublemakers." He found that these differences in perception of the institution were more important than demographic, life history, and delinquency history

variables in distinguishing between well and poorly adjusted inmates. It is difficult to speculate on whose perception of the institution was more veridical, that of the troublemakers or of the "good inmates." However, since the rehabilitative limitations of correctional institutions are beginning to be acknowledged (Martinson, 1974) and the unpredictability of events in correctional institutions has been recognized for some time (Clemmer, 1940), it might be inferred that the poorly adjusted inmates possessed the more realistic picture of institutional operations.

Many other studies have been conducted on inmate adjustment to prison, most of them geared to the identification of inmate characteristics conducive to a smooth adaptation to incarceration (Wolfgang, 1961; Cohen, 1957; Rudoff, 1960; Morello, 1958, 1961). There is a dearth of research, however, on the relationship between institutional adjustment and post-release outcome. To quote Lipton, Martinson, and Wilks (1975), "more important . . . is the question of what institutional adjustment means and how it is related to the offender's behavior when he is returned to the community. Clearly, it does not take the same skills to adjust to a rigidly structured, highly disciplined environment that it takes to adjust to a free society" (p. 300).

Several researchers have focused on the period of time immediately preceding release in their search for the effects of incarceration on inmates. Landau (1975) found that prison inmate's future time perspective (FTP) became increasingly short as the time the inmate spent in prison increased. He also demonstrated that the future time perspective of incarcerated delinquents was shorter than that of nonincarcerated delinquents, suggesting that the environment of the total institution

was to a large degree accountable for the weakened ability of inmates to conceive of future time. This conclusion was generalized to include other types of total institutions as well, since Landau demonstrated that the future time perspective of soldiers in the Army is significantly shorter than that of a comparable group of civilians. This study is useful in showing the debilitating effect of both increased time in a total institution and the environment of the total institution itself in preventing inmates from conceptualizing the future.

Agus and Allen (1968) attempted to study inmates' apprehension about leaving the institution. They found evidence that some inmates experienced increased anxiety prior to release, manifested by more frequent clinic attendance and a six-fold increase in complaints of dizziness and headaches after parole notification. They also concluded that inmates who had spent more than six months in prison were more likely to develop release anxiety than inmates incarcerated for under six months. They attributed this relationship to the fact that the short-termers experienced "poor institutional adjustment and lack of formation of positive interpersonal relations with officers and other inmates," implying that good institutional adjustment may cause release anxiety.

Another study dealing with changes in inmate behavior immediately preceding release was conducted by Grisso (1975a). Grisso measured the extent of institutionalized delinquents' misbehavior immediately preceding release and its relationship to their perceptions of the desirability of release. This construct was measured by the Desirability of Release (DOR) Scale, designed for inmates to make direct comparisons between the quality of life at the institution versus home.

He found that a low desire for release was related to increases in misbehavior preceding the release date, a relationship that was much less prevalent among high scoring inmates. In another study, Grisso (1975b) differentiated between inmates with high and low desires for release on the basis of background characteristics. He found inmates scoring low on the DOR scale were more likely to have been previously institutionalized, to have had less stable family relationships, to have expressed more pessimistic views of their own homes, and to have demonstrated a tendency to deal with home and school difficulties by withdrawal. This study provides strong evidence that institutional life can be relatively rewarding for some inmates, especially when compared to a potentially unsatisfying home life. In addition, the increase in misbehaviors prior to release by inmates with low DOR scores suggests that some inmates may attempt to act in such a way as to prolong their institutional stays.

The literature reviewed so far indicates that (1) institutionalism may exist in correctional institutions, (2) institutionalized inmates may be those who appear best adjusted to the prison routine, and (3) institutionalized inmates may be less successful upon release than noninstitutionalized inmates. However, none of the studies conducted to date has been specifically designed to explore the relationship between institutionalism and post-release outcome. Several published recidivism studies have reported findings which were unexpected and left unexplained and which might lend support to the above hypotheses.

A study carried out by the California Department of Correction research division related institutional behavior during the first year of incarceration to parole outcome (Jaman, 1971). Investigators

selected five variables: performance on work assignment, vocational training, academic education, voluntary programs, and number of disciplinary infractions, to relate to parole outcomes for both new admissions and readmissions. Although for new admissions none of the variables bore a significant relationship to parole outcome, there were some unexpected trends. At one and two years after release, inmates rated exceptional in their work performance had the highest percent of returns to prison. Also, men with above average ratings of overall behavior had a higher percent of returns to prison than did men with below average ratings. For readmissions, those inmates who had high ratings for voluntary participation in organized group programs were significantly more likely to return to prison than those with below average or no participation. In addition, inmates who had had one disciplinary infraction were significantly more likely to return to prison than men with no write-ups and men who had received two or more disciplinary reports.

This study has some unconventional implications. It showed that in some cases the "good" inmates who tried to obey institutional regulations and participate in rehabilitative activities were less successful upon release than the "not-so-good" inmates. Perhaps the experience of receiving praise for a job well done or having the enjoyment of working with a group of men on an interesting activity even in prison may be so rewarding to some inmates that upon release their lives appear unattractive by comparison. It would be the behavior of these individuals that might be best explained by the construct of institutionalism.

Daniel Glaser, in his famous study of federal correctional institutions, also presented a finding which supports this argument (Glaser,

1964). He and his colleagues attempted to relate prison work assignment to post-release success or failure. It was found that irrespective of prior crime, age, or duration of assignment, inmates who held semi-skilled work assignments had the lowest failure rate. The highest failure rates were in the typing, bookkeeping, and clerical positions, assignments generally associated with high influence in the inmate community. It is possible that inmates who "know how to do time" actually self-selected for these prestigious positions. However, it is also possible, as Glaser suggests, that "the jobs themselves promote crime by encouraging the inmates to be manipulative and by giving them a conception of themselves as of a leadership or executive elite. The latter influences, could give these men, at release, a combination of unusually high aspirations with less than average prison preparation for the types of employment likely to be available to them" (p. 258).

The two previous studies were concerned with the relationship between inmate institutional behavior and post-release outcome. The following two studies deal with inmate attitudes. Miller and Dinitz (1973) administered three attitude scales designed to measure inmate perceptions of institutional impact to 480 juveniles incarcerated in an Ohio maximum security institution and correlated the results to re-institutionalization rates. It was found that, in general, boys with satisfactory outcomes after release had more unfavorable attitudes toward the institution than the boys who were reincarcerated. In addition, those inmates who had subscribed to the inmate code, rejecting staff expectations for inmate behavior, were significantly more likely to succeed on release than inmates who had not subscribed to the inmate code.

Kassebaum, Ward, and Wilner (1971) conducted an extensive study examining the effects of group counseling on a variety of criteria including inmate attitudes, behavior in prison, and post-release outcome. Although their major findings are not relevant to the present discussion, a relationship between the endorsement of a certain attitude in prison and post-release success, found serendipitously, is worth noting. The authors related inmates' scores on four attitude subscales: opposition to staff, solidarity, isolation, and alienation, to parole outcome. To quote the authors, "We found a significant difference in parole outcome for those endorsing one of the four measures--alienation. The relationship was not in the expected direction. Men appearing most alienated did significantly better on parole than the men who were least alienated" (p. 263). This finding can be interpreted in light of the argument that has been presented concerning the implications of institutional adjustment for post-release outcome. It could be argued that one who is alienated in prison has not adjusted to the institutional routine and has attempted to maintain autonomy. Thus, a person scoring high on an alienation scale would most likely not have experienced institutionalism.

The studies reported in this section provide evidence disputing the customary assumption that good institutional adjustment and conformity to staff norms are important prerequisites for post-release success. In fact, it appears that becoming too "adjusted" to the prison community by obtaining rewards from the system or developing favorable attitudes toward the institution carries its own hazards. It is highly probable that some and perhaps many inmates find prison life rewarding and identify themselves primarily with the prison world. It is also possible that in some prisons these "institutionalized"

inmates are actually the individuals who receive the largest share of the rewards from the institution. Like their "criminalistic" counterparts, these men may also be incurring harm from institutional living. However, it may not be the adverse effects of the inmate subculture that should be held accountable. Rather, their acquiescence to the system, functional for prison life, may be a serious detriment to successful reintegration into society. Additionally, as several of the previous studies suggest, those inmates who appear most rebellious in prison may have a better chance of "making it" on the outside. Those inmates who reject the formal rules and official expectations may be attempting to maintain their autonomy and individual self-determination, qualities which might prove to be important for post-release adjustment.

The lack of success of the recidivism studies in relating institutional behavior and attitudes to post-release outcome has been noted by many authors (Irwin, 1970; Waller, 1974). Most of the work in the field of recidivism prediction has found institutional behavior to be a poor predictor of post-release outcome and thus attention has been directed to more effective predictor variables such as type of offense, age at first arrest, and number of previous incarcerations. (For a complete review of prediction studies, see Simon, 1971.) Although incarceration has not been found to have a negative effect on the ex-offender, neither has it been found to have a positive influence (Lipton et al., 1975; Martinson, 1974). Thus, the current state of the art appears to view prison as a "hollow box" through which offenders pass, within which they are subjected to various dehumanizing procedures and prevented from continuing their normal lives for a

period of time; but they come out measurably no different than when they entered.

A difficulty with much of the recidivism research is its tendency to treat all inmates as similar, assuming that incarceration will produce the same effect on all inmates (Wilkins, 1969). It is quite clear from the literature reviewed that inmates can be categorized in many different ways and thus it is likely that different types of inmates might perceive and react to prison very differently from one another. Moreover, the effect of prison on an inmate who "liked it there" would probably be rather different from its effect on someone who found the environment extremely aversive. It would seem worthwhile, then, to analyze the different ways in which inmates perceive prison and adapt to it, assuming that its effect may vary depending on the modes of adaptation that inmates employ.

The following chapter documents the evolution of a method to measure inmate adjustment to prison and to determine the relationship between "liking" prison and institutional behavior. It also describes the development of typology which deals with modes of inmate adjustment to prison.

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TYPOLOGY OF INMATE ADJUSTMENT TO PRISON--

STUDIES I AND II

Introduction

The purpose of the series of studies to be described in the following pages was threefold: (1) to develop a reliable instrument for measuring inmates' modes of adjustment to prison; (2) to validate the instrument by relating it to inmate behaviors in prison and background characteristics; and (3) to determine the relationship, if any, between inmate modes of adjustment to prison and their adjustment to the outside world after release.

Study I--Development of the Instrument

Drawing heavily from the literature presented in the preceding chapter, an initial typology was developed, describing three mutually exclusive hypothesized modes of adjustment to incarceration: Institutionalism, Treatment Orientation, and Rebelliousness. Although institutionalism was the mode of adjustment of greatest interest in the present research, it was assumed that not all inmates would adjust in that way. Other logical possibilities were considered, and the present typology seemed to incorporate previous research findings into the most plausible system. The three modes of adjustment differed from one another in terms of inmates' attitudes toward the institution and institutional behavior. The institutionalized inmate was expected to hold positive attitudes toward prison and find prison life more rewarding than life on the outside. Most likely, he would conform rather well

to institutional rules and would obtain a good institutional job. In general, his behavior would be acquiescent and he would conform to staff expectations for "good" inmate behavior. The treatment-oriented inmate, although disliking prison, would conform to the expectations of the institutional staff and parole board with the goal of facilitating release from prison as quickly as possible. Because participation in treatment programs is usually regarded by authorities as an indicator of "rehabilitation," this type of inmate was expected to be highly active in counseling, educational, and vocational programs. To demonstrate that he had positively "changed," this type of inmate would maintain excellent work and disciplinary records. Rebellious inmates would actively manifest their dislike for the institution through non-compliance with institutional authorities. They would refuse to play the role of "good inmate," thus maintaining autonomy and self-determination to some degree. The purpose of Study I was to develop reliable attitude scales to measure inmates' tendencies to conform to each of the above-mentioned modes of adjustment.

Method

The Instrument

The first version of the composite Inmate Orientation to Prison scale completed in July of 1974 consisted of three scales measuring Institutionalism, Treatment Orientation, and Rebelliousness (see Appendix for complete scales). Each scale consisted of 26 Likert-type items reflecting general attitudes about the prison, other inmates, correction officers, and counselors. Items were written to conform to hypotheses of how institutionalized, treatment-oriented, and

rebellious inmates would perceive prison.⁷ A few scale items had been adopted from the Braginsky et al. Patient Attitude Test (Braginsky et al., 1969, p. 125). For example, the Institutionalism scale included the following item: "The best way to do your time is to relax and enjoy your stay in the institution," the Rebelliousness scale included, "An inmate should stick to his own beliefs and never be influenced by any staff member," and the Treatment Orientation scale contained the item, "I think it's important for an inmate to show the authorities that he is sincerely interested in his own rehabilitation."

Subjects

Fifty male inmates incarcerated in a minimum security correctional institution in Connecticut during August of 1974 participated in the study.

The selection criterion for inmate participation was forthcoming release date; all inmates identified by staff as having a release date within three months of the study were selected. This procedure ensured that inmates selected for Study I would no longer be in the institution when the scale would later be administered to a larger sample of the population.

Procedure

Selected inmates were called from their work assignments and told to report to the counseling section of the institution. To prevent poor comprehension, questions were read to each inmate individually

⁷This understanding had been strengthened by a visit to a minimum security prison where the author held a series of informal interviews with inmates who discussed the strategies they used to adjust to the prison environment.

either by the author or by one of two student interns assigned to work with her, who then recorded the subject's verbal responses on a prepared answer sheet.

Results and Discussion

Inter-item correlations were obtained and items from each of the three scales which correlated with one another at a level of .30 or above were selected for inclusion in the second version of the scales. Many items were excluded due to lack of discriminability or low correlations with other items of the scales. Eleven items were included in the second version of the Rebelliousness scale, nine items derived from the original Rebelliousness scale and two reversed items taken from the Institutionalism scale. The alpha coefficient measuring internal consistency for those 11 items was found to be .85. Inmates scoring high on the Rebelliousness subscale did not feel that they were treated properly or fairly by correction officers and staff members. They felt they were not understood by staff members and expressed a basic mistrust of treatment staff and rehabilitation programs.

Eight items from the original Treatment Orientation scale were found to correlate highly with one another and thus formed the second version of that scale. The alpha coefficient for these eight items was .85, implying internal consistency. Surprisingly, none of the items that were retained actually dealt with treatment or rehabilitation programs. Instead, the items reflected a general concern with maintaining an exemplary record and controlling antisocial impulses with the expectation that this behavior would lead to a speedy release from prison. Due to the exclusion of items dealing with treatment

programs, the name of the scale was changed to the Manipulative-Release Orientation Scale. It was thought that this name more closely corresponded to the type of inmate who tries to "manipulate" his way out of prison. Inmates high on this subscale responded favorably to items such as, "I think an inmate should tell a staff member what he wants to hear," or "I would go against what I thought was right if it meant being granted an early parole."

Five related items were found to reflect the institutionalized mode of adjustment. The coefficient alpha index of reliability for this subscale was .69, indicating moderate internal consistency. Inmates scoring high on these items appeared to have a rather positive attitude to prison. They felt that inmates were both respected and treated fairly by correction officers, and were given many opportunities for self-improvement. They believed inmates should relax, try to enjoy themselves, and try to get along with both correction officers and other inmates.

Results from Study I indicated that inmates did tend to perceive the institution in line with the hypotheses presented earlier. However, the scale which was theoretically most crucial, that measuring institutionalism, appeared to be the weakest of the three. Two plausible explanations for this were considered: (1) since the prison studied was a minimum security, treatment-oriented institution, there might have been few institutionalized inmates, and (2) due to prison social desirability norms, inmates might have been reluctant to admit their positive feelings for prison on a paper-and-pencil test.

It was decided that further research using a more appropriate institution would be in order. The purpose of Study II was threefold:

(1) to test the improved instruments on a maximum security inmate sample, (2) to experiment with another measure of institutionalism, and (3) to determine the validity of the three modes of adjustment typology.

Study II--Establishing Construct Validity of the Typology

In an attempt to improve the reliability of the Institutionalism scale, a number of new items for that scale were constructed as well as a few more for the other two scales (see Appendix). Other instruments for measuring institutionalism were also explored, and the Kuhn and MacPartland (1954) Twenty Statements Test was decided upon. This instrument purports to measure a person's self-concept by requesting him to answer the question "Who am I?" in 20 different ways. Specifically, it is supposed to elicit a subject's conception of the social roles he plays, such as man, father, worker, prisoner. It was expected that institutionalized inmates would define themselves more in terms of their prison roles and less in terms of their outside world roles than inmates using the other two adjustment patterns. This technique had the advantage of not asking the respondent directly whether he liked prison and thus circumventing the problem of social desirability norms.

Study II was designed both to improve the internal consistencies of the three scales and to test their validity. It was expected that data concerning the respondents' institutional behavior, concern with the outside world, knowledge of current events, and prison experience would be systematically related to inmate responses on the three scales (see Appendix for complete copy of questionnaire).

Method

Subjects

Subjects for Study II were inmates incarcerated in two state prisons in Connecticut: Enfield, the minimum security institution where Study I had been conducted, and Somers, the maximum security prison. Inmates from both prisons were selected randomly from institutional files; with a 48 percent refusal rate at Enfield and a 31 percent rate at Somers, usable data were gathered from 33 Enfield inmates and 28 Somers inmates.⁸

Procedure

Questionnaires were administered to inmates in groups of 10 to 25 during mid-December 1974. To assure comprehension, the instructions and scales were read aloud by the author while the inmates recorded their answers on their questionnaires.

Results and Discussion

Reliabilities for the three revised subscales were found to be relatively high, with alpha coefficients for the Institutionalism, Manipulative-Release, and Rebelliousness subscales being .81, .70, .86, respectively, for the Somers sample and .83, .67, .74 for the Enfield sample. Thus, the scales were shown to be internally consistent. To test the validity of the scales, correlations were computed between the

⁸ The refusal rates were extraordinarily high, it is believed, due to the fact that inmates received no advance warning and an obvious "escape clause" was included in the instructions.

scale scores and the data gathered on background variables and institutional behavior.

The Somers Sample

The results from the Somers sample did lend support to the validity of the hypothesized typology. It was found that those inmates who scored high on the Institutionalism scale tended to be less concerned with the outside world than inmates scoring low. For example, institutionalism was found to be inversely related to thoughts of home ($r = -.34$), as measured by response to the question, "While you are in prison, how often do you think about your life on the outside?" It was also inversely related to the number of correspondents an inmate reported that he had ($r = -.38$) as well as to the scores inmates received on a 10-item current events test measuring knowledge of politics and sports ($r = -.57$).⁹ The fact that inmates favorable toward the institution appeared to be less concerned with the outside world may be construed as an indication that these inmates tended to view the prison as their home.

Scores on the Rebelliousness scale were positively correlated with the number of infractions inmates reported receiving ($r = .37$), indicating that inmates scoring high on this subscale tended to be punished more often for disobeying institutional rules. In addition, rebellious inmates showed a tendency to be more concerned with the outside world, as evidenced in their higher scores on the current events test ($r = .36$).

⁹For the Somers sample, correlations of at least .318, .375, and .438 were significant at the .10, .05, and .02 levels, respectively.

Inmates scoring high on the Manipulative-Release scale also appeared to be concerned with the outside world, indicated by a positive correlation with number of letters inmates reported writing per month ($r = .31$). In addition, they appeared to be disinterested in prison affairs, as indicated by a negative correlation with reported involvement in institutional recreational activities ($r = -.33$) such as sports or music. They were concerned with maintaining a good institutional record since manipulative-release orientation was found to be inversely related to the number of infractions reported per month ($r = -.45$). Results from Study II did support the proposition that there are three inmate perspectives in viewing institutional life and that inmates who maintain each of these perspectives behave in characteristic ways.

There appeared to be no relationship at all between time served in prison either during the present sentence or total time in prison, and the Institutionalism scale.¹⁰ Rebelliousness was inversely related to proportion of prison term served ($r = -.46$), indicating that inmates in the early phase of their terms were more rebellious than inmates in the middle or late portions of their prison terms. In addition, rebelliousness was positively related to time expected to serve

¹⁰In the questionnaire, inmates were asked to report the dates when they were admitted to prison to serve the present sentence and when they expected to be released. From these dates, it was possible to compute the number of months each inmate had served in his present sentence, how long before he would be released, and the proportion of the entire sentence already served. In addition, each inmate was asked to report total number of incarcerations and the total amount of time he had spent in prison throughout his lifetime.

($r = .32$), indicating that the more time an inmate had yet to serve, the more rebellious he was. The manipulative-release orientation appeared to be more prevalent among inmates less experienced with prison, since scores on this scale were negatively related both to number of incarcerations ($r = -.42$) and total time in prison ($r = -.38$). However, there apparently was no relationship between manipulative-release orientation and the amount of time served or yet to serve in the present sentence, indicating that manipulateness might be a preferred strategy among inmates incarcerated for the first or second times, but for repeaters, this approach was not frequently chosen.

Before the results from the Twenty Statements Test can be presented, the coding system must be explained. Only statements relating to prison roles and outside world roles were coded; all other statements not relating specifically to the prison or to the outside world (e.g., I am a man) were ignored. Statements referring to prison roles were classified into two categories: either positive or neutral, such as "I am an inmate," or negative, such as "I am treated like an animal." All statements referring to some aspect of life on the outside (e.g., I am a father; I am a bus driver) were coded as outside world role statements. A surprising finding was that although the mean number of total statements written was 15.4, considered high for responses to the TST (see Spitzer, Crouch, and Stratton, 1971), the mean number of prison statements written was only 2.4 and the mean for home statements was just 1.1. Therefore, it appeared that inmates were reluctant to describe themselves in terms of the objective roles they played, either within or outside of the institution. Instead, they tended to describe

themselves in evaluative terms, such as "I am weak," "I am friendly," or in universal terms, such as "I am a child of God."

It was found that only those inmates who included higher proportions of negative statements about prison tended to be concerned with the outside world. Inmates with more antiprison statements had more correspondents ($r = .77$), received more letters per month ($r = .56$), thought of home more often ($r = .43$), and had higher scores on the current events test ($r = .43$). They were also less involved in institutional activities ($r = -.33$). None of these relationships was upheld for inmates responding with positive or neutral prison statements. On the other hand, inmates who identified positively or neutrally with prison were more likely to have spent more time in prison throughout their lifetimes ($r = .43$) as well as during the present sentence ($r = .70$).

Those inmates who identified themselves with outside world roles appeared slightly less interested in institutional activities ($r = -.33$) as measured by reported participation in either recreational or treatment activities, and were more concerned with maintaining a good institutional record ($r = -.29$ infractions/mo.). They had also spent less total time in prison ($r = -.50$). In essence, they seemed to manifest a manipulative strategy and there was, indeed, a positive relationship between percentage of outside world statements and scores on the Manipulative-Release scale ($r = .29$).

A puzzling result, however, was the positive relationship found between proportion of outside world role statements and scores on the Institutionalism scale ($r = .36$). In addition, a slight negative relationship was found between institutionalism and positive or neutral

prison statements ($r = -.26$). These findings indicate that those who like prison tend to define themselves in terms of their roles outside of prison and not in terms of their prison roles.

This finding raised a serious question about the validity of the Institutionalism scale as a true measure of institutionalism. It was possible that the Institutionalism scale failed to discriminate between two kinds of inmates, both with positive attitudes to prison. One type, the truly institutionalized inmate, would view prison as home and would be disinterested in the outside world as indicated by previous findings. Another type of inmate might also score highly on the Institutionalism scale simply because he would have generally favorable attitudes toward his situation, both within and outside of prison. This type of inmate would probably have a stable environment to return to and would merely be waiting out his time unresentfully.

The Enfield Sample

Scores on the Institutionalism subscale were inversely related to current events test scores ($r = -.39$) and number of infractions per month ($r = .29$).¹¹ This suggested that inmates favorable to prison were less interested in current events and more concerned with being "good inmates" by staying out of trouble. However, neither the Rebelliousness nor Manipulative-Release scales correlated with any of the expected inmate behavioral variables. In fact, inmates scoring high on the Rebelliousness scale wrote fewer letters ($r = -.32$) and

¹¹For the Enfield sample, correlations of at least .283, .334, and .392 were significant at the .10, .05, and .02 levels, respectively.

were more involved in treatment programs ($r = .40$) than low scoring inmates.

In addition, a unexpected relationship was found between institutional experience and concern with the outside world. It appeared that at Enfield, the more prison experience an inmate had, the more active was his interest in the outside world as measured by number of correspondents, number of letters sent, thoughts of home, and current events test scores (see Appendix for correlations). Also, positive identification with prison as measured by the Twenty Statements Test was positively correlated with the above variables, indicating that the more an inmate identified himself with the prison, the more concerned he was with the outside world.

These findings may be attributable to the progressiveness and treatment orientation of Enfield. It may be that those inmates who feel positively toward prison do so because, in their case, prison has been a constructive experience which has succeeded in preparing them for leaving the institution and has not encouraged the development of institutionalism. It is also possible that a selection factor is operating so that the type of inmates who are selected for Enfield are different in some unspecified way from inmates who remain at Somers. Another possible explanation for the institutional differences could simply be size, since Enfield has less than one-third the population of Somers.

Summary

In summary, the results from Study II provided partial support for the validity of the proposed typology. Inmates scoring high on the

Institutionalism scale tended to be less concerned with the outside world. Manipulative-release-oriented inmates had less prison experience and were concerned with maintaining "clean" records. Rebellious inmates reported more infractions and tended to be more concerned with the outside world. Differences were found between the minimum and maximum security prisons in the correlations between scale scores and inmate behaviors. Finally, the possibility was raised that the Institutionalism scale was actually measuring two different types of inmates who are both favorable to prison--the truly institutionalized inmate and the generally positive inmate. This final point will be addressed in the following section.

Discussion of Studies I and II

In deciding upon means of adapting to a correctional institution, each inmate is placed in a position of having to assess the value of certain rewards and costs inherent in compliance with or resistance to various institutional demands. The formal rewards for compliance seem considerable. Playing the role of "good inmate" can pay off with a good institutional job, favorable treatment by correction officers, furloughs, and possibly an earlier release date. However, the inmate who chooses this alternative may incur a psychological cost; he has compromised his autonomy by acquiescing to the pressures of the authorities and he may even have made himself more vulnerable by developing a dependency on a highly structured way of life. The resistant inmate may pay the costs of increased time in prison, worse jobs, and less favorable relations with correction officers while obtaining the reward of the knowledge that he has maintained his dignity

and autonomy. The resistant inmate is also rewarded by the status he is given by other inmates, a fact demonstrated in Garabedian's study which showed that the outlaw is perceived as leader by many (non-outlaw) inmates (Garabedian, 1963). Thus, there appear to be many conflicting factors that the inmate must consider in his decision to comply with or resist institutional demands.

To replace the previous model of institutional adjustment tested in Studies I and II, a two-dimensional model involving four modes of adaptation can be substituted. The advantage of a four-group typology is that it accommodates the possibility that some inmates who are relatively satisfied with the formal aspects of the system would nevertheless not become dependent upon the institution. It is conceivable that maintaining a high motivation for release would mediate against the "institutionalizing" effects of imprisonment, thus suggesting the existence of a fourth type of inmate, the Positivistic inmate who is both satisfied with prison but also desires release.

Another reason for developing a second model was that it appeared that the former Institutionalism and Rebelliousness scales actually represented two poles of the same dimension, since the correlation between the two scales was $-.70$. Thus, a more parsimonious explanation of these two scales was that inmates were either satisfied with prison or not.

According to the second model, then, there are two factors which are important correlates of inmate adjustment patterns to prison. The first is the degree to which inmates are satisfied or dissatisfied with the formal aspects of the correctional institution--the correction

officers, the counselors, the programs, and so on. The more satisfied an inmate is with the way the prison in general is run, the more likely he is to conform with institutional demands and play the role of "good" inmate. Conversely, the more dissatisfied an inmate is with the formal aspects of the institution, the more likely he is to resist, opting for the role of the rebellious inmate or troublemaker.

However, another factor can be identified which appears to cross-cut satisfaction with prison in determining how an inmate will adjust to incarceration, and that is his degree of release orientation. For an inmate to receive the rewards of the formal system, he must comply with certain expectations for "good" inmate behavior, such as maintaining good disciplinary and work records. One such important reward is a favorable recommendation to the parole board, a goal with a great deal of meaning to someone highly motivated to be released. It is quite possible that an inmate who is highly dissatisfied with prison would nevertheless overcomply with formal expectations for inmate behavior, in hopes that he would obtain a speedy release from prison. Some "anti-institutional" inmates would, no doubt, compromise their principles and publicly demonstrate their "interest in rehabilitation." Others, however, would refuse to act in contradiction with their attitudes and thus would remain the troublemakers and rebels, incurring institutional costs while maintaining autonomy.¹²

¹² It should be stressed here that the term release orientation refers to an inmate's willingness to manifest the type of behavior that may "earn" him release from prison. A rebellious inmate would most likely want release from prison; however, he would be unwilling to act appropriately "release oriented."

Inmates who are satisfied with the prison may also be categorized as either high or low on release orientation. The literature on institutionalism discussed in the last chapter implies that "institutionalized" inmates would be low on release orientation, since they perceive the prison as their "home" and are adjusted comfortably to the prison routine. Other inmates, most likely those who have a stable lifestyle on the outside and who have not become immersed in the inmate subculture, would be satisfied with prison and release oriented as well.

Given the two factors identified as affecting adjustment to prison, and varying these factors by two levels, a two by two matrix can be formed. The four hypothesized modes of adjustment to prison are represented in Figure 2.

The Four Modes of Adjustment

Following are descriptions of the four modes of inmate adjustment to prison:

The Rebellious Inmate: The rebellious inmate would possess negative attitudes to the institution but would not be willing to conceal them even to attain the goal of release. Instead, the rebellious inmate would publicly reject and confront the formal prison rules, refusing to comply with the total institution's requirements for "good" inmate behavior. Consequently, he would be regarded as a "troublemaker" by institutional authorities or at the very least would not be looked upon favorably in terms of prison jobs or other advantages.

The Institutionalized Inmate: The institutionalized inmate, possessing favorable attitudes toward the prison, would be expected to

		SATISFACTION	
		Low	High
RELEASE ORIENTATION	Low	Rebellious	Institutionalized
	High	Manipulative-Release	Positivistic

Figure 2. Revised Typology of Inmate Adjustment to Prison.

comply with formal institutional demands in an attempt to establish a comfortable lifestyle for himself within the institution. Most likely, he would obtain a "good" institutional job and would become actively involved in the prison community activities through participation in sports and clubs. However, because his release orientation is low, it would not be necessary for him to manifest an extreme concern for rehabilitation, so he should not be involved in treatment programs nor should his disciplinary record be exemplary. His concern and contact with the outside world would be minimal.

The Manipulative-Release-Oriented Inmate: The manipulative-release-oriented inmate would be dissatisfied with the institution but would be expected to conceal these attitudes in his interactions with staff. Instead, he would conform to institutional standards with the expectation that conformity will facilitate his release from prison. It would be expected that inmates with this orientation would enroll in the appropriate programs for release preparation and would attempt to present themselves as inmates sincerely interested in rehabilitation. They would view the institution as an obstacle to be overcome as quickly and efficiently as possible, while privately rejecting the institution's goals.

The Positivistic Inmate: The positivistic inmate is both satisfied with the institution and release oriented. He most likely has a stable home life and is anxious to resume his life on the outside. However, he does not view prison as extremely aversive since he perceives that he is treated fairly by correction officers and other staff members.

It might be noted here that although two of the four adjustment patterns involve antiprison attitudes, only one of the four types (rebelliousness) is characterized by behavioral noncompliance. Thus, the proposed typology implies that most inmates in correctional institutions attempt to conform to the expectations of staff members, either to attain a comfortable institutional lifestyle or to facilitate release. This implication conforms with Glaser's (1964) observation that most inmates attempt to adjust to the demands of the institution rather than manifesting noncompliance or rebelliousness.

Inmate data from Study II were reanalyzed using the revised model of inmate adaptation to incarceration. Inmate scores on the Release Orientation scale and the composite Satisfaction with Prison scale (23 items, coefficient alpha .89) were dichotomized at the means (Somers and Enfield inmates combined), thus yielding a high and low inmate group for each scale. Specifically, all inmates who scored 61 or more on the Satisfaction with Prison scale were designated as scoring high on that scale; those scoring 60 or below were viewed as scoring low ($\bar{X} = 60.96$). On the Release Orientation scale, those inmates scoring 41 or above were viewed as release oriented; those with scores of 40 or lower were labeled not release oriented ($\bar{X} = 40.8$). The mean item score for the Satisfaction with Prison scale was 2.7, indicating that the average inmate was slightly dissatisfied with prison. Thus, inmates scoring above the mean were either slightly dissatisfied, neutral, or satisfied with prison while those scoring below the mean were either moderately or strongly dissatisfied. It was felt that due to prison social desirability norms which would discourage inmates from admitting that they "liked" prison, scores above the mean indicated

qualitatively more favorable attitudes to prison. The mean for the Release Orientation scale was 3.1, indicating that the average inmate was relatively neutral on this dimension. Thus, inmates scoring above the mean indicated that they were release oriented; inmates below the mean were not.

Comparisons were made among the four groups on the variables measured in Study II. Data from each prison were analyzed separately; and due to the small number of inmates in each group, only descriptive statistics were computed.

The Somers Sample

As Table 2 indicates, institutionalized inmates are older, have spent more time in prison during the present sentence, have spent more total time in prison, and have less time to serve than inmates maintaining the other three orientations. Conversely, manipulative-release-oriented inmates are younger, have spent less time in prison during the present sentence, have spent less total time in prison, and have a longer time to serve. On the variables dealing with concern for the outside world, institutionalized inmates have the lowest mean score on thoughts of home and have the lowest number of correspondents of the four inmate types. They are also the most active in prison affairs, averaging three activities per inmate.

Rebellious inmates are surprisingly similar to institutionalized inmates on such variables as age, time served in the present sentence, total time in prison, and participation in prison activities, indicating that release orientation might be more important than satisfaction with prison in discriminating among the four groups. However, rebellious

Table 2. Mean Scores for Variables Measured in Study #2 by Mode of Adjustment--Somers Sample.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Rebellious	Institutionalized	Manipulative-Release	Positivistic	Total
Age	31.1	32.9	21.8	29.9	28.7
Time in Present Institution ^a	22.5	27.4	15.0	17.6	20.6
Time in Present Sentence ^a	26.5	29.3	21.7	19.6	24.3
Time Expected to Serve ^a	28.6	8.5	74.4	21.8	33.3
Phase of Sentence ^b	1.8	2.6	1.6	2.0	2.0
Total Number Incarcerations	2.8	2.4	1.0	1.6	2.0
Age at First Arrest	15.7	16.1	17.2	22.0	17.8
Total Time in Prison ^a	96.7	104.0	21.0	39.4	65.3
Thoughts of Home ^c	3.2	3.0	3.7	3.4	3.3
Correspondents	8.0	6.9	8.4	9.8	8.3
Letters Written/Month	10.9	12.0	11.2	19.5	13.4
Letters Received/Month	10.6	11.0	10.7	19.3	12.9
Activities (Total)	2.2	3.0	1.2	1.0	1.9
Recreational Activities	1.2	1.9	.7	.8	1.2
Treatment Activities	1.0	1.1	.5	.2	.7

Table 2 (Continued).

	Rebellious	Institutionalized	Manipulative-Release	Positivistic	Total
Current Events Score	4.7	3.6	3.6	2.6	3.6
Infractions/Month	.33	.15	.04	.0	.13
(N)	(7)	(10)	(6)	(5)	(28)

^aIn months.

^b₁ = early; 2 = middle; 3 = late.

^c₁ = not at all; 2 = some of the time; 3 = most of the time; 4 = all of the time.

inmates were found to be much more likely to commit infractions than inmates of the other three categories.

The Enfield Sample

As the correlational analyses suggested, few of the relationships that were found among the Somers inmates were also found at Enfield. Essentially, no consistent relationships were found among inmate types and time served or expected to serve, except that the positivistic inmates appeared to have served more time and have less time to serve than the other three types. Unlike the Somers sample, Enfield inmates who were high on release orientation appeared to have had more prison experience (both total time in prison and number of incarcerations) than those inmates low on the Release Orientation scale (see Table 3).

Institutionalized inmates did tend to be less concerned with the outside world than the other three types, since they had the fewest number of correspondents, wrote and received the fewest number of letters, and had the lowest scores on the thoughts of home scale and the current events test.¹³ There were no consistent trends among the other three inmates types with reference to concern for the outside; they all appeared relatively highly concerned.

Institutional behavior also showed no consistent trends. No differences were found among the four groups in participation in overall prison activities. However, an interesting finding related to participation in treatment programs. Apparently, inmates who are low on the Satisfaction with Prison scale were more likely to be involved in

¹³Low scores were tied with another cell.

Table 3. Mean Scores for Variables Measured in Study #2 by Mode of Adjustment--Enfield Sample.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Rebellious	Institutionalized	Manipulative-Release	Positivistic	Total
Age	26.1	27.3	30.0	29.2	28.2
Time in Present Institution ^a	11.4	11.5	17.1	44.8	21.2
Time in Present Sentence ^a	23.9	14.0	25.3	55.4	29.6
Time Expected to Serve ^a	13.1	5.8	13.5	4.4	9.2
Phase ^b	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.5	2.2
Total Number Incarcerations	1.3	1.2	2.0	2.5	1.8
Age at First Arrest	17.7	20.4	16.0	18.1	18.1
Total Time in Prison ^a	38.7	20.4	86.0	71.4	54.1
Thoughts of Home ^c	3.6	3.2	3.2	4.0	3.5
Correspondents	5.3	4.8	9.6	7.3	6.8
Letters Written/Month	15.1	8.3	16.7	30.5	17.7
Letters Received/Month	14.3	8.7	12.4	16.4	13.0
Activities (Total)	3.4	2.0	2.4	1.9	2.4
Recreational Activities	2.0	1.4	1.1	1.5	1.5
Treatment Activities	1.4	.6	1.3	.36	.92

Table 3 (Continued).

	Rebellious	Institutionalized	Manipulative-Release	Positivistic	Total
Current Events Score	4.0	3.4	5.7	3.4	4.1
Infractions/Month	.01	.05	.02	.01	.02
(N)	(5)	(7)	(10)	(11)	(33)

^aIn months.

^b1 = early; 2 = middle; 3 = late.

^c1 = not at all; 2 = some of the time; 3 = most of the time; 4 = all of the time.

"treatment" programs.¹⁴ This may indicate effective screening on the part of staff members, assuming that unsatisfied inmates are in more need of treatment, or that inmates involved in treatment feel freer to express negative attitudes about the prison.

Like the Somers sample, the rebellious inmates were more likely to have committed infractions than inmates in the other three groups.

Conclusions

In Studies I and II, two related models of inmate adjustment to prison have been presented and partially validated. The second model, which involves classifying inmates into one of four groups on the basis of their scores on two attitude scales, has the conceptual advantage of allocating cases to mutually exclusive categories. That is, an inmate is either rebellious, institutionalized, manipulative-release oriented, or positivistic; he cannot be a member of more than one group. On the other hand, by dichotomizing the scale scores, the second model suffers the disadvantage of losing the quantitative detail of inmates' relative scores.

It was clear that further research was necessary to test the validity of the second model of inmate adjustment to incarceration, since the secondary analyses of data from Study II, in which the model was tested, did not allow for the computation of inferential statistics due to small cell sizes.

¹⁴This term is used loosely to cover educational as well as counseling-oriented activities.

In addition, the question of the relationship of the institutional climate, that is, custodial versus treatment oriented, to inmate mode of adaptation merited further study. Whether inmates are more or less likely to react to a particular type of prison in a rebellious or institutionalized fashion, for example, was a question that merited attention.

CHAPTER III

STUDY III--FURTHER VALIDATION OF THE TYPOLOGY OF INMATE ADJUSTMENT

Introduction

It was hypothesized that inmates who employ a particular mode of adjustment to prison would be similar to other inmates using the same mode on a number of variables relating to institutional behavior, orientation to the outside world, background characteristics, and institutional experience. Moreover, these inmates would be distinguishable on the above variables from inmates employing other modes of adjustment.

Institutionalized and positivistic inmates were defined as being relatively satisfied with the correctional officers, staff, and programs in the prison while manipulative-release and rebellious inmates were defined as being generally dissatisfied.

With respect to release orientation, manipulative-release and positivistic inmates would report that the possibility of release is an important factor influencing their institutional behavior. Institutionalized and rebellious inmates would report that the possibility of release is unimportant in influencing institutional behavior. (See Table 4.)

Behavioral Correlates of the Modes of Institutional Adjustment

It was expected that rebellious, institutionalized, manipulative-release, and positivistic inmates would be distinguishable from one another on the following variables:

Table 4. Hypothesized Behavioral and Attitudinal Characteristics of the Four Inmate Types.

	Rebellious	Institutionalized	Manipulative- Release	Positivistic
Attitudes to Prison	dissatisfied	satisfied	dissatisfied	satisfied
Release Orientation	not release oriented	not release oriented	release oriented	release oriented
Institutional Behavior				
Recreational activities	low involvement	high involvement ^a	low involvement	low involvement
Treatment activities	low involvement	low involvement	high involvement	high involvement
Institutional job	undesirable	desirable	rehabilitation oriented	rehabilitation oriented
Disciplinary record	poor	good	excellent	excellent
Work record	poor	good	excellent	excellent
Outside World Orientation				
Number of correspondents	medium	low	high	high
Number of letters written	medium	low	high	high
Number of letters received	medium	low	high	high
Number of visitors	medium	low	high	high

Table 4 (Continued).

	Rebellious	Institutionalized	Manipulative- Release	Positivistic
Current events score	medium	low	high	high
Thoughts of home score	medium	low	high	high
Background Data				
Occupation	moderate status	low status	moderate status	high status
Family stability	medium	low	medium	high
Institutional Experience				
Amount of time served	moderate	long	short	short

^aThese labels refer to relations among the four inmate types, not absolutes. For example, "low" is used to mean less than "medium" which is less than "high."

Institutional Behavior

Factors such as program involvement, disciplinary record, work record, and kind of institutional job should be related to mode of adjustment to incarceration. Institutionalized inmates should be involved in nonrehabilitative activities, have fairly good disciplinary and work records, and have a desirable institutional job. Rebellious inmates should be involved in few or no programs, have frequent misconducts, and have a fairly poor job record. Manipulative-release and positivistic inmates should involve themselves in treatment programs, maintain excellent disciplinary and work records, and hold jobs that have implications for post-release careers.

Orientation to the Outside World

Variables such as number of correspondents, number of letters written and received per month, number of visitors, and knowledge of current events should also be related to mode of institutional adjustment. It would be expected that institutionalized inmates would not manifest an interest in the outside world while those inmates using manipulative, positivistic, or rebellious strategies to imprisonment would maintain contacts and express interest in the outside world.

Determinants of the Modes of Institutional Adjustment

The variables discussed above are thought to be indicative of specific modes of institutional adjustment. As the literature on the effects of incarceration suggests (Welford, 1967; Thomas and Foster, 1973; Wing and Brown, 1970), it is likely that two important factors would have some bearing on the type of adjustment pattern employed by

a particular inmate: (a) his background characteristics, and (b) the extent and length of his prison experience.

Background Characteristics

Thomas (1973), Wellford (1967), and Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) have indicated that variables such as social class and family stability are important in determining inmate patterns of adjustment to a total institution. It is likely that a man who has experienced a relatively rewarding life on the outside world would be highly motivated to return to it and thus would employ the manipulative-release or positivistic strategy, while a man with little "going" for him on the outside would attempt to obtain rewards from institutional life, thus becoming "institutionalized." Prior occupation would be expected to relate to institutional adjustment, so that manipulative-release and positivistic inmates would be more likely to have held white-collar or skilled blue-collar positions and institutionalized inmates would be less likely.

Institutional Experience

If no relationship is found between time served and mode of adjustment, it must be assumed that inmates enter prison with a certain orientation, maintain that orientation throughout their prison stay, and leave without having been measurably changed by their prison experience. However, many researchers have found that the attitudes of inmates both in prisons and mental hospitals do appear to change as a function of the time they have spent within the institution (Wheeler, 1962; Garabedian, 1963; Wing and Brown, 1970). It is expected that there would be a general tendency away from rebellious and manipulative-release orientations and toward institutionalism and positivism with greater time served. This trend toward more satisfaction with prison may be thought

of as an habituation process. An inmate is required to live in a place which he finds aversive and initially responds by rejecting everything about it (rebelliousness) or trying to manipulate his way out (manipulative-release orientation). He compares his new world to his former world and finds it inadequate. However, with time, the inmate's basis for comparison fades into memory and the aversive qualities of the institution are perceived as less horrible due to lack of contrast. With increasing time in prison, the manipulative inmate may become disenchanted with his approach since it has not met with success and will redirect his orientation away from the outside world and toward the prison world. It is also expected that the more prior incarcerations an inmate has had, the more likely he would employ the institutionalized mode of adjustment to prison. If institutionalism is found to be more prevalent among inmates with prior institutional experience, two possible conclusions could be drawn: (1) individuals who had employed positivistic, manipulative, and rebellious strategies while in prison were more successful at avoiding reincarceration, or (2) upon reincarceration, recidivists who had previously used positivistic, manipulative, or rebellious modes of adjustment changed their modes to institutionalism.

Comparing Modes of Adjustment across Institutions

As the data from Study II suggest, the proposed typology of institutional adjustment would probably be most relevant at a custody-oriented and least relevant at a treatment-oriented institution. The reason for this assumption relates to differing expectations of staff and administration for what constitutes "good" inmate behavior. Street,

Vinter, and Perrow (1966) studied six juvenile institutions differing from one another in terms of their organizational goals and treatment of inmates by staff. The three major organizational types they examined were:

- (1) Obedience conformity--These institutions stressed respect for authority and conformity to rules while allowing high levels of staff domination.
- (2) Reeducation development--These institutions attempted rehabilitation through changing the inmates' behavior. They stressed training, skills development, and the learning of prosocial behaviors.
- (3) Treatment--These institutions perceived rehabilitation as a product of intrapsychic processes and personality change. Their programs stressed the importance of self-insight within an accepting, nonhostile atmosphere. Few punishments were used.

The investigators found that these differing organizational features had important implications for many aspects of organizational functioning including staff attitudes and behavior toward inmates, day-to-day operating patterns, and inmates' social relations and self-concepts. For example, they found that the staff at obedience/conformity institutions demanded obedience and immediate compliance from inmates, maintained high social distance, and conducted rituals of deference and degradation. In contrast, personnel at the treatment organizations expected recalcitrance and only minimal compliance from the inmates, used persuasion rather than dominance, and de-emphasized the social distance between inmates and staff. Inmate attitudes also differed.

In the obedience/conformity institutions, inmates had relatively negative perspectives toward the institution and staff while at the treatment institutions, inmate attitudes were relatively positive.

Another study which measured staff conceptions of inmate characteristics in adult treatment and custody institutions obtained similar results (Brown, DuPont, Kozel, and Spevaeck, 1971). When asked to describe the "ideal inmate" on an adjective checklist, correction officers from a rehabilitative institution characterized them as willful and competitive, while staff members from a custodial institution preferred deferential inmates who were concerned with gaining support from the institution.

These findings lend support to the hypothesis that institutionalism would be more prevalent at obedience/conformity institutions, since the characteristics of these organizations more closely resemble those of the "total institution" described by Goffman. Institutionalism would most likely occur at institutions where compliance and rule following are rewarded by staff, a condition presumably more prevalent at maximum than minimum security institutions.

Method

The Research Setting

In the present study, inmates were sampled from three adult male correctional institutions of varying security levels located in two states. Below is a brief description of each institution.

Huntingdon

Designed and built in the 1880's, the State Correctional Institution at Huntingdon, Pa. houses approximately 875 inmates of minimum, medium, and maximum security levels. The institution is a massive structure surrounded by a high brick wall and located on the outskirts of a small rural town in Pennsylvania.

To quote one of Huntingdon's staff members, emphasis at this institution is on "containment, custody, and control." The prison operates three major industries--printing, clothing manufacturing, and soap making--in addition to providing training in various vocational skills such as masonry and barbering. There is a furlough program as well as a limited work release program.

Before 1972, Huntingdon was a maximum security institution but was redesignated a mixed institution when the Pennsylvania Department of Correction decided to regionalize, or place inmates in the institutions closest to their homes. Nevertheless, most of the personnel remain from the maximum security period and the physical plant ensures security.

Enfield

Also commonly referred to as "the Farm," Enfield is Connecticut's minimum security prison for adult males. It has a capacity of 400. Physically, Enfield resembles a college campus, with several separate brick buildings situated to form an interior quadrangle or commons. There is no perimeter wall or gate and few gates to negotiate upon entrance.

Until 1970, Enfield was administratively united with Somers, Connecticut's maximum security prison, and its major emphasis was

farming, with inmate labor producing many of the foodstuffs consumed there and at other state correctional facilities. However, in that year a progressive administration was hired to run the prison autonomously and since then, vast efforts have been made to liberalize and improve the institution's staff-inmate relations, services, and programs. A large proportion of inmates are currently involved in educational and vocational programs. Many activities, ranging from sports to self-improvement programs, are available for inmate participation; there is also an active furlough program. To involve custodial personnel and inmates in the rehabilitation process, the Enfield administration implemented the "treatment team" concept, which gave the above groups a "voice" in determining an inmate's program plan while in prison.

Inmates selected for Enfield are generally well behaved, low security risks who have expressed an interest in rehabilitation. Although there are some long-termers, many Enfield inmates have a relatively short time to serve due to the Department of Correction policy of using Enfield as a stage of graduated release before some maximum security inmates are returned to the community.

Somers

Somers, with a capacity of 1000, is Connecticut's maximum security adult male institution. Security is of major importance at Somers, a fact attested to by the following statement from a Department of Correction booklet: "Somers is a self contained life support facility It is made secure by bounded perimeters, a series of interlocking gates and security windows" (p. 20). Protection of outsiders and staff involves extreme precautions. For example, before

entering the institution, all visitors are subjected to an electronic metal detector, and female employees and guests take meals in a special room, separated by a gate from the corridors traversed by inmates.

Somers does offer its inmates some training opportunities through various vocational and work programs. However, in interviews conducted with management personnel, a researcher noted a strong emphasis placed upon the importance of close supervision and strict adherence to rules and regulations (Duffee, 1975, p. 68).

There is virtually no selectivity in assigning inmates to the Somers facility. Except for the small minority of inmates who are sent directly to Enfield or are later transferred there, most adult male inmates sentenced to serve more than one year in a Connecticut state prison are sent to Somers.

The Instruments

The Correctional Institution Environment Scale

To gauge the social climates of these institutions objectively and thus verify the similarities and differences among the three prisons, the Correctional Institution Environment Scale (CIES) (Wenk and Moos, 1972) was chosen for use in the present study. The CIES is composed of 86 items forming nine subscales which are organized around three dimensions: (1) people-to-people relationships (subscales 1 - 3), (2) institutional programs (subscales 4 - 6), and (3) institutional functioning (subscales 7 - 9). Brief descriptions of the nine dimensions are provided below:

- (1) Involvement--measures inmate levels of activity and energy in day-to-day functioning.
- (2) Support--measures extent to which inmates and staff are encouraged to be helpful and supportive to other inmates.
- (3) Expressiveness--measures extent of open expression of feelings.
- (4) Autonomy--measures extent to which inmates are encouraged to use initiative.
- (5) Practical Orientation--measures extent to which environment is preparing inmate for release.
- (6) Personal Problem Orientation--measures extent to which inmates are encouraged to gain insight into their personal problems.
- (7) Order--measures how important order and organization are to the program.
- (8) Clarity--measures extent to which rules and procedures are clear and routing predictable.
- (9) Staff Control--measures extent to which staff keeps inmates under control through rule reinforcement, scheduling, etc.

Higher scores for all scales except the staff control dimension indicate that the respondents perceive the institution favorably.

The Inmate Attitude Scale

To measure inmate orientation to prison, the 22-item Satisfaction with Prison scale and the 16-item Release Orientation scale were administered. Items from these scales were interspersed in the questionnaire, and the composite scale was labeled the Inmate Attitude scale. These scales were shown in Study II to possess internal consistency, with a coefficient alpha of .88 for the Satisfaction with Prison scale and a coefficient alpha of .70 for the Release Orientation

scale. The two scales were shown to be slightly positively correlated ($r = .24$); however, this correlation is low enough to assure that they are measuring different constructs and thus have discriminant validity. Several reverse items were added by the author to the Release Orientation scale in attempts to improve internal consistency and discourage positive response bias (see Appendix). Items from a scale developed by Thomas (Thomas and Zingraff, 1974; Thomas and Foster, 1974) to measure prisonization were also included.

Background Information and Current Events Questionnaires

In the questionnaires, inmates were also asked to provide information regarding three basic areas: background characteristics, institutional behavior, and contact with the outside world. Specifically, the background variables of interest were: age, race, previous occupation, family stability, service in the armed forces, and previous involvement with the criminal justice system. The institutional variables studied were: disciplinary record, participation in institutional programs and activities, prison work assignment, and topics of conversation discussed with other inmates. To gauge inmates' concern and contact with the outside world, questions dealing with current events, number of correspondents, number of letters written and received, and number of visitors were included. Several questions pertaining to thoughts of home were included to allow inmates who may have difficulty writing letters to adequately express the extent of their concern for the outside world (see Appendix).

The Supervisor's Rating Scale

To obtain data on work supervisors' ratings of inmate work performance, questionnaires were distributed at Enfield to supervisors of

all inmates included in the study sample. They were asked to rate each inmate listed in terms of his general work performance on a five-point scale ranging from poor to excellent (see Appendix).

The staff at Huntingdon routinely used a similar form of rating inmate work performance. Instead of collecting new data on this variable for the present study, the institutional rating forms were used.

There were no data readily available at Somers on inmate work performance and permission was not granted to collect new data.

Subjects

Huntingdon Sample

One-third of the total institutional population of 855 was selected for the study by recording every third name listed in the prison's inmate file. Thus, a sample of 286 inmates was initially selected: Of those 286 inmates, 53 (18.5%) refused to take part in the study, 8 (2.8%) could not be reached for various reasons (e.g., hospitalized, paroled, escaped, etc.), and 12 (4.2%) were detained in punitive segregation and thus were prohibited from taking part in the study. In addition to the 73 inmates in the sample who did not participate at all, 14 (4.9%) inmates failed to complete the questionnaires correctly, and their responses were excluded when the data were analyzed. Thus, the results to be described in this study represent 69.6% of the initially chosen sample.

In addition to participating in the validation study per se, 78 of the 199 inmates interviewed also completed the 86-item version of the Correctional Institution Environment Scale (CIES). Selection

for this task was done on a random basis with every other group called being asked to complete this additional scale.

Enfield Sample

Half of the Enfield population of 358 was initially chosen for participation in the present research. Of this number, 48 (13.3%) refused to participate, either by not completing the questionnaire or failing to appear at the appointed times. In addition, 6 inmates (3.4%) were unable to be reached due to their working outside the institution, and 9 questionnaires that were returned (5.0%) were unintelligible. Thus, of the initial 179 inmates chosen for the study, usable data were derived from 125 or 69.8% of them.

Fifty-five of these inmates also filled out the CIES. They were chosen on a random basis, with every other group being asked to participate.

Somers Sample

A 33% systematic random sample was selected from the total population of Somers which at the time of the sample selecting numbered 801 inmates. Of this initial sample, 89 inmates (33.3%) refused to participate, either by not arriving at the appointed times or failing to complete their questionnaires. Another 19 inmates (7.1%) were not allowed to participate in the study because they were being segregated from the general population for punishment or protection. A final 12 inmates (4.5%) could not be reached for various reasons (e.g., hospitalized or transferred) so they also did not fill out questionnaires. In summary, 147 usable questionnaires were obtained from the inmates at Somers, providing data for 55.1% of the initially selected sample.

Seventy-four of the 147 inmates participating in the validation study completed the Correctional Institution Environment Scale as well. They were chosen by the same means as inmates in the previous institutions.

Procedure

Data collection for the Huntingdon inmates occurred during the first three weeks of June 1975. Inmates at Enfield and Somers were interviewed during the first three weeks of July 1975.

About one week before the scheduled start of the data collection, a message was circulated at each institution notifying inmates of the impending research project. The message was signed by the Superintendent or Deputy Superintendent of each prison and was designed to let the inmates know that the research would be carried out with the cooperation of the authorities but that all information concerning individual inmates would remain confidential.

After inmate lists were generated at each prison, the inmates chosen to participate in the study were screened for literacy. Inmate records were consulted by either the author or one of her assistants for each inmate's WRAT (Wide Range Achievement Test) reading score, one result of a battery of diagnostic tests that most inmates receive upon entrance to prison. This score is purported to represent the grade level equivalent to the test taker's level of reading ability. A cut-off point of 4.1 was designated as the minimum reading level required for an inmate to be literate, and thus eligible to complete the questionnaire in a group. Those inmates with reading levels below 4.1 were scheduled for individual interviews with either the author or

one of her assistants, who would read all questions aloud and record all verbal responses. Thirty-four Huntingdon inmates, 23 Enfield inmates, and 28 Somers inmates were designated as illiterate; these inmates had slightly higher attrition rates than the literate inmates (32.3%, 42.2%, and 50.0%, Huntingdon, Enfield, and Somers, respectively).¹⁵

The group administration of the questionnaires took place in the educational wings of the three institutions in rooms large enough to accommodate between 25 and 50 people. Approximately 20 to 25 inmates were scheduled for each hour-long session. Usually four sessions were scheduled daily. The author supervised all group sessions, silently accompanied by an escort. At Huntingdon and Enfield, the escort was a civilian clerk and student intern, respectively, while Somers authorities required the escort to be a uniformed correction officer.

As the inmates entered the room, their names were checked against a master list by the escort and they were asked to take a seat. About five to ten minutes after the scheduled time, the author passed out copies of the questionnaire and pencils and convened the session with the following instructions:

My name is Lynne Goodstein and I am a doctoral student in Social Psychology from the City University of New York. I am conducting a research project on inmates' attitudes about correctional institutions and I have come to ask for your help. I would like to read the instructions on the cover of this questionnaire aloud and I hope you will read them silently along with me. Afterwards, I will answer any questions you may have.

¹⁵ It is possible that some illiterates at Somers were subjected to the group interview since WRAT scores were not available for approximately 29% of the inmates in the sample.

"You have been selected to participate in a research study designed to find out how inmates feel about themselves and about correctional institutions. The study should take about 45 minutes. This study is not designed to evaluate you as an individual. The purpose of this research is to study group, not individual differences. This questionnaire has been designed for research purposes only and your responses will remain strictly confidential. No individual's questionnaire will be shown to any staff member at this, or any other institution. Thank you for taking part in this study."

Frequently, inmates would question how they were selected, and it was explained that the selection process was random, so that every second or third name would be chosen from the institutional file and there was no rhyme or reason why they were selected; they were not being singled out. Sometimes inmates would ask about the practical effects of a research project such as this. To this comment, the author responded that many prison administrators and corrections planners are interested in changing the correctional system, but that they do not have the necessary contact with inmates to know what kind of change is needed. It was suggested that this questionnaire was one means for inmates to express their feelings, both positive and negative, with the hope that the results will be read by people in positions of influence within the correctional system.

Concern was sometimes voiced about whether the questionnaires were truly confidential, and, if so, why it was necessary to request names. The author reaffirmed the fact that no one other than herself would be allowed to see the questionnaires and explained that names were required in case some information had been left out so she could consult the inmate's file.

After all inmates' questions about the study were answered, the author stated that participation in the research project was voluntary; and if any inmate did not wish to participate, he was free to leave.

The author instructed the inmates to turn to the first page of questions, called the Inmate Attitude Scale, and to read along silently as she read the instructions aloud:

Instructions: Below are written a number of statements which relate to being an inmate in a correctional institution. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement by placing a check (✓) in the appropriate box to the right of the statement. If you strongly agree with the statement, place a check in the box on the extreme right. If you strongly disagree, place a check in the box on the extreme left. If you are somewhere in the middle, place a check in one of the three middle boxes that comes closest to your opinion.

She then read each item twice, casually checking the responses of the inmates to be sure that they were following along with her. After the Inmate Attitude Scale was completed, the inmates were instructed to complete the next two sections of the questionnaire, Background Information and the Current Events Test, at their own pace and to remain in their seats when they had finished. The final section of the questionnaire consisted of either the 86-item Correctional Institution Environment Scale (CIES) or the Twenty Statements Test (TST).¹⁶ If the inmates were scheduled to complete the CIES, the following instructions were read:

INSTRUCTIONS: FOLLOWING ARE 86 STATEMENTS ABOUT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS. YOU ARE TO DECIDE WHICH STATEMENTS ARE TRUE OF YOUR INSTITUTION AND WHICH ARE NOT.

TRUE -- circle the T when you think the statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE

FALSE -- circle the F when you think the statement is FALSE or MOSTLY FALSE

The author then read each item aloud twice while the inmates circled the responses of their choice. After all 86 items had been read and answered, the questionnaires were collected and the session was adjourned.

¹⁶The TST data were collected for another research project.

It was not uncommon for inmates not to appear for their scheduled appointments. Sometimes their absence was attributable to their inability to be released from their jobs at the scheduled times; other times it was due to the inmates' disinterest in participating in the study. To discriminate between these two situations, it was decided that inmates who did not appear at their appointed times would be scheduled for a maximum of three sessions. If they failed to appear at three separate times, it would be assumed that they had refused to participate.¹⁷

Results

Comparisons of the Three Institutions

The Inmates

No specific differences in the background characteristics of inmates among the three prisons were predicted and, for the most part, no differences were found. As Table 5 indicates, the ages of inmates at the three prisons were not significantly different from one another. Inmates from the three prisons received approximately the same amount of education and were first arrested at approximately the same age. As Table 6 shows, there was no difference in the proportion of married inmates

¹⁷ Attendance was especially poor at the last institution visited by the author, the Connecticut Correctional Institution at Somers. This was probably partially attributable to a rumor that apparently was spread by some of the inmates that the author was an agent for the F.B.I. Attempts were made to "cool out" the situation by asking inmates who did appear for the sessions to explain to other inmates exactly what was being requested and that there was no basis to the rumor. Nevertheless, this circumstance probably accounts to some degree for the higher refusal rates at Somers than at the other institutions studied.

Table 5. Mean Age, Age at First Arrest, and Highest Grade Achieved for Inmates at the Three Prisons.
 (Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)
 (Number varies because of missing data)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers	F-Ratio
Age	29.60 (193)	30.47 (109)	28.44 (135)	df (2,443), 1.65*
Age at First Arrest	18.21 (194)	18.96 (112)	18.04 (140)	df (2,443), .585*
Grade	9.76 (191)	10.28 (116)	9.80 (142)	df (2,446), 2.21*

* $p > .10$

Table 6. Marital Status and Race of Inmates in the Three Prisons.
 (Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)
 (Number varies because of missing data)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers	χ^2
% Nonwhite	31.9 (194)	67.9 (108)	51.9 (135)	37.75 (df = 2)**
% Married	21.9 (196)	26.4 (121)	24.3 (140)	.857 (df = 2)*

* $p > .10$
 ** $p < .001$

among the three institutions. Furthermore, although certain types of offenses were more likely to have been committed by inmates than others, overall distributions of types of offenses committed did not differ among the three institutions. This was indicated by the fact that all post hoc pairwise Z tests were not significant. Table 7 shows that inmates in all three institutions were most likely to have committed burglary, robbery, a narcotics offense, or murder or manslaughter, with approximately the same proportions of the inmates at the three prisons serving time for these offenses.

The one demographic characteristic that differentiated inmates among the three prisons was race. Significantly fewer Huntingdon inmates reported themselves as nonwhite than inmates at either Enfield or Somers. Separate Z tests comparing Enfield and Somers proportions with that of Huntingdon indicate that there were significantly more nonwhite inmates at Enfield ($z = 6.37, p < .01$) and Somers ($z = 3.60, p < .01$) than at Huntingdon. (See Table 6.) This finding is probably accountable to the fact that Huntingdon draws its population from the predominantly rural area of Pennsylvania, while Somers and Enfield, the only institutions for adult males in Connecticut, draw a larger proportion of their inmates from urban areas.

The Social Climates

Sample sizes for this portion of the research were estimated in compliance with the guidelines described in Mendenhall and Ramey (1973) for choosing the size of a sample. It was decided that since the possible scores on any subscale of the CIES ranged from 0 to 9, the estimate of the difference of any two prison sample means should be correct to within 1.25 points with a probability equal to .95. Thus,

Table 7. Distribution of Types of Offenses Committed by Inmates in the Three Prisons (in Percents).

Offense	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Burglary	21.2	16.1	16.2
Robbery	18.7	25.4	27.5
Drug-Related	10.4	20.3	16.9
Assault	7.8	9.3	6.3
Manslaughter	1.0	9.3	9.9
Murder	16.6	4.2	5.6
Sexual	7.3	6.8	11.3
Possession of Weapon	1.0	.8	.7
Other	5.7	4.2	1.4
Escape	10.4	3.4	4.2
(N)	193	118	142

$$\chi^2 = 52.69 \text{ (df = 18), } p < .001$$

it was necessary to include at least 50 inmates from each prison in the sample. Due to the means by which inmates were selected to complete the Correctional Institution Environment Scale, unequal sample sizes were chosen for each prison, but in all cases the sample exceeded the minimum size of 50 inmates.

Inmate responses to the CIES were compared across the three prisons using nine one-way analyses of variance. On six of the nine CIES scales, there were significant differences among the prisons, with Huntingdon being rated consistently as most favorable (see Table 8). The Newman-Keuls test, a post hoc pairwise comparison procedure, determined that Huntingdon was rated significantly more favorably than Somers on the Support and Clarity subscales, significantly more favorably than Enfield on the Expressiveness dimension, and significantly more favorably than both Enfield and Somers on the Autonomy, Practical Orientation, and Staff Control dimensions ($p < .05$). No differences were found among the three prisons on the Involvement, Personal Problem Orientation, or Order and Organization subscales. Despite the obvious differences in size, organizational structure, expressed goals, and security ratings between Enfield and Somers, these two prisons were rated by inmates as similar on all nine of the CIES Social Climate dimensions.

As Table 9 shows, inmates were no more likely to employ specific modes of adjustment at one institution than another. Approximately the same proportions of the inmate samples at the three prisons were rebellious, institutionalized, manipulative-release, and positivistic.

Table 8. Mean Inmate Scores and F-Ratios for Nine CIES Scales for the Three Prisons.

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers	F-Ratio df = (2,204)
Involvement	3.205	2.927	2.500	2.821
Support	2.936	2.455	2.000	5.080**
Expressiveness	2.333	1.709	2.149	3.26*
Autonomy	1.949	1.382	1.162	4.863**
Practical Orientation	5.039	4.164	3.552	4.086*
Personal Problem Orientation	3.590	3.127	3.045	2.746
Order and Organization	3.231	2.564	3.189	1.725
Clarity	3.539	3.055	2.595	5.59**
Staff Control	7.013	7.600	7.473	3.784*
(N)	78	55	79	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 9. Percentage of Inmates Employing the Four Modes of Adjustment at the Three Prisons.

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	24.6	31.7	36.2
Institutionalized	19.5	18.3	18.4
Manipulative-Release	20.0	20.8	21.3
Positivistic	35.9	29.1	24.1
(N)	195	120	141

The Attitude Scales--Determining Reliability

As a final check on the internal consistency of the scales, item to total correlations were computed on the 23-item Satisfaction with Prison scale and the 18-item Release Orientation scale for each of the three prisons studied. A minimum item to total correlation of .30 was set for inclusion of items in the final scales, and it was found that three items, one from the Satisfaction with Prison scale (item #37) and two from the Release Orientation scale (items #22 and #26) failed to meet this criterion. Thus, these items were dropped from their respective scales.

For the remaining 22 items of the Satisfaction with Prison scale, a coefficient alpha, a statistic which represents the degree to which a scale is internally consistent, was computed for each of the three prisons. These alpha coefficients, .89, .92, and .87 for Huntingdon, Enfield, and Somers, respectively, demonstrate that the scale items appear to be measuring a unitary dimension. The remaining 16 items of the Release Orientation scale were subjected to the same procedure; and it was found that they, too, demonstrated high internal consistency, with alpha coefficients of .76, .77, and .83 for Huntingdon, Enfield, and Somers, respectively.

After the internal reliabilities of the two scales were assured, correlations between scale scores and other variables derived from the questionnaire data were computed. It was hoped that these correlations would mirror the relationships found in Study II and thus reaffirm the validity of the two scales. For the most part, the variables which significantly correlated with the scales in Study II were not related to

the revised scales in Study III. No relationship was found between the Satisfaction with Prison scale and Thoughts of home, Number of correspondents, or Scores on the current events test, variables which had been significantly related to either the Institutionalism or Rebelliousness scales in Study II. (See Table 10.) The Satisfaction with Prison scale was positively correlated with Age, Age at First Arrest, and Thoughts of Job in two of the three prisons. In addition, Satisfaction with Prison was negatively correlated with Total number of infractions as well as the degree inmates reported discussing Prison topics. Thus, although inmates high on Satisfaction with Prison are older, they became involved with the criminal justice system later in life. They tend to conform to prison regulations but are not preoccupied with prison affairs. Finally, their acceptance of prison neither precludes nor encourages an interest in affairs outside of prison.

The Release Orientation scale was found to be inversely related to two measures of prison experience: Time in the present sentence and Total time in prison. In addition, inmates scoring high on release orientation appeared to be more concerned about their outside job and reported that they were more upset upon entrance to prison. Finally, release orientation is inversely related to total number of infractions.

In sum, inmates who are highly release oriented tend to be less experienced with prison, reporting that entering prison was a highly upsetting experience. Although no more concerned with family or current events than other inmates, they do seem preoccupied with a legitimate aspect of their lives on the outside, their jobs. Coupled

Table 10. Correlations between Satisfaction with Prison and Release Orientation Scales and Selected Background Variables for the Three Prisons.

	Satisfaction with Prison Scale			Release Orientation Scale		
	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Age	.12	.18**	.27***	-.03	.16*	-.06
Age at First Arrest	.06	.27***	.19**	.09	.22**	.19**
Time in Present Sentence	-.13	-.09	-.06	-.17**	-.04	-.29***
Total Time in Prison	-.07	-.04	.02	-.17**	-.09	-.34***
Thoughts of Jobs	.27***	.17*	.14	.21**	.28***	.18**
Thoughts of Family	.14*	-.03	.21**	.16**	.10	.18**
# Correspondents	.03	-.12	-.12	.02	-.04	-.03
Current Events Test						
# Infractions	-.17**	-.23**	-.17**	-.18**	-.22**	-.28***
Prison Topics	-.37***	-.19**	-.25**	-.11	-.02	-.04
Upset upon Entrance	.01	-.04	-.06	.15**	.17*	.19**

* $p < .10$

** $p < .05$

*** $p < .01$

with an apparent interest in maintaining their legitimate views of themselves, release-oriented inmates tend to conform to institutional rules. These correlations reflected some of the results obtained in Study II.

The Satisfaction with Prison scale by itself did not reflect the satisfaction with prison and disdain for the "outside world" that was characteristic of the hypothesized institutionalized inmate. However, it had been conceptualized that institutionalism was an interaction of two variables--satisfaction of prison and lack of release orientation. Thus, if the construct of institutionalism, as well as the three other hypothesized modes of adjustment, were to be determined valid, the two scales would have to be crossed and inmate/respondents allocated to one of the four cells.

It was first thought that the natural mid-points on the individual Likert items would be the most appropriate place to split the respondents between "highs" and "lows": In this way, inmates identified as "high" on satisfaction with prison would have made generally positive responses to the items on that scale. Conversely, inmates identified as "high" on release orientation would have expressed a definite willingness to behave in ways expected of inmates to obtain a quick release. However, using this classification scheme, the Institutionalized cell was composed of 17 Huntingdon, 9 Enfield, and 8 Somers inmates; or 8.6, 7.4, and 5.8 percents of the samples from the three prisons, respectively. These cutting points were unacceptable, since they would not provide enough cases in the Institutionalized cell for analysis of data in the Follow-up Study which was to involve a total of only 101 inmates. Consequently, the scale medians for the inmates of the three prisons

combined were used as cutting points, so that the inmates from each prison would be more evenly distributed among the four modes of adjustment. The cutting points were 55 for the Satisfaction with Prison scale and 49 for the Release Orientation scale. As Table 11 indicates, using this classification scheme, inmates were no more likely to employ one mode of adjustment to incarceration than another.

Comparison of the Four Adjustment Types

To limit the number of dependent variables, thus reducing the possibility of obtaining significant results by chance, questionnaire variables that could be scaled were combined into indices. In all cases where indices were computed from two or more variables (except for the Family Status Index), the same procedure was followed. Since the variables to be combined into an index were not scaled using the same units, standard scores, or Z scores, were obtained for each subject for each variable to be used. These standard scores were then summed for each subject to obtain the combined effect of the variables in that index. Finally, to avoid dealing with negative numbers, a constant was added to each set of scores equal to the largest negative number, thus adjusting the range so that the distribution of computed scores would start at zero and increase. This procedure was not used to formulate the Family Status Index, since the variables constituting this index were all binary and thus could be simply summed.

One index, entitled the Prison Experience Index (PEI), was formed of three variables: (1) time in the present institution, (2) time in the present sentence, and (3) total time in prison. These variables correlated highly with one another and formed an internally

Table 11. Distribution of Inmates by Mode of Adjustment at the Three Prisons.

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
% Rebellious	24.7	32.0	35.4
% Institutionalized	19.7	18.4	19.7
% Manipulative-Release	19.7	20.8	20.4
% Positivistic	35.9	28.8	24.5
(N)	198	125	147

$$\chi^2 = 7.32, (df = 6), p > .10$$

consistent scale (coefficient alpha = .852). The PEI represented the amount of time an inmate has been incarcerated in a correctional institution. The Outside World Contact Index (OCI) was formed from the following five variables: (1) visitors per month, (2) visits per month, (3) number of correspondents, (4) number of letters written, and (5) number of letters received. These five variables constituted a scale with a coefficient alpha of .76. The OCI reflected the degree of the inmate's contact with individuals important to him on the outside through both visits and correspondence. The Family Status Index (FSI) measured past and potential resources available to the inmate through his immediate family, placing emphasis on the existence of a supportive spouse. The FSI was made up of four variables: (1) whether the inmate lived with his immediate family before prison, (2) whether he expects to live with his immediate family after prison, (3) his thoughts of his family during his incarceration, and (4) his marital status. These variables constituted a scale with a coefficient alpha of .61.

Institutional Behavior

Recreational activities. Inmate responses to the question concerning which activities or programs they were involved in at the institution were classified into two categories: recreational and treatment activities. Recreational activities were comprised of all sports, crafts, and music-related programs. Treatment activities involved all therapy, counseling, job-training programs, and college courses, excluding those that were classified as inmates' regular work assignments.

Table 12 indicates that significant differences exist in the degree to which inmates employing different modes of adjustment engage in

Table 12. Mean Recreational Activities Participated in by Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment for Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	1.24 (45)	.86 (35)	1.20 (47)
Institutionalized	1.05 (38)	1.88 (16)	1.83 (23)
Manipulative-Release	.68 (38)	.88 (25)	.54 (24)
Positivistic	.76 (66)	.83 (29)	1.36 (31)
	F(3,184) = 2.38	F(3,101) = 2.73	F(3,121) = 3.945
	p < .10	p < .05	p < .025

recreational activities at Enfield and Somers. In addition, a trend exists for Huntingdon inmates of different adjustment modes to engage in different amounts of recreational activities ($F(3,184) = 2.388$, $p < .10$). Moreover, as hypothesized, for Enfield and Somers, the institutionalized group engaged in the largest number of recreational activities. For the Enfield sample, the institutionalized group engaged in significantly more recreational activities than any of the other three adjustment groups, while for the Somers sample, the institutionalized group engaged in significantly more recreational activities than the manipulative-release group. Furthermore, for the Huntingdon sample, the institutionalized group is the second most active group in recreational activities, after the rebellious inmates.

For the following analyses, continuous dependent variables are analyzed by individual one-way analysis of variance. A multivariate analysis of variance was attempted to control for overall alpha; however, due to data missing from scattered cases and variables, a complete data set was available for only a small proportion of the total samples.¹⁸

Treatment activities. No significant differences in involvement in treatment activities exist among the four adjustment groups for Huntingdon or Enfield, as Table 13 shows. For the Somers sample, a trend exists for inmates of the four groups to be differentially

¹⁸ Although explicit hypotheses concerning the relationship among the four adjustment groups had been posited, one-way analyses of variance rather than planned comparisons were used throughout the data analysis. This was due to the fact that in many cases the data did not follow the hypotheses closely and planned contrasts would not have illustrated the differences that did exist in the data. The less powerful analysis of variance was employed.

Table 13. Mean Treatment Activities Participated in by Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment for Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	1.69 (45)	1.22 (36)	1.00 (47)
Institutionalized	1.68 (38)	1.50 (16)	1.39 (23)
Manipulative-Release	1.79 (38)	1.12 (25)	1.00 (24)
Positivistic	1.53 (66)	1.31 (29)	.61 (31)
	$F(3,184) = .257$	$F(3,103) = .282$	$F(3,122) = 2.46$
	$p > .10$	$p > .10$	$p < .10$

involved in treatment activities. Surprisingly, in this prison the institutionalized group again was the most involved and the positivistic group the least involved. Although this finding was not predicted, it is consistent with the expectation that institutionalized inmates are most interested of the four groups in prison activities. It is possible that at Somers, inmates view "treatment" activities not as a means to show interest in rehabilitation but simply as a way to participate in institutional life. Thus, it is logical that institutionalized inmates would be most active.

Disciplinary record. On the questionnaire distributed to inmates, a question was included regarding the number of disciplinary infractions the respondent had committed during his present sentence. This number was then divided by the number of months the inmate had served in his sentence, thus obtaining a figure representing number of disciplinary infractions committed per month. Rebellious inmates at Enfield are significantly more likely to commit disciplinary infractions than inmates in any of the other three groups. No significant differences in number of disciplinary infractions committed per month were found among the groups for the other two prisons. (See Table 14.)

Supervisors' ratings. As Table 15 illustrates, no significant differences were found among the four groups at Huntingdon and Enfield for supervisors' ratings of inmates' work performance. Data on supervisors' ratings were not available for the Somers sample.

Type of institutional job. Inmate work assignments were classified according to two criteria: skill level and rehabilitation potential. Standards for classifying inmate jobs as unskilled,

Table 14. Mean Infractions Per Month Committed by Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment for Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	.16 (46)	.39 (35)	.28 (47)
Institutionalized	.07 (38)	.01 (17)	.11 (21)
Manipulative-Release	.07 (35)	.02 (25)	.12 (25)
Positivistic	.11 (67)	.02 (28)	.16 (31)
	F(3,183) = .746	F(3,102) = 4.322	F(3,121) = .993
	p > .10	p < .01	p > .10

Table 15. Mean Supervisors' Ratings for Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment for Two^a Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield
Rebellious	3.09 (22)	3.28 (29)
Institutionalized	3.32 (22)	3.28 (18)
Manipulative-Release	3.19 (26)	3.43 (14)
Positivistic	3.31 (35)	3.33 (21)
	F(3,102) = .257	F(3,79) = .086
	p > .10	p > .10

^aThird institution did not allow for data to be collected.

semi-skilled, or skilled were obtained from questionnaires completed by members of the Classification Committees of two of the three prisons studied.¹⁹ Assignments were considered as having rehabilitation potential only if a particular job appeared to have direct bearing on the holder's obtaining work in that field after release from prison. That is, all training programs were coded as high on rehabilitation potential while a job in the crafts room, although it may require moderate skill, was not.

Skill level. Table 16 shows that there was a trend at Somers for institutionalized inmates to be more likely to hold skilled jobs than inmates using the other three modes of adjustment.

Rehabilitation potential. Trends were also evident at Somers and Huntingdon for institutionalized inmates to be more likely than any other group to hold jobs with rehabilitation potential (see Table 17).

Attitudes toward the Institution

Table 18 reports inmates' responses to the question, "How adjusted do you think you are to the institution?" broken down by mode of adjustment to prison. It is clear that for the Huntingdon sample, the institutionalized group reports itself as the most adjusted while the rebellious group reports itself as least adjusted. Comparing individual cells, the institutionalized group reports itself as significantly more adjusted than any of the other groups. For the Enfield and

¹⁹The Classification Committee consists of approximately three to six institutional staff members responsible for assigning new inmates to jobs and transferring inmates from one work assignment to another.

Table 16. Percent of Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment with Skilled Jobs for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases upon which percentages are based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	23.4 (47)	24.3 (37)	25.0 (48)
Institutionalized	34.2 (38)	36.8 (19)	51.9 (27)
Manipulative-Release	24.3 (37)	31.8 (22)	25.0 (28)
Positivistic	19.1 (68)	47.2 (11)	23.5 (34)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 2.94$ $p > .10$	$\chi^2 = 2.94$ $p > .10$	$\chi^2 = 7.24$ $p < .10$

Table 17. Percent of Inmates of Four Modes of Adjustment Holding Jobs with Rehabilitation Potential for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases upon which percentages are based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	28.5 (47)	25.7 (35)	14.9 (47)
Institutionalized	50.0 (38)	41.2 (17)	34.2 (38)
Manipulative-Release	48.2 (38)	20.8 (27)	15.8 (38)
Positivistic	25.0 (69)	18.5 (27)	13.0 (69)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 6.78$ $p < .10$	$\chi^2 = 3.01$ $p > .10$	$\chi^2 = 7.37$ $p < .10$

Table 18. Percent of Inmates Reporting Adjustment to Prison by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases upon which percentages are based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	35.4 (48)	35.1 (37)	38.8 (49)
Institutionalized	81.1 (37)	44.4 (18)	37.5 (24)
Manipulative-Release	50.0 (36)	42.9 (21)	65.5 (29)
Positivistic	54.5 (66)	65.5 (29)	44.1 (34)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 17.84$	$\chi^2 = 6.27$	$\chi^2 = 6.44$
	p < .001	p < .10	p < .10

Somers samples, this pattern is not repeated. Both samples show trends indicating that the four groups can be differentiated on the basis of their reported adjustment to prison; however, on both cases it is not the institutionalized group that reports itself as most adjusted.

Table 19 indicates how the inmates in the four adjustment groups responded to the question, "How upset were you upon entrance to the institution?" Results were dichotomized by coding "extremely calm" and "moderately calm" as not upset and "moderately upset" and "extremely upset" as upset. For all three prisons, no significant differences were found among the four groups in their likelihood of reporting being "upset" upon entrance to the institution. It may be noted, however, that for each prison studied the institutionalized group had the lowest proportion of inmates reporting that they were upset.

Orientation to the Outside World

Table 20 presents the mean scores on the Outside Contact Index (OCI) and the Current Events Test (CET), both measures of the degree of inmate contact with and knowledge of events in the outside world. No significant differences on the OCI were found among the four adjustment groups for any of the three prisons. In addition, Table 21 shows that there appear to be no differences among the four groups in the inmates' knowledge of Current Events at Somers and Enfield. A significant difference was found among the four adjustment groups at Huntingdon in their knowledge of Current Events. The institutionalized and rebellious groups scored higher than the other two groups. Employing the Newman-Keuls procedure, it was found that the institutionalized

Table 19. Percent of Inmates Reporting Being Upset Upon Admission by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases upon which percentages are based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	72.1 (43)	72.2 (36)	76.9 (52)
Institutionalized	54.1 (37)	63.2 (19)	71.4 (28)
Manipulative-Release	72.2 (36)	75.0 (24)	91.3 (23)
Positivistic	66.6 (60)	82.4 (34)	80.0 (35)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 3.62$	$\chi^2 = 2.48$	$\chi^2 = 3.60$
	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10

Table 20. Mean Scores on the Outside World Contact Index by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases upon which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	4.29 (38)	5.48 (33)	5.65 (46)
Institutionalized	5.72 (34)	5.67 (19)	5.29 (24)
Manipulative-Release	5.71 (33)	5.10 (21)	5.75 (21)
Positivistic	5.40 (58)	5.66 (25)	5.81 (28)
	F(3,160) = 1.24	F(3,95) = .117	F(3,116) = .091
	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10

Table 21. Mean Scores on the Current Events Test by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	7.76 (49)	6.64 (39)	7.18 (50)
Institutionalized	8.08 (39)	6.31 (22)	7.17 (24)
Manipulative-Release	7.56 (39)	7.44 (25)	7.52 (27)
Positivistic	6.87 (71)	6.56 (34)	6.90 (31)
	$F(3,194) = 2.778$	$F(3,116) = .906$	$F(3,128) = .580$
	$p < .05$	$p > .10$	$p > .10$

group answered significantly more questions correctly than did the positivistic group.

Background Characteristics

No significant differences in grade level obtained by inmates before entering prison were found for inmates in the four groups at the three prisons studied (see Table 22). A trend existed for institutionalized inmates at Enfield to have completed a lower grade level than inmates who employed the three other modes of adjustment.

Inmates' occupations prior to incarceration were classified on a scale of 1 to 100 using Duncan's Socioeconomic Index for Occupations (Reiss and Duncan, 1961), which was derived from the 1950 census. No significant differences among the four adjustment groups were found in any of the prisons studied on this variable. (See Table 23.)

As Table 24 demonstrates, there are differences among the four adjustment groups on the Family Status Index, a composite score which represents the extent of family resources the inmate has at his disposal. For all three prisons, the rebellious group has the lowest FSI score, and this score is significantly lower ($p < .05$) (as determined by the Newman-Keuls test) than any of the three other scores at Huntingdon and than the positivistic group at Somers. No other pairs of scores were found to be significantly different from each other.

Age does not seem to differentiate among the four groups at either Huntingdon or Enfield, while at Somers age does significantly differentiate among the four groups (see Table 25). The Newman-Keuls procedure indicates that the Somers positivistic inmates are significantly older than the manipulative-release inmates, but that no other pairs of means are different. Age at first arrest seems to differentiate

Table 22. Mean Inmate Grade Level by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	9.63 (46)	10.18 (39)	9.26 (53)
Institutionalized	9.95 (39)	9.29 (21)	9.77 (28)
Manipulative-Release	9.86 (37)	10.83 (24)	9.34 (30)
Positivistic	9.68 (69)	10.63 (32)	9.92 (36)
	$F(3,187) = .219$	$F(3,112) = 2.28$	$F(3,143) = .559$
	$p > .10$	$p < .10$	$p > .10$

Table 23. Mean Score on Occupational Index by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	14.94 (47)	18.26 (38)	16.87 (53)
Institutionalized	19.49 (37)	21.00 (19)	19.35 (28)
Manipulative-Release	16.89 (38)	20.17 (24)	17.46 (30)
Positivistic	18.37 (68)	23.00 (30)	20.02 (36)
	$F(3,186) = .778$	$F(3,107) = .393$	$F(3,143) = .452$
	$p > .10$	$p > .10$	$p > .10$

Table 24. Mean Scores on the Family Status Index by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	1.68 (44)	2.06 (33)	1.88 (49)
Institutionalized	2.46 (37)	2.11 (19)	2.57 (23)
Manipulative-Release	2.49 (39)	2.65 (23)	2.44 (27)
Positivistic	2.49 (66)	2.75 (32)	2.80 (30)
	$F(3,183) = 5.163$	$F(3,104) = 2.80$	$F(3,126) = 3.46$
	$p < .01$	$p < .05$	$p < .025$

Table 25. Mean Inmate Age by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	28.57 (47)	27.97 (34)	27.88 (50)
Institutionalized	31.29 (38)	32.96 (22)	29.76 (25)
Manipulative-Release	28.84 (38)	28.62 (21)	25.20 (30)
Positivistic	29.85 (69)	32.63 (32)	31.24 (33)
	$F(3,189) = .088$	$F(3,106) = 1.83$	$F(3,135) = 3.15$
	$p > .10$	$p > .10$	$p < .05$

among the four groups at both Enfield and Somers, as Table 26 indicates, but not at Huntingdon. Specifically, the positivistic inmate was oldest at first arrest and the rebellious inmate was youngest. The differences between the mean ages at first arrest of positivistic and rebellious inmates are significant ($p < .05$) according to the Newman-Keuls procedure, but none of the other pairs of means are significantly different from each other.

Data were also collected on the inmates' experiences with other total institutions. Since whether or not an inmate had spent time in another institution provides binary rather than continuous data, the chi-square statistic was used to analyze these results. Table 27 shows reformatory experience to be differentially distributed among the four groups at Somers with 59.6% of the rebellious group having spent time in a reformatory while only 30.6% of the positivistic group had that experience. There was a trend for the Enfield groups to be differentiated by reformatory experience, but no differences existed among the Huntingdon groups.

With regard to prior mental hospitalization or time served in the armed forces, it appears that no differences exist among the four groups for any of the three prisons (see Tables 28 and 29). Thus, prior experience with total institutions, except for reformatories, does not influence the mode of adjustment an inmate makes to an adult correctional institution.

The race of the inmates is the final background characteristic that was analyzed with figures available in Table 30. It appears that for Huntingdon and Somers, race was evenly distributed among the four groups. There was a trend for Enfield's adjustment groups not to be

Table 26. Mean Age at First Arrest by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	16.75 (48)	16.11 (35)	16.18 (51)
Institutionalized	19.21 (38)	18.41 (22)	18.27 (26)
Manipulative-Release	19.03 (38)	19.00 (24)	18.35 (29)
Positivistic	18.23 (70)	22.52 (31)	20.38 (34)
	$F(3,181) = 1.35$	$F(3,109) = 3.25$	$F(3,137) = 2.98$
	$p > .10$	$p < .025$	$p < .05$

Table 27. Percent of Inmates with Reformatory Experience by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases upon which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	37.5 (48)	53.8 (39)	59.6 (52)
Institutionalized	33.3 (39)	47.6 (21)	50.0 (28)
Manipulative-Release	43.6 (39)	28.0 (25)	33.3 (30)
Positivistic	32.9 (70)	26.5 (34)	30.6 (36)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 1.43$	$\chi^2 = 7.37$	$\chi^2 = 9.44$
	$p > .10$	$p < .10$	$p < .05$

Table 28. Percent of Inmates with Mental Hospital Experience by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases upon which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	10.4 (48)	15.4 (39)	29.4 (51)
Institutionalized	20.5 (39)	23.8 (21)	17.9 (28)
Manipulative-Release	10.3 (39)	4.0 (25)	36.7 (30)
Positivistic	8.5 (71)	22.9 (35)	17.1 (35)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 3.82$ $p > .10$	$\chi^2 = 4.67$ $p > .10$	$\chi^2 = 4.50$ $p > .10$

Table 29. Percent of Inmates with Experience in the Armed Forces by Mode of Adjustment for Two^a Prisons.
(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	17.6 (34)	28.0 (50)
Institutionalized	35.0 (20)	37.0 (27)
Manipulative-Release	36.4 (22)	31.0 (29)
Positivistic	32.4 (34)	28.6 (35)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 3.24$ $p > .10$	$\chi^2 = .75$ $p > .10$

^aData were not collected at the third institution.

Table 30. Percent of Inmates Reporting Themselves as White by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	58.7 (46)	23.5 (34)	38.3 (47)
Institutionalized	69.2 (39)	50.0 (20)	52.0 (25)
Manipulative-Release	70.3 (37)	19.0 (21)	56.7 (30)
Positivistic	72.5 (69)	38.2 (34)	57.5 (33)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 2.58$	$\chi^2 = 6.32$	$\chi^2 = 2.98$
	p > .10	p < .10	p > .10

evenly racially distributed, with institutionalized inmates more likely to be white and manipulative-release inmates less likely.

Institutional Experience

As Table 31 shows, mode of institutional adjustment was related to the extent of an inmate's prison experience at one of the institutions studied. The institutionalized inmates at Somers have significantly higher scores on the Prison Experience Index (PEI) than did the manipulative-release inmates as determined by the Newman-Keuls procedure. However, scores on the PEI were unrelated to mode of institutional adjustment for the Huntingdon sample; and although there was a trend that a relationship existed between prison experience and mode of adjustment at Enfield, the relationship was in the opposite direction. That is, institutionalized inmates at Enfield had the lowest mean score on the PEI while the positivistic inmates had the highest.

A final way of looking at institutional experience and its relation to mode of adjustment to prison is to look at the inmate's phase of incarceration, that is, the proportion of his total sentence already completed (see Table 32). For the inmates at Huntingdon and Somers, no relationship could be found between the phase of an inmate's sentence and his mode of adjustment. For the Enfield sample, a trend existed for rebellious inmates to have served the largest portion of their sentences while the positivistic group appears to have served the smallest.

Discussion

In the present study, four modes of adjustment to incarceration have been described and validated. These four modes of adjustment have

Table 31. Mean Scores on the Prison Experience Index by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	2.88 (46)	1.94 (35)	2.93 (46)
Institutionalized	2.40 (36)	1.77 (19)	3.49 (23)
Manipulative-Release	2.69 (37)	2.47 (22)	1.62 (29)
Positivistic	2.22 (68)	3.26 (35)	2.10 (33)
	$F(3,184) = .699$	$F(3,108) = 2.16$	$F(3,128) = 2.98$
	$p > .10$	$p < .10$	$p < .05$

Table 32. Mean Proportion of Term Served by Mode of Adjustment for the Three Prisons.
(Number of cases on which mean is based in parentheses)

	Huntingdon	Enfield	Somers
Rebellious	.57 (32)	.71 (35)	.44 (35)
Institutionalized	.63 (33)	.65 (20)	.46 (23)
Manipulative-Release	.57 (32)	.68 (24)	.38 (24)
Positivistic	.56 (60)	.58 (30)	.34 (33)
	$F(3,154) = .502$	$F(3,106) = 2.18$	$F(3,112) = 1.34$
	$p > .10$	$p < .10$	$p > .10$

been shown to have implications for inmate behavior within and attitudes toward the institution. In contrast to the conventional portrayal of inmates suffering "the pains of imprisonment," evidence has been presented that some prison inmates adjust quite favorably to the institution and attempt to maximize the gratifications obtainable from the institution. These institutionalized inmates accept the formal aspects of the institution and are not motivated to obtain a speedy release.

Since the differences in institutional climates found in the present study were not as expected, we are hard put to conceptualize the three prisons in terms of the treatment-custody continuum described earlier. Connecticut's correctional system is well known for its progressive outlook and commitment to rehabilitative goals, and yet its two prisons were viewed as having a less favorable social climate than a Pennsylvania institution built in the 1880's. It might be, as some researchers have noted (cf. Street et al., 1966), that inmates have difficulty adjusting to the more ambiguous system of rules and expectations of a treatment-oriented institution and thus prefer the clarity of custodial prisons. Or, possibly, in the present study the differences in social climates between Pennsylvania and Connecticut prisons actually reflect the different characteristics of the criminal populations which feed the respective prisons, e.g., urban vs. rural, black vs. white, etc. The findings may also be accounted for by increased evaluation apprehension experienced by inmates at the Huntingdon prison. It is possible that the Connecticut inmates felt freer to express their true feelings about their institutions, while the Huntingdon inmates felt compelled to respond more favorably for fear that their responses would

somehow become known to the administration. At any rate, no evidence has been presented in support of the hypothesis that the social climate of the institution strongly encourages one mode of adjustment over another. Each institution had approximately the same proportion of inmates employing each of the four modes of adjustment.

Study III demonstrated that inmates employing specific modes of adjustment behaved in particular ways within the institution. As predicted, institutionalized inmates participated in the most recreational activities of any group in two of the three prisons and were second most active at the third. This finding suggests that institutionalized inmates are actively involved in seeking the short-term satisfactions which are obtainable within the restricted environment of the correctional institution. Further supporting the argument that institutionalized inmates do not attempt to facilitate their release from prison is their lack of extra involvement in treatment activities. There were no differences among the four groups in their participation in treatment activities in two of the three prisons. This finding suggests that institutionalized inmates are selective about the activities in which they participate; they prefer to spend their time in enjoyable pursuits rather than in activities that may potentially help them, for example, to improve their employment potential or cure their drug or alcohol problem.

That institutionalized inmates attempt to maximize the rewards and gratifications obtainable within the institution is further supported by the data on inmates' work assignments. Although no significant differences among the four groups existed for any of the prisons studied, the trends were all in a consistent direction. Proportionately

more institutionalized inmates held jobs classified as highly skilled than inmates in any other adjustment group. Since the skill level of a job was found to correlate significantly with desirability,²⁰ it can be inferred that institutionalized inmates were more likely than inmates using other modes of adjustment to obtain desirable jobs.

It is somewhat puzzling that the trends also indicated that institutionalized inmates were the most likely of the four groups to hold jobs with what was labeled, "rehabilitation potential." It had been hypothesized that these types of jobs, either engaging in a craft or enrolling in a training program, would be most attractive to inmates with higher release orientation. One possible explanation for this finding could be that jobs with rehabilitation potential are also desirable, and thus would be sought after by Institutionalized inmates. There is no direct evidence on the relationship between rehabilitation potential and desirability since this question was not asked of the Classification Committees, but since the correlation between skill level and rehabilitation potential is .68 for the three prisons combined, it may well be that jobs with rehabilitation potential are also among the most desirable.

The findings on reported adjustment to prison, for one prison at least, support the hypothesis that institutionalized inmates are most

²⁰ Questionnaires concerning skill level and desirability of inmate jobs were completed by members of the Classification Committees on two of the three prisons studied. They rated available jobs for their respective institutions on two five-point scales (see Appendix). The first scale ranged from unskilled to highly skilled, the second ranged from highly undesirable to highly desirable. For the Enfield work assignments (N = 28), the correlation between skill level and desirability was .65; for the Huntingdon jobs (N = 25), $r = .57$. No data were obtained from Somers' employees.

likely to report themselves as well adjusted to prison life. That institutionalized inmates at Huntingdon reported themselves as most adjusted further validates the present procedure for classifying inmates. The fact that the institutionalized inmates at Somers and Enfield did not report themselves as most adjusted to prison may be consistent with Connecticut's more progressive official perspective on rehabilitation. High release orientation may be encouraged within a state which embodies progressive ideals and thus inmates high on release orientation may perceive themselves as more adjusted to prison.

While institutionalized inmates may be different from inmates using other modes of adjustment where prison affairs are concerned, they seem to be no different in the ways in which they relate to the outside world. Contrary to the hypothesis that institutionalized inmates are less involved in affairs outside of the institution and less knowledgeable about outside world events, this does not seem to be the case. Rather, institutionalized inmates appear just as likely to maintain contacts with persons on the outside through letters and visitors, and maintain an awareness of current events as inmates employing the other three adjustment modes. This finding suggests that it may be a fallacy to assume that institutionalized inmates are not interested in the world around them. They may be able to take a greater interest in world affairs from the security of their institutional existence. Thus, although the institutionalized inmate employs a different strategy for "dealing with" institutional life than the others, he does not extend this unique perspective to deal with the outside world while incarcerated. Whether or not this interest in the outside world will act to mediate against the hypothesized adverse

effects of institutionalism on post-prison adjustment remains to be seen and will be discussed in the next chapter.

In an attempt to discover determinants or predisposing factors that might account for why specific inmates chose the mode of adjustment they did, data were gathered on a number of background characteristics of the inmates and hypotheses were formulated regarding the relationships between these background characteristics and various modes of adjustment to prison. In general, it was hypothesized that institutionalized inmates would have had the poorest background of the four groups, in terms of interpersonal and economic resources that would allow for a stable and rewarding lifestyle. Specifically, it was expected that institutionalized inmates would be more likely to be alienated from their families and would have a lower socio-economic status than inmates in the other three groups. These hypotheses were not borne out in the data. Instead, it appears that institutionalized inmates are just as likely as manipulative-release and positivistic inmates to have a supportive family, and it is the rebellious inmates who are deficient in this area. This finding may be attributed to the fact that rebellious inmates react in a negativistic manner to legitimate institutions both inside of prison and out. That is, they are poorly adjusted to both institutional and family life.

Moreover, the occupations and grade levels of the four groups for each prison are approximately the same, suggesting that the institutionalized inmates were no more economically disadvantaged than any of the other groups before they entered prison. It should be mentioned, however, that since the vast majority of inmates held

semi-skilled or unskilled jobs prior to prison, there was little variance on the occupation variable.

A further search for distinguishing background characteristics was unsuccessful since institutionalized inmates are no different from the other three groups on such variables as race, experience in other total institutions such as reformatories, mental hospitals, and the armed forces, age, or age at first arrest. Nor do institutionalized inmates differ consistently from the other groups in terms of prior prison experience and inmates do not become more institutionalized the further along they are in their sentences. In fact, since no differences exist among the four adjustment types in terms of the phase of their sentences, it cannot be assumed that inmates progress through various modes of adjustment during different stages in their sentences. Rather, it appears that some inmates settle on one mode of adjustment to incarceration while other inmates employ others, and that a specific mode is maintained throughout the course of the inmates' incarceration.

Unfortunately, the data available afford no definitive answer to the questions "Why do inmates assume different modes of adjustment? Why do inmates become institutionalized?" It may be that the determinants which govern the inmate's choice of mode of adjustment were not measured in the current study and pertain to "internal" traits of the individuals, such as personality characteristics. Or perhaps determination of mode of adjustment to prison is much more circumstantial, involving events that occur to an inmate early in his incarceration, such as the job he is assigned or the social contacts he makes with other inmates. At any rate, although it appears valid to assume

that institutionalized inmates do exist in correction institutions, we would be hard pressed to state with certainty the reasons that they got that way.

Rebellious inmates, on the other hand, seem to be more easily differentiated from other inmate types on the basis of their background characteristics. At all three prisons rebellious inmates had a less stable and rewarding family life, and at two prisons they were most likely to have spent time in reformatories and been youngest at first arrest. Behaviorally, rebellious inmates can be differentiated from the other adjustment groups on the one variable that probably has most face validity--number of disciplinary infractions committed per month.

Although their institutional behavior does not follow the patterns hypothesized, the positivistic inmates differ from the other three groups on some background characteristics. As predicted, they tend to have been introduced to the criminal justice system later in life, having the least likelihood of reformatory experience at two prisons as well as being relatively old at first arrest.

In the present study, the manipulative-release inmates cannot be distinguished from the three other groups in any way. This may be accountable to the fact that the manipulative-release orientation is not a valid mode of adjustment to prison or that the data collected failed to grasp the salient characteristics of this mode of adjustment.

In summary, the present study attempted to further validate the typology of inmate adjustment to prison developed in the previous chapters. It was successful in demonstrating that inmates seem to employ different strategies for adapting to the institution. However,

many of the hypotheses that were posited concerning the institutional behavior, outside world orientation, background characteristics, and institutional experience of the four inmate types were not upheld. Specifically, the study failed to identify any variables that distinguished the manipulative-release group from the other three, nor did it specify any characteristics that would have predisposed an inmate to become institutionalized.

Even without all hypotheses being confirmed, however, the present study succeeded in setting the stage for the research to follow--determining post-release outcome for inmates employing the four modes of adjustment. The following section will discuss whether an inmate's mode of adjustment to prison is at all related to how well he performs after he is released.

CHAPTER IV

STUDY IV--INMATE ADJUSTMENT AND POST-RELEASE OUTCOME

Introduction

Regardless of the type of prison from which an inmate is released, the mode of adjustment he used while incarcerated should be related to his post-release outcome. As suggested earlier, mode of adjustment to incarceration is related to two factors which, in combination, should affect the probability of an inmate faring successfully upon release. The first factor involves the objective physical and material resources which the inmate has available to him upon release. An inmate who has a stable family situation, a remunerative job, and, in general, a rewarding lifestyle to return to would, we might expect, have a better chance of succeeding than one who does not. The second factor involves an inmate's subjective self-perceptions and motivations. The greater the extent to which an inmate views himself as belonging within the institution and the less he feels himself as part of the outside world, the more likely that the inmate would be unable to deal with the challenges and responsibilities of the free society.

More specifically, it is hypothesized that: (1) inmates who employ an institutionalized mode of adjustment to prison at the time of their release will perform less well after release than positivistic, manipulative, or rebellious inmates. Although institutionalized inmates may have the necessary objective resources, they would not possess the outward-oriented motivation that would enable them to succeed upon release. They would be expected to have both a higher rate of technical violations as well as a higher rate of new convictions

beginning immediately after release from the institution. This type of behavior should occur relatively soon after release, since this would be the time when the salience of institutional life would be the greatest. It is also hypothesized that: (2) rebellious inmates would fare better than institutionalized inmates but not so well as manipulative or positivistic inmates. This is because, although the rebellious inmate is motivationally oriented to the outside world, rejecting his "belonging" in prison, he is deficient in many of the objective material resources. The positivistic and manipulative inmates possess both the necessary material resources as well as having maintained their outside world self-concepts. Therefore, it is hypothesized that: (3) manipulative and positivistic inmates would be the most likely to succeed upon release.

Using recommitment to prison as the dependent variable in a short-term follow-up study is unfeasible due to the low frequency with which inmates can be expected to return to prison after a short period of freedom, either on new convictions or technical violations of parole. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency Research Center determines national recidivism norms for participating agencies in 50 states, the federal system, and Puerto Rico. For all males paroled in 1970, for example, 75 percent were still on parole at the end of one year, while six percent had absconded, 14 percent had been returned to prison as technical violators, and only five percent had been returned to prison as a result of new major convictions (NCCD, 1972).

Carney (1967), in an earlier study of inmates released from a medium security correctional institution in Massachusetts, computed recidivism rates for releasees as early as one and six months after release. He

found that of the total 54.5 percent who were reincarcerated after four years, 8.6 percent had been returned to prison after one month and another 26.3 percent were returned by the end of the sixth month.²¹ Thus, again it can be seen that the frequency of inmates who can be expected to be reincarcerated within less than six months after release is low.

There is some indication, however, that other behaviors which can be measured within three to six months after release from prison are significantly related to future arrest rates. In a study of inmates released from several Canadian prisons, Waller (1974) found that for parolees, an important factor for predicting arrest within 12 and 24 months after release from prison was whether the parolee had received any reprimands from his parole agent within his first five weeks of freedom. Other post-release variables found to be significant in predicting arrest rates within 12 months were: whether the releasee had been involved in fights during the first five weeks after release, involvement with alcohol, and the length of time the releasee held a job during the first 12 months. These findings indicate that a parolee's behavior within one month after release is likely to be related to his eventual success or failure in avoiding rearrest and thus is likely to be related to his probability of reincarceration.²²

²¹Criteria for remaining on parole--no problem or incarceration for 60 days or less.

²²Waller used arrest rather than reincarceration as a measure of recidivism because temporarily, arrest occurs sooner after release and thus fewer omissions of releasees arrested but not yet reincarcerated during the follow-up period would be made.

Time limitations for the present study ruled out the collection of long-term reincarceration data; nevertheless, the following post-release information was considered theoretically useful and of interest: (1) parole violation rates, (2) rearrest rates, (3) employment data, and (4) data on the use of addictive substances. It is hypothesized that parolees who had utilized the institutionalized mode of adjustment in prison would be more likely to commit technical violations of parole more quickly after release than inmates who utilized the other three adjustment modes. In addition, they would be more likely to be arrested, less likely to be consistently employed, and more likely to be addicted than inmates who used the other three modes of adjustment.

Method

Subjects

Huntingdon Sample

The follow-up sample consisted of all inmates scheduled for parole hearings during the months of June, July, and August. It was necessary to include all those inmates scheduled for hearings, even though some of them would have their paroles denied because the hearings occurred usually within a month of the actual parole date, and it was not known before the hearing exactly who would be paroled. There were 100 inmates in this initial follow-up sample. Of these 100, 21% refused by failing to appear for the interview or not completing the questionnaire, and 9% could not be interviewed for various reasons (e.g., temporarily transferred, residents of Community Service Centers,

etc.). Thus, usable questionnaires were obtained from 70 (70%) of the original 100 inmates.

Of the 70 inmates from whom usable questionnaires were received, 15 (21.4%) were subsequently refused parole and 13 (18.6%) were re-entered to serve a new sentence, thus could not be followed up. In addition, five parolees were assigned to Community Service Centers which are halfway houses directed by the Department of Correction, and it was thought that the life situations of these persons would be different enough from normally paroled men that they should be excluded from the follow-up sample. Four other men were paroled out of state and could not be followed up. Thus, 33 men from the original Huntingdon follow-up sample were monitored after their release from prison. Nine additional men who had not been included in the original follow-up sample but who had completed questionnaires as part of the validation sample were later paroled and added to the list of parolees being monitored, bringing the number to 42.

Enfield Sample

The procedure for parole decision making is slightly different at Enfield and Somers than at Huntingdon. In Connecticut, parole hearings are held about 90 days prior to an inmate's actual parole date. Thus, it was possible to include only those inmates definitely scheduled for parole on the follow-up list. Ninety-six inmates, scheduled for parole in July, August, and September of 1975, were included in the original follow-up sample. Twenty-one (21.9%) refused to complete the questionnaire and 10 (10.4%) did not appear for the interview for various reasons (e.g., they were on work release, had escaped, etc.). Thus,

completed questionnaires were obtained for 65 inmates, or 68% of the original Enfield follow-up sample.

Of these 65, 16 could not be followed up. Three were discharged without parole, six were paroled too late to be included in the study, six were paroled out of state, and one was resentenced. Thus, 49 (51%) of the inmates in the original follow-up sample were actually monitored after they were released from prison.

Somers Sample

Since most inmates in the Connecticut penal system are transferred to Enfield before their release, the number of inmates included in the original Somers follow-up sample was rather small, 43. Of these 43, 12 (27.9%) refused to participate, and 11 (25.6%) failed to report for the interview for various reasons (e.g., hospitalized, quarantined, transferred, etc.). Thus, usable questionnaires were obtained for 20 inmates in the Somers follow-up sample.

Ten of the inmates who had provided usable questionnaires could not be monitored. Six were paroled too late to participate in the study, two were paroled out of state, one entered a halfway house (CCC), and the final one had completed his sentence and thus did not report to a parole officer.

In summary, combining the Huntingdon, Enfield, and Somers samples, 101 parolees were monitored for a period of six months after their respective release dates.

Procedure

The procedure used for collecting questionnaire data from the inmates before their release was identical to that used in Study III.

Inmates included in the follow-up were released on a staggered basis during the months of June through November, 1975. Since the research design called for six-month follow-up period for each parolee, the follow-up period extended from July 1975 through May 1976.

The following information was gathered about each parolee on a monthly basis for six months after his parole: (1) his employment status during the preceding month; (2) his involvement with addictive substances; (3) whether he had received any informal warnings from his parole officer; (4) whether he had committed a technical violation; (5) whether a misconduct report had been written; (6) whether the parolee had been issued a parole violation warrant; (7) whether he had been arrested by a police officer for any new offenses; (8) whether his parole had been revoked; and (9) whether he had absconded. The questionnaires were mailed on a monthly basis to the supervisors of the various parole districts to which the parolees were assigned and the supervisors distributed the questionnaires to the appropriate parole officers. The requested information was then provided by the parolee's parole officer (see Appendix for copy of questionnaire) and returned to the researcher in an enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. Response rates of the parole officers were extremely high. Most questionnaires were returned after the parole officers received them and if the form were not returned after one month, a second form for that same month was sent along with the questionnaire for the subsequent month. Using this procedure, 94.2% of the total follow-up questionnaires required were eventually returned.

Results

Due to the relatively small sample size in the follow-up study as well as the lack of differences in inmate modes of adjustment among the prisons found in Study III, the data are collapsed across the three prisons, yielding 101 follow-up cases.

Post-release outcome was conceptualized as the quality of the parolee's adjustment to the outside world after release, not simply whether he had been returned to prison. Thus, data on such variables as employment status and involvement with addictive substances were collected. Both of these variables were broken down dichotomously, such that a parolee was considered employed if he were employed either full time, part time, or was enrolled in school or a training program. In addition, a parolee was considered involved in an addictive substance if he was reported as being involved with either alcohol or hard or soft drugs during the month in question. Parolee behaviors that would be serious enough to cause the parole officer some alarm but not serious enough to be considered a cause for revocation of parole were also of interest; thus, data were collected on informal warnings. These data were also coded dichotomously, such that for a particular month a parolee who had received one or more informal warnings during that month would have been coded "1" and a parolee who had received no informal warnings would have been coded "0."

Since the types of behaviors that could lead to the parolee's return to prison were also of interest, data were collected on technical violations, misconduct reports, parole violation warrants, arrests on new charges, and parole revocations. Due to the infrequency

of these behaviors occurring during the six-month follow-up period, a composite variable was constructed which was composed of technical violations, misconduct reports, parole violation warrants, arrests, and parole revocations. This variable dealt with formal negative contacts between the parolees and the criminal justice system and was labeled "Formal CJS Contacts." This variable was designed to be dichotomous, such that in any one month if a parolee had been involved in a technical violation, revocation, misconduct report, parole violation warrant, or arrest, his Formal CJS Contacts would be classified as "1." If the parolee was free of involvement in any of the above conditions, his variable would be coded as "0." "Formal CJS Contacts," which represented conflict between the parolee and the "authorities," either the parole officer, the police, or both, constituted the most serious measure of "parole failure" reported so far.

The variables which comprised the overall Formal CJS Contact index were also analyzed separately on a cumulative basis. For example, if a parolee had committed one or more technical violations during the months up to and including month 4, he would be coded as "1" for the fourth month. If he had committed no technical violations throughout his entire first four months on parole, he would be coded "0" for that month.

Absconding from supervision was the final variable upon which data were collected and the other serious measure of "parole failure." It was classified separately, however, because this type of behavior did not result in a speedy return to prison but allowed the absconder to spend a longer period of time in the "free world" than the parole

violator, although he would be eventually returned to prison when caught. Since the present research dealt specifically with the question of institutional dependency and the tendency for some parolees to behave in ways to insure their return to prison, it was felt that the act of absconding did not follow this pattern. This variable was also analyzed cumulatively, so that if a parolee had absconded at any time before or during the month in question, he would be coded as "1."

Data analyzed on a month by month noncumulative basis for the six-month follow-up period are presented in Tables 33 through 36. The total number of cases upon which analyses were carried out diminishes from 100 in month 1 to 82 in month 6. This is due to the fact that no data were available for parolees who had absconded or were returned to prison during previous months. The number of cases missing each month is noted in each table presenting follow-up results.

Case attrition is fairly evenly distributed among the four adjustment groups across the six-month period; thus, it should not adversely affect data analyses. One by-product of this means of handling data is the relative weighting of a parole problem over successive months. Since the total number of cases diminishes from month 1 through 6, the act of being warned, for example, in month 5 is weighted slightly more heavily than in month 1. This artifact, however, does not affect the overall results, since the data were also computed retaining the full compliment of cases for each of the six months and the results were the same.

The First Month

During the first month, there appear to be significant differences among the four groups of parolees who had employed different modes of adjustment to incarceration. Moreover, it appears that, as predicted, the institutionalized group had the most serious adjustment problems of the four. First, the four groups could be differentiated from one another on the basis of informal warnings received.²³ As Table 33 indicates, members of the institutionalized group were most likely to receive informal warnings from their parole officers while the rebellious group was least likely. Z tests to compare individual cells showed that the institutionalized group received significantly more informal warnings than the rebellious group ($z = 3.037$, $p < .025$), but not than the manipulative-release or positivistic groups. No other individual groups were significantly different from one another. Data from the rebellious, manipulative-release, and positivistic groups were then pooled, yielding an overall percentage of 13.5 parolees warned during the first month. A Z test comparing the institutionalized group to the three groups combined found that the institutionalized group was significantly more likely to receive informal warnings ($z = 2.38$, $p < .02$).

The four groups could also be differentiated by likelihood of employment during the first month on parole ($p < .05$). Again, as

²³ Although researchers are often admonished not to perform the chi-square statistic when the expected frequency of more than 20 percent of the cells is less than 5, this rule of thumb is open to question. Recent research has demonstrated that, to quote Edwards (1967), "the chi square test of significance is remarkably robust, provided that all of the expected numbers are equal to or greater than 1" (p. 334).

Table 33. Percent of Parolees Who Had Not Absconded or Been Returned to Prison Receiving Informal Warnings for Each Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.^a
(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	5.7 (35)	14.3 (35)	12.1 (33)	12.5 (32)	9.7 (31)	16.7 (30)
Institutionalized	42.1 (19)	46.7 (15)	20.0 (15)	21.4 (14)	14.3 (14)	14.3 (14)
Manipulative-Release	22.2 (18)	11.1 (18)	16.7 (18)	16.7 (18)	18.8 (16)	0 (14)
Positivistic	17.9 (28)	26.9 (26)	16.0 (25)	12.0 (25)	20.8 (24)	12.5 (24)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 11.66$	$\chi^2 = 8.05$	$\chi^2 = .55$	$\chi^2 = .84$	$\chi^2 = 1.48$	$\chi^2 = 2.56$
	.008 < p < .01	.04 < p < .05	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10
Missing Cases	1	7	10	12	16	19

^aChi-square for overall table (df = 38) = 30.36, n.s.

Table 34 demonstrates, members of the institutionalized group were most likely to be unemployed, significantly more likely than the manipulative-release group ($p < .01$). The institutionalized group was not significantly different, however, from the other two groups on likelihood of employment. The manipulative-release group was by far most likely to be employed, significantly more likely than members of the rebellious and positivistic groups as well. When the institutionalized group was compared to the three groups combined, there was not a significant difference in the likelihood of being unemployed during the first month. Thus, although the institutionalized group had the highest proportion of unemployed members, it is the manipulative-release group that stands apart.

The four adjustment groups were also distinguishable from one another on the basis of their compiled Criminal Justice System Contact scores (see Table 35). The institutionalized group was again most likely of the four groups to have negative contact with the Criminal Justice System during this first month. Individual Z tests comparing pairs of cells indicate that the institutionalized group was significantly more likely to have unfavorable contact than the rebellious group ($z = 2.591, p < .05$).²⁴ In addition, a trend existed for the institutionalized group to be more likely than the manipulative-release group to have an unfavorable CJS Contact during the first month after release; however, the institutionalized and positivistic groups were not significantly different from one another. The positivistic group

²⁴Since the observed frequency for the rebellious group was 0, a Z test using that score could not be computed. The 0 was approximated by substituting a probability of .001 into the Z test formula.

Table 34. Percent of Parolees Who Had Not Absconded or Been Returned to Prison Who Were Unemployed for Each Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.^a
(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	40.0 (35)	40.0 (35)	33.3 (33)	37.5 (32)	25.8 (31)	23.3 (30)
Institutionalized	52.6 (19)	40.0 (15)	33.3 (15)	50.0 (14)	50.0 (14)	42.9 (14)
Manipulative-Release	5.6 (18)	16.7 (18)	16.7 (18)	22.2 (18)	25.0 (16)	21.4 (14)
Positivistic	42.9 (28)	38.5 (26)	28.0 (25)	28.0 (25)	33.3 (24)	20.8 (24)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 10.17$	$\chi^2 = 3.34$	$\chi^2 = 1.78$	$\chi^2 = 3.30$	$\chi^2 = 3.02$	$\chi^2 = 2.68$
	.01 < p < .025	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10
Missing Cases	1	7	10	12	16	19

^aChi-square for overall table (df = 38) = 31.27, n.s.

Table 35. Percent of Parolees Who Had Not Absconded or Been Returned to Prison with Negative CJS Contacts for Each Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.
(Number of cases upon which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	0 (35)	8.6 (35)	9.1 (33)	9.4 (32)	3.2 (31)	3.3 (30)
Institutionalized	26.5 (19)	0 (15)	6.7 (15)	7.1 (14)	7.1 (14)	7.1 (14)
Manipulative-Release	5.6 (18)	5.6 (18)	22.2 (18)	11.1 (18)	12.5 (16)	0 (14)
Positivistic	17.9 (28)	11.5 (26)	4.0 (25)	4.0 (25)	4.2 (24)	4.2 (24)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 10.77$	$\chi^2 = 1.99$	$\chi^2 = 4.24$	$\chi^2 = .88$	$\chi^2 = 1.83$	$\chi^2 = 1.01$
	.01 < p < .02	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10
Missing Cases	1	7	10	12	16	19

was significantly more likely to have an unfavorable CJS contact than the rebellious group ($p < .02$) but not more than any of the other groups. Lastly, a trend existed for institutionalized inmates to be more likely to have a negative CJS contact than the three groups combined ($p < .10$).

When analyzed separately, there was a trend for technical violations to be disproportionately committed by the four groups during month 1. The institutionalized group was most likely to commit technical violations and the rebellious group least likely (see Table 36).

In addition, the four groups were significantly different from one another in their likelihood of receiving parole violation warrants (see Table 37). There was a trend for the institutionalized group to receive more warrants proportionately than the rebellious and manipulative-release groups ($z = 1.87$, $p < .10$).

No differences among the four groups were found for the other three variables that composed the Formal CJS Contact Score. Each group was equally likely to receive misconduct reports, be arrested, or have their paroles revoked. (See Tables 38, 39, and 40.)

There was a trend for the four groups to be different from one another in their likelihood of being involved with addictive substances. As Table 41 indicates, the positivistic group was more likely to have been involved with addictive substances, but since the overall chi-square statistic was not significant, post hoc Z tests could not be run. Thus, it cannot be assumed that any group is significantly different from any other group.

Table 36. Percent of Parolees Who Committed One or More Technical Violations Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.
(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	0 (35)	5.7 (35)	5.7 (35)	8.6 (35)	8.6 (35)	8.6 (35)
Institutionalized	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)	21.2 (19)	26.3 (19)	26.3 (19)	26.3 (19)
Manipulative-Release	5.3 (19)	10.5 (19)	21.1 (19)	26.3 (19)	31.6 (19)	31.6 (19)
Positivistic	14.3 (28)	17.9 (28)	17.9 (28)	17.9 (28)	17.9 (28)	17.9 (28)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 6.363$	$\chi^2 = 2.537$	$\chi^2 = 3.667$	$\chi^2 = 3.917$	$\chi^2 = 5.148$	$\chi^2 = 5.148$
	.09 < p < .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10
		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 37. Percent of Parolees for Whom Parole Violation Warrants Were Issued Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.
(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	0 (35)	0 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)	5.7 (35)
Institutionalized	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)	21.1 (19)	21.1 (19)	21.1 (19)
Manipulative-Release	0 (19)	5.3 (19)	10.5 (19)	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)
Positivistic	10.7 (28)	14.3 (28)	14.3 (28)	14.3 (28)	14.3 (28)	14.3 (28)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 7.851$	$\chi^2 = 6.363$	$\chi^2 = 4.681$	$\chi^2 = 4.681$	$\chi^2 = 4.681$	$\chi^2 = 2.927$
	.04 < p < .05	.09 < p < .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10
			n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 38. Percent of Parolees for Whom One or More Misconduct Reports Were Filed Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.
(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	0 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)
Institutionalized	0 (19)	0 (19)	5.3 (19)	10.5 (19)	10.5 (19)	10.5 (19)
Manipulative-Release	0 (18)	5.3 (18)	10.5 (18)	10.5 (18)	10.5 (18)	10.5 (18)
Positivistic	7.1 (28)	7.1 (28)	10.7 (28)	10.7 (28)	10.7 (28)	10.7 (28)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 5.320$	$\chi^2 = 1.726$	$\chi^2 = 1.985$	$\chi^2 = 1.884$	$\chi^2 = 1.884$	$\chi^2 = 1.884$
	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10
	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 39. Percent of Parolees Arrested One or More Times Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.

(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	0 (35)	5.7 (35)	11.4 (35)	14.3 (35)	17.1 (35)	17.1 (35)
Institutionalized	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)	21.1 (19)	26.3 (19)
Manipulative-Release	5.3 (19)	5.3 (19)	10.5 (19)	15.8 (19)	21.1 (19)	21.4 (19)
Positivistic	7.1 (28)	10.7 (28)	10.7 (28)	10.7 (28)	14.3 (28)	14.3 (28)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 5.597$	$\chi^2 = 1.971$	$\chi^2 = .354$	$\chi^2 = .356$	$\chi^2 = .521$	$\chi^2 = 1.202$
	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10
	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 40. Percent of Parolees Whose Paroles Were Revoked Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.
(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	0 (35)	0 (35)	0 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)
Institutionalized	10.5 (19)	10.5 (19)	10.5 (19)	10.5 (19)	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)
Manipulative-Release	0 (19)	0 (19)	0 (19)	0 (19)	0 (19)	5.3 (19)
Positivistic	3.6 (28)	7.1 (28)	7.1 (28)	10.7 (28)	10.7 (28)	10.7 (28)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 5.452$	$\chi^2 = 5.126$	$\chi^2 = 5.126$	$\chi^2 = 3.653$	$\chi^2 = 5.248$	$\chi^2 = 3.327$
	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10
	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

Table 41. Percent of Parolees Who Had Not Absconded or Been Returned to Prison Who Were Addicted for Each Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.^a
(Number of cases upon which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)	3.0 (33)	3.1 (32)	3.2 (31)	0 (30)
Institutionalized	10.5 (19)	13.3 (15)	13.3 (15)	0 (14)	7.1 (14)	7.1 (14)
Manipulative-Release	5.6 (18)	5.6 (18)	16.7 (18)	16.7 (18)	0 (16)	0 (14)
Positivistic	21.4 (28)	11.5 (26)	12.0 (25)	4.0 (25)	8.3 (24)	8.3 (24)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 6.45$	$\chi^2 = 2.55$	$\chi^2 = 2.99$	$\chi^2 = 5.48$	$\chi^2 = 3.64$	$\chi^2 = 3.64$
	.09 < p < .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10
Missing Cases	1	7	10	12	16	19

^aChi-square for overall table (df = 38) = 30.47, n.s.

Finally, Table 42 shows that there was no difference among the four groups in their likelihood of having members abscond during the first month after release.

Warnings--Months Two through Six

As in month 1, Table 33 shows that the institutionalized group received the highest proportion of informal warnings during month 2. Z tests indicate that the institutionalized group was significantly more likely to receive informal warnings than the manipulative-release and rebellious groups ($p < .025$) but not than the positivistic. It appears that differences among the four groups totally disappear in the third month, and from that time onward, each group has an equal probability of having its members receive informal warnings.

Employment Status--Months Two through Six

No significant differences can be detected among the four groups in their likelihood of being employed from month 2 through month 6 (see Table 34 for raw data and statistics). It might be noted that for months 4, 5, and 6, it is the institutionalized group that has the smallest proportion of employed members; however, these differences did not approach significance.

Formal CJS Contacts--Months Two through Six

From month 2 through the end of the follow-up period, it appeared that members of the four groups were equally likely to perform behaviors that would cause a formal confrontation with the authorities (see Table 35 for raw data and statistics). The institutionalized group was

Table 42. Percent of Parolees Who Absconded Up To and During Each Successive Month of Follow-up by Mode of Adjustment.

(Number of cases on which percentage is based in parentheses)

	Month					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Rebellious	0 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)	2.9 (35)	5.7 (35)	8.6 (35)
Institutionalized	10.5 (19)	10.5 (19)	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)	15.8 (19)
Manipulative-Release	5.3 (19)	5.3 (19)	5.3 (19)	10.5 (19)	10.5 (19)	10.5 (19)
Positivistic	3.6 (28)	3.6 (28)	3.6 (28)	3.6 (28)	3.6 (28)	3.6 (28)
df = 3	$\chi^2 = 3.693$	$\chi^2 = 1.698$	$\chi^2 = 2.964$	$\chi^2 = 4.083$	$\chi^2 = 2.750$	$\chi^2 = 2.157$
	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10	p > .10

no more likely than members of the other three groups to have a negative CJS contact after month 1.

However, there was a trend as of month 2 for the groups to be differentiated from one another on the basis of parole violation warrants being issued (see Table 37). The institutionalized group was still the most likely to have received parole violation warrants and the rebellious group least likely by month 2. These differences, however, failed to be maintained in subsequent months. No differences among the four groups were detectable for the other variables which constituted the Formal CJS Contact Score from month 2 onward.

Addiction--Months Two through Six

Throughout the entire follow-up period, relatively few parolees were reported as being involved with addictive substances (see Table 41). Nevertheless, those parolees who were involved appeared to be no more likely to have used one particular mode of adjustment to prison than any other.

Absconding from Supervision

The same result as above seems to be true for this variable. In all, there were relatively few cases of absconding from supervision from which to draw inferences (a total of nine parolees absconded during the six-month period). Those parolees who did abscond were evenly spread out across the four groups, with three rebellious, three institutionalized, two manipulative-release, and one positivistic parolees absconding by the sixth month. Clearly, no group was significantly more likely than any other group to have members abscond.

Discussion

The results of the follow-up study present evidence that institutionalized inmates perform less well on parole the first month than parolees who had employed other modes of adjustment to prison. From the evidence obtained, it appears that institutionalized inmates have greater difficulty in dealing with the minor challenges of day-to-day decisions that must be made immediately after release from an institution, such as finding and keeping a job and engaging in activities to occupy one's free time.

As the results indicated, institutionalized inmates seemed to fare most poorly of the four groups on the subjective measure of informal warnings from the parole officer, implying that at least from the parole officer's perspective these parolees had the most difficult time adjusting to "civilian life." A review of the reasons the parole officers gave for issuing a warning indicated that they ran the gamut--from concern that the parolees not see his ex-wife, to alarm at the parolee's increase in drinking, to an emphasis on the necessity for his looking for work. One could argue that the variable of informal warnings is not a valid one in conceptualizing "parole outcome," since it really reflects the degree to which the parolee can favorably present himself to his parole officer. Thus, receiving an informal warning might simply imply that a parolee was unable to conceal potentially damaging information from his parole officer.

The same type of argument, that "successful" parolees are not necessarily uninvolved in parole violations behaviors but are simply adept at impression management with their parole officers, has been

made by various authors (cf. Kassebaum, Ward, and Wilner, 1971) about more formal parole outcome variables as well. Thus, it could also be argued that the events that are compiled into the negative CJS contact score for the present study actually indicate the degree to which a parolee can "manage" his parole officer. Applying this argument to the present typology of inmate adjustment to prison, it might be inferred that manipulative-release-oriented inmates, who are theoretically not "rehabilitated" by their prison experience but who are able to project the impression that they were to the authorities, might be successful after release at appearing blameless while still engaging in parole violation activities. Due to the obvious difficulty of obtaining valid data regarding parolee behavior for which the parole officers are unaware, this issue cannot be resolved within the confines of the present research.

It must be stressed, however, that the purpose of the present research project was not to determine whether a specific type of inmate behavior in prison leads to crime-free or violation-free behavior after release. Rather, the present research focuses on the notion of institutional dependency--whether certain types of inmates would behave in ways on parole that would be likely to lead them back to institutional life. Thus, we are not as interested in the "true" behavior of the parolee on parole as we are in the impression the parolee makes on his officer, since it is usually the officer who initiates parole revocation procedures. Presumably, if the parolee presents himself as "doing O.K." to his officer--maintaining employment, remaining drug free, obeying all restrictions of his parole, etc.--it can be assumed that he wants to remain on parole, even though this motivation

may mean concealing some of his behaviors from his parole officer. On the other hand, if a parolee presents himself as having trouble adjusting to his new life--having difficulties with employment, his personal affairs, and so on--these admissions could be construed as suggestions, perhaps even on the unconscious level, that being returned to prison might be an acceptable outcome.

Another interpretation of the finding that institutionalized inmates perform most poorly during the first month of release deals with the actual difficulties these inmates apparently had in returning to "the real world." Parolees who had an institutionalized mode of adjustment to prison did, indeed, seem to make a poorer adjustment to the outside world, even in areas as objective as employment status. This finding is probably not solely attributable to the impressions they made to their parole officers, although that may be part of the reason. It is probably safe to assume that the parolees who had been "institutionalized" inmates had more problems during their first month on parole than did the others. To what factors can these behavioral difficulties be attributed?

Remarkably, findings from the present study indicate that deficits in adjustment skills during the first month on parole seem to be attributable solely to the institutionalized inmate attitudes toward the institution and not to background factors or to a lack of contacts made with the outside world during incarceration. That is, since the institutionalized group was no more deficient than any of the other adjustment groups on socio-economic status, outside world contacts, or family status, these variables can be ruled out as alternate interpretations for the present findings. In addition, institutional

experience does not seem to account for the differences in parole adjustment during the first month, since the institutionalized group is no more experienced and, thus, presumably no more "used" to prison than members of any of the other three groups. It could be argued that holding a more desirable prison job, as the institutionalized inmates did, would make the employment possibilities on parole seem dull by comparison, and this dissatisfaction with the employment situation after release might lead to poor parole adjustment. This interpretation would not be in contradiction to the theoretical framework presented earlier on institutional dependency. Rather, it is precisely the dependency on a commodity available within the institution (a good job) and not available in the outside world that plays a part in the parolee's poor parole adjustment. This observation is especially ironic since it was found that institutionalized inmates tended to have prison jobs with the most "rehabilitation potential," and thus might be expected to have better employment opportunities after release than other inmates.

The puzzling question raised by the findings of the present research is why the effects of institutional adjustment on post-release behavior were primarily confined to the first two months of release. It would be expected that, although these effects might be strongest during the first month due to the cognitive proximity of the institution to the parolee, they would diminish gradually over the six-month period. It seems that two factors might be operating to make the first month on parole qualitatively different from the months to follow. First, it appears that for the formerly "institutionalized" parolees, the first month on parole is by far the hardest, with the highest proportion of

parolees in that group being informally warned, unemployed, and having formal parole difficulties as compared to the following months. Thus, it is possible that the first month acts as a test period for parolees who had been institutionally dependent. It is during this time that they have the most difficult adjustment to make, but if they are able to make that adjustment successfully (that is, without returning to prison), the following months become easier and easier.

The second factor that might account for the first month differences between the institutionalized group of parolees and the others concerns the strategy that most inmates use when they are first released from prison. It has been documented (cf. Glaser, 1964) that upon release from prison most parolees intend, at least, to make good. Initially, they attempt to maintain employment and abide by the conditions of their paroles, aspiring to live as prosocially as possible. However, with increased time spent in the community they may begin to rekindle their former contacts and encounter the same types of experiences that precipitated their prior criminality, thus leading them in the direction of further antisocial behavior. In addition, the problems they may have had with family or work before they were incarcerated may begin to manifest themselves with increasing time on parole. This account may help to explain why the incidence of unemployment, informal warnings, and negative parole outcome generally increases from the first to the later months on parole for the rebellious, manipulative-release, and positivistic parolees.

In summary, the findings of the present study suggest that parolees who employed an institutionalized mode of adjustment to prison made the poorest parole adjustment of all parolees especially during the

first months after release. Few of these differences held up, however, for months 2 through 6, and that after month 2, parolees who had employed the four modes of adjustment to prison have an equal chance of maintaining a favorable parole adjustment.

The original expectation of the study, that positivistic and manipulative-release inmates would have significantly more favorable parole adjustments than rebellious or institutionalized inmates, was not upheld. In fact, in two instances, that of informal warnings and formal negative contact with the authorities (negative CJS contacts), the rebellious group maintained the most favorable scores of the four groups during the first month. This finding is in direct contradiction with the commonsense notion in corrections that inmates who are hostile toward the institution will also be hostile toward society and thus will fare poorly on parole. The present study finds no indication that rebellious inmates, once paroled, perform any more poorly than inmates who were more cooperative while in the institution.

Although the findings are limited to the first two months of parole, the present study obtained the opposite results. That is, it was found that inmates who accepted the basic structure of the institution, who did not show a great desire to be released, who, in some cases, said that they were well adjusted to the institution and often held desirable jobs--in essence, those who might be called the "model prisoners" of the institutional population--seemed to have a more difficult time adjusting to the outside world. These findings may be considered a further validation of the existence of institutionalism within correctional institutions. As researchers in the mental hospital field have shown, total institutions can greatly influence their

residents, often in a manner which is obstructive and debilitating to individual initiative. This same phenomenon can be said to exist within correctional institutions, causing institutionalized inmates to lack the necessary initiative and flexibility to adapt smoothly to the world outside the prison.

What implications does this research have for correctional policy? An immediate one deals with the treatment of parolees during their first month on parole. Since it appears that the first month, especially, is a trouble spot for parolees who experienced any institutional dependency, it seems that parole officers might be advised to give special consideration to parolees who appear especially tied to the institution and ambivalent about their release.

However, this short-range suggestion ignores a more fundamental implication of the results of the present research for correctional policy. It is quite possible that the present-day correctional institution may be reinforcing the "wrong" kind of behaviors if its goal is successful parole adjustment of its inmates. It is possible that the reinforcement of "model prisoner" behavior is, in fact, the reinforcement of "institutionally dependent" behavior, and as this study confirms, institutionalized inmates do not make the most successful parole adjustments.

One possible cure for the problem of institutional dependency might be to simply make the conditions in prisons that much worse for everyone. This is a doubtful solution, however, because though the physical conditions would be less desirable, the types of behaviors expected of the inmates by the correctional authorities would probably not change. In fact, given the physical and interpersonal constraints

of a large-scale residential institution, it is no doubt necessary for staff members to expect and reward conformity and compliance in inmates. In fact, if staff members rewarded independent and self-reliant inmates and punished those who were most compliant, it is doubtful that correctional institutions could function at all.

The findings of the present research lead one to question the premises upon which a total institution such as the prison or any total institution, such as a mental hospital, reformatory, or the armed forces, for that matter, are built. If the types of behavior and attitudes expected for an inmate to be successful within the institution may actually operate to thwart that individual's adjustment to the outside world, what purpose is that institution really serving? It could be said, and indeed has been argued by many correctional administrators, that the major goal of corrections is to incapacitate, to keep convicted criminals from repeating the same crimes for which they have been convicted, for at least as long as their sentences last. However, this argument must be reconciled with the equally commonly expressed goal of corrections over the past century or so that it was also the job of prisons to correct. Rehabilitation has been the password among corrections professionals, who until recently, were committed to the idea that the behavior of criminals could be changed for the better through the development and implementation of counseling, educational, vocational programs, and the like. Several recent literature reviews (Lipton et al., 1975; Robison and Smith, 1971) and hundreds of well-intentioned but unsuccessful programs have cast serious doubt on the realistic possibilities of corrections to correct. Faced with the pessimism which naturally results from the

admission of failure, the correctional community seems to be retrenching and rethinking its goals (see Von Hirsch, 1976).

The present study goes one step further in demonstrating the lack of positive effects that incarceration has on prison inmates. The findings indicate that incarceration can, in fact, have a disorienting effect on a group of inmates who might be thought superficially to derive the most from their correctional experience. Thus, incarceration, it might be argued, has not only no positive effects, but actually incurs negative effects on some inmates. This statement is not likely to raise too many eyebrows among persons familiar with the corrections literature; writers since Clemmer (1940) have argued that long-term incarceration might have harmful effects on parole adjustment. However, surprisingly few researchers or writers have concentrated on the potentially negative effects on inmates' conformity to the prison routine, preferring instead to speak of the potential harm that inmates could invoke on each other by way of conformity to the inmate subculture.

It is not within the scope of this dissertation to suggest alternatives to traditional sentencing and correctional policies. Several excellent recent publications have been devoted to that purpose (Von Hirsch, 1976; Morris, 1974). However, since it is clear that long-term incarceration does not seem to help inmates, one goal of corrections in the future should be to devise sanctions for convicted criminals that do not hurt. Future correctional policy should be geared to doing the least damage to the convicted offender as possible, even if the offender receives no appreciable benefit.

With regard to the fate of the institutionalized inmate, it may well be that those individuals who become institutionalized within a correctional environment are simply institutionally dependent personalities who, if the option of prison were removed, would simply locate another institution upon which to focus their dependency. This perspective has much anecdotal data to support it and at least one complete book devoted to a case study of this phenomenon (Strauss, 1975). There is no doubt that some persons encounter more difficulty in dealing with the responsibilities and frustrations of day-to-day living than others and that some may even attempt to seek refuge in an institution where their essential needs are provided for. However, in terms of the burden upon the state as well as the satisfaction of the individual, it is probably best to minimize the extent to which a person relies on public resources instead of his own. Practitioners in the mental health field have been quite successful in transferring long-term patients from institutional to home-like settings where they were gradually expected to take over full responsibility for their livelihood (Fairweather, 1975). It might be possible to undertake similar programs for those institutionalized prison inmates who are expected to have particularly difficult periods of adjustment to the "outside."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The studies performed and reported in this dissertation were designed to explore two main questions. First, does institutionalism exist within correctional institutions; and second, do inmates who are institutionalized have more difficulty adjusting to the outside world after parole than those who are not? To answer the first question, a typology of inmate adjustment to prison was constructed and validated, incorporating institutionalism as one mode of adjustment along with rebelliousness, manipulative-release orientation, and positivism. Institutionalized inmates were defined as being relatively satisfied with prison and not oriented to release, since they are adjusted comfortably to the prison routine. Rebellious inmates possess negative attitudes to prison and would not be willing to conceal them even to attain the goal of release; thus, they would be viewed by authorities as troublemakers. The manipulative-release inmate is dissatisfied with prison but desires release; thus, he conceals his negative attitudes in interactions with staff. Finally, the positivistic inmate is satisfied with prison but is also anxious to be released from the institution. Systematic random samples of inmates from three prisons were categorized by their modes of adjustment to incarceration based upon their responses to two attitude scales developed during the present research--Satisfaction with Prison and Release Orientation. Results indicate that some inmates, although by no means the majority, indeed are institutionalized. As predicted, these inmates appear to attempt to maximize the immediate gains and rewards

obtainable from institutional living through greater participation in recreational activities and holding more desirable institutional work assignments. These findings, as well as others involving the institutional behavior of inmates employing the four modes of adjustment, ensure the construct validity of the scales and the relevance of the present typology in describing inmate adjustment to prison. Hypotheses concerning the preconditions for the development of institutionalism were not confirmed. There was no evidence that institutionalized inmates had a more unstable or less satisfying lifestyle prior to incarceration; nor did they have a longer history of incarceration than inmates employing the three other adjustment modes. These findings imply that institutionalized inmates may differ from other inmates on some personality or other individual difference dimension but for the most part they cannot be differentiated on the basis of differences in their backgrounds or criminal histories.

The second question in the current research was addressed via a six-month follow-up of 101 inmates released from the three prisons studied. Prior to their release on parole, these inmates completed the Satisfaction of Prison and Release Orientation scales and were categorized by their modes of adjustment to incarceration. Following their release, data regarding various aspects of post-release adjustment were gathered from each inmate's parole officer on a monthly basis for six months. Hypotheses concerning poorer post-release adjustment of institutionalized inmates were confirmed for the first month on parole and partially confirmed for the second, illustrating that institutionalized inmates do indeed appear to have greater difficulty adjusting to the outside world immediately after release.

However, these findings proved to be rather short lived, since by the third month on parole and continuing through the sixth month, parolees who had employed the four modes of adjustment in prison appeared to perform at approximately the same level. Thus, by the sixth month it was not possible to conclude that parolees who were institutionalized while in prison performed more poorly overall than parolees in the three other groups nor were they more likely to be returned to prison. Specifically, after the first two months on parole, the institutionalized inmates appeared to perform consistently better than they had during their first two months of freedom.

In evaluating the implications of these research findings, a distinction should be made between their theoretical and practical significance. Empirical confirmation that institutionalism exists among prison inmates and that this mode of adjustment bodes unfavorably for inmates' short-term post-release outcomes provides a meaningful addition to our understanding of the processes of prison institutionalism. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that when differences in post-release adjustment are apparent, it is not the anti-institutional or "prisonized" inmates (rebellious type) who perform most poorly in the community, but rather the inmates who appeared to make the best adjustment to the prison routine (institutionalized type). This finding by itself puts to question the assumption made by many researchers on prison socialization that anti-institutional or prisonized attitudes held by inmates within prison invariably lead to poorer parole outcomes and ultimately higher rates of recidivism. The six-month follow-up period used in the present research is too short to make definitive inferences concerning recidivism rates; further research

over longer time periods is necessary to deal with this issue. Nevertheless, evidence provided concerning short-term performance on release and institutional adjustment lends no support to the notion that anti-institutional (prisonized) attitudes are detrimental after parole.

Although the effects of institutionalism to prison as determined by the present research do indeed appear to be short-term ones, they provide a picture of the correctional institution as a place which does not prepare its most compliant residents psychologically for life on the outside. This implication provides empirical validation for the assumption that correctional institutions conform to Goffman's model of "total institutions" and that they can be viewed as related, although perhaps as cousins rather than siblings, to traditional mental institutions. One might speculate that the existence of the more developed and organized inmate subculture in prisons aids the majority of prison inmates in avoiding the stronger "institutionalizing" forces of prison while the more amorphous social structure of patients in mental hospitals as well as the basic vulnerability of persons who become mental patients allows a larger proportion to be susceptible to institutionalism in a hospital setting (Wing and Brown, 1970; Wulbert, 1965).

Although the present research may aid in our understanding of total institutions on a theoretical and descriptive level, the practical implications if taken at face value are probably meager. The typology developed as part of this research does not look promising for criminologists in predicting who will and who will not return to prison. In this regard, the present research supports the assertions of many criminologists that knowledge of inmate behavior and attitudes during

incarceration adds little or nothing to background variables or criminal history in the attempt to predict recidivism.

Furthermore, even for the much more limited goal of predicting which inmates will have difficulty adjusting to the community immediately after release, the present research falls short. Although the Satisfaction with Prison and Release Orientation scales can be used safely for the analysis of group data, these scales in their present form do not possess high enough internal reliabilities to predict individual behavior (cf. Nunnally, 1967). Additional refinement of the scales is required before they could be used by corrections practitioners interested in identifying inmates who might have trouble adjusting to the community during the first month or so on parole.

In conclusion, the present studies can be interpreted as conforming to a research tradition in social psychology and sociology which has identified situational factors as taking precedence over individual factors in determining behavior. What has been attempted in the present research was to demonstrate that an individual characteristic measured by two attitude scales, institutionalism, was predictive of post-release adjustment behavior and perhaps even recidivism rates. Results confirmed the validity of this prediction, but only for a short time period, basically demonstrating that prison incarceration may negatively affect some types of inmates, but these effects seem to be extremely short lived.

This finding can be viewed in the same vein as the results of many studies designed to measure the long-term effects of social innovations geared to change the attitudes and behaviors of individuals with regard to a particular social institution, e.g., education, work, etc. Head

Start is an example of one type of intervention designed to improve the attitudes of lower-class preschool children and their parents toward education. Results of several long-term evaluation studies indicated that while the children remained in the Head Start program and for a short time after they had been enrolled in regular elementary school classes, they demonstrated improved abilities for learning and more positive attitudes toward education in general. However, by the second year after "graduation" from Head Start, these children no longer showed the positive effects of their prior training. In fact, they could no longer be differentiated from a control group of children from similar backgrounds who had not received the "benefits" of Head Start training (Ball, 1967; Ciccarelli, Evans, and Schiller, 1970).

To what factors can we attribute the "wash-out" of the results of the Head Start program after a relatively short period of time? The child and his/her parents presumably were positively influenced by the Head Start program during the period of enrollment; however, these changes apparently were not strong enough to withstand countervailing social forces which operated to offset them after the child entered elementary school.

The experience of institutionalized inmates during incarceration may be analogous to that of the children exposed to the Head Start program. Institutionalized inmates may indeed be adversely affected by prison by becoming dependent upon the institutional routine, in the process sacrificing personal autonomy and independence. However, when they are released from prison, the reward contingencies of the institution are no longer operative in the community and they are forced to deal with the same situational realities as parolees who had adjusted

to prison through rebellious, manipulative-release, or positivistic orientations. The fact that there were no major differences among the four groups in terms of background characteristics further reinforces this point. All parolees regardless of their modes of adjustment to prison are subjected to approximately the same environmental conditions after release, for the most part the same conditions that existed prior to their incarcerations. It is no wonder that by the sixth month on parole their behavior is no longer influenced by attitudes which they held toward an institution which by that time is cognitively only part of their past.

Before concluding that mode of adjustment to incarceration is unrelated in the long run to post-release outcome, it would be advisable to perform long-term follow-up research, waiting at least two years before collecting outcome data. Using a much extended follow-up period would enable one to determine if an inmate's mode of adjustment to incarceration were related to his post-release behavior in ways that would be undetectable during a short-term follow-up. For example, since rebellious inmates seem to be hostile to authorities in general, it is possible that they would eventually be more likely to resume antisocial behaviors and thus would manifest higher recidivism rates in the long run. This effect may require more time than was available in the present study to "show up." In addition, although it would be expected that institutionalized inmates would have the greatest post-release adjustment difficulties immediately after release from prison, it may take several months of demoralizing experiences in the community before they would consciously perform behaviors that were geared specifically to being returned to prison. The six-month

follow-up period currently used may have been too brief to deal with this possibility as well. The type of longer term follow-up research suggested above is being planned and hopefully will be carried out using subjects surveyed as part of the present research.

APPENDIX

INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE--STUDY 1

(Original Scale)

Attitudes toward Correctional Institutions

(Instructions) This is a study of some of your attitudes about being an inmate in a correctional institution. I am going to read to you a series of statements dealing with various aspects of institutional life. I would like you to express your agreement or disagreement with each statement by using one of the following five responses:

1. strongly disagree
2. slightly disagree
3. neither agree nor disagree
4. slightly agree
5. strongly agree

This questionnaire is not designed to evaluate you as an individual. The purpose of this research is to study group, not individual differences. This questionnaire has been designed for research purposes only and your responses will remain strictly confidential.

1. The most important thing for an inmate to do is establish a comfortable routine in the institution.
2. I believe that an inmate should behave according to what he thinks is right, even when it means he will be punished by the authorities.
3. Once he's incarcerated, an inmate should stop thinking about the future.
4. It is the smart inmate who gets involved in counseling, group therapy, and other rehabilitative activities.
5. Correction officers show inmates a great deal of respect.
6. It is important for an inmate not to concern himself with the outside world.

7. Anyone who tries to better himself deserves the respect of others.
8. If you really want to, it's not too hard to shorten your time in the institution.
9. Once a criminal always a criminal.
10. The staff at correctional institutions make the inmates feel like animals.
11. If you disagree with a correction officer, you should tell him so.
12. The rights of inmates should be protected by any means possible.
13. The best way to get along in prison is to try to forget that you are an inmate.
14. The prison is a totally dehumanizing atmosphere.
15. An inmate should make an effort to see his counselor frequently.
16. I think it's important for an inmate to try to do the best he can on his work assignment.
17. If I were to get involved in a organized activity in prison, I would definitely choose an inmate-run activity.
18. Inmates should have more to say as to what happens to them during their incarceration.
19. I often think about the kind of life I will lead when I get out of here.
20. In many ways a prison is just like any other neighborhood you find on the outside.
21. Ever since I arrived here, I have been preparing myself and planning for my release.
22. An inmate should try to make his life as simple as possible while in the institution.
23. Anyone who is in prison for committing a crime should not be allowed to vote.
24. The best way to foster your rehabilitation is to adjust to the prison routine.
25. There is nothing wrong with having been an inmate in a correctional institution.
26. Most of the institutional rules that are enforced are not necessary.

27. It is often better not to have visitors from home because they might upset you.
28. I try to keep in close contact with my counselor because I know he can be helpful.
29. Getting involved in the institution's recreational activities is the best way to spend your free time.
30. It is the smart inmate who always does what the staff members tell him to do.
31. I try not to think too much about what type of job I'll get when I am released.
32. The best way to do your time is to take advantage of as many rehabilitation opportunities as possible.
33. More money should be spent on treatment services in correctional institutions.
34. A woman would be foolish to marry a man who had been in prison.
35. Correction officers never respect the dignity of inmates as human beings.
36. All inmates should participate in group therapy or other treatment programs.
37. The inmates in institutions should be able to make most of the decisions concerning the way the institution is run.
38. I think it's wrong for an inmate to file a lawsuit against a correction officer or staff member, even if he has a good case.
39. An inmate should stick to his own beliefs and not be influenced by any staff member.
40. Treatment programs, such as group therapy, are used for inmate control.
41. Regardless of how it looks, the correction officer is the inmate's enemy.
42. The institution offers a lot of opportunities for a man to improve himself.
43. If an inmate feels that he has been treated unfairly by a correction officer, he should definitely consider filing a legal brief against the individual.
44. It would be hard to try to develop a close friendship with a person who had been an inmate in a correctional institution.

45. There are many people on the outside who have committed worse crimes than the inmates in this institution.
46. For the most part, the civil liberties of inmates are callously disregarded in the prison.
47. Developing a good institutional record is probably the most important thing for an inmate to do while in prison.
48. I think it's important for an inmate to show the authorities that he is sincerely interested in his own rehabilitation.
49. The best way to do your time is to relax and enjoy your stay in the institution.
50. It's better to tell the staff what they want to hear than to tell them the truth if you want to get out soon.
51. I would go against what I thought was right if it meant being granted an early parole.
52. It is important to me to be well liked by both other inmates and correction officers.
53. It is more beneficial for an inmate to spend his free time in group therapy than playing baseball or basketball.
54. I try to avoid fights because I know it would look bad on my institutional record.
55. It is important not to think about the life you lead outside the institution as long as you are an inmate.
56. In the long run, enrollment in treatment programs really pays off.
57. Because of the way he is treated, prison is constant hell for an inmate.
58. Personally, I am having a difficult time adjusting to prison life.
59. The food in this institution is as good as the food that is served in most restaurants.
60. There is no use in seeing your counselor because there is nothing he can do anyhow.
61. The best activities in this institution for inmates are the sports programs.
62. An inmate cannot wait for staff members to notice him, he must show them that he has been rehabilitated.
63. Although I believe in inmate rights, I don't let staff members know of my beliefs.

64. There is no reason for an inmate to put any effort into his prison work assignment.
65. An inmate would be foolish to risk receiving a major misconduct for a matter of principle.
66. I don't care what I have to go through in the institution, as long as I can be released quickly.
67. I never have much to talk to my counselor about.
68. If I were to get involved in an organized activity in prison, I would choose a rehabilitative activity.
69. If you disagree with a correction officer, you should keep it to yourself so you don't hurt your chances of getting parole.
70. All institutional programs are a big waste of time.
71. I try to stay out of the way of treatment staff members as much as possible.
72. Most housepets are treated better than the inmates at this institution are treated.
73. The administration does a good job of protecting the inmates' rights.
74. The staff members and correction officers show no understanding of the inmates' needs and problems.
75. I think an inmate should tell a staff member what he wants to hear.
76. During his incarceration, I think it is crucial for an inmate to maintain contacts with the outside world.
77. Correction officers are very fair in their treatment of inmates.
78. If he wants to, an inmate can manage to enjoy himself in prison.

INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE--STUDY II

INTRODUCTION: You have been selected to participate in a research study designed to find out how inmates feel about themselves and about correctional institutions. The study should take about forty-five minutes. This study is not designed to evaluate you as an individual. The purpose of this research is to study group, not individual differences. This questionnaire has been designed for research purposes only and your responses will remain strictly confidential. Your voluntary participation in this study will be greatly appreciated. However, if you choose not to take part in the study you are free to go.

Inmate Attitude Scale

Instructions: Below are written forty-eight statements which relate to being an inmate in a correctional institution. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement by placing a check (✓) in the appropriate box to the right of the statement. If you strongly agree with the statement, please a check on the box on the extreme right. If you strongly disagree, place a check in the box on the extreme left. If you are somewhere in the middle, place a check in one of the three middle boxes that comes closest to your opinion.

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1. Inmates are treated well in this institution.					
2. The counselors in this institution do a fine job.					
3. Nobody at home cares whether I live or die anymore.					
4. Correction officers show inmates a great deal of respect.					
5. It's easy for an inmate to get along with the correction officers and treatment staff members.					
6. An inmate should do whatever is necessary to better his chances of getting an early parole.					
7. So many bad things have happened to me that the future doesn't look too good for me when I get home.					
8. The staff at correctional institutions make the inmates feel like animals.					
9. I'm confident that things will be better for me when I leave here.					

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
10. It's not worth it for an inmate to anger the authorities about anything.					
11. An inmate can find rewarding things to do in the institution.					
12. It's very important for me to maintain a good institutional record.					
13. Correction officers never respect the dignity of inmates as human beings.					
14. Inmates can really benefit from their incarceration.					
15. My family and friends have just about given up on me.					
16. Lots of prison activities are very enjoyable.					
17. It's easy to get used to prison life.					
18. Regardless of how it looks, the correction officer is the inmate's enemy.					
19. The people I knew before I came here will still respect me when I go home.					
20. Because of the way he is treated, prison is constant hell for an inmate.					
21. On the whole, the staff treat the inmates very well.					
22. An inmate has to manipulate others in order to get what he wants.					
23. I don't think having been here will hurt my chances of getting a good job when I get out.					

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
24. Inmates should always obey the authorities in order to get released quickly.					
25. I like having a lot of friends among the correction officers and other inmates.					
26. I think people will give me a fair chance when I leave prison as long as I stay out of trouble.					
27. It's the smart inmate who always does what the staff members tell him to do.					
28. It's better to tell the staff members what they want to hear than to tell them the truth if you want to get out soon.					
29. I would go against what I thought was right if it meant being granted an early parole.					
30. Above all else, an inmate should try to enjoy his stay in the institution.					
31. Being sent here has ruined my whole life.					
32. I try to avoid fights because I know it would look bad on my institutional record.					
33. Correction officers show inmates a great deal of respect.					
34. All institutional programs are a big waste of time.					
35. An inmate would be foolish to risk receiving a major misconduct for a matter of principle.					
36. I don't care what I have to go through in the institution as long as I can be released quickly.					

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
37. I try to stay out of the way of treatment staff members as much as possible.					
38. I'm afraid to face the people I know on the street when I get out.					
39. Most housepets are treated better than the inmates at this institution are treated.					
40. The institution offers a lot of opportunities for a man to improve himself.					
41. The best way to do your time is to relax and enjoy your stay in the institution.					
42. It is important to me to be well liked by both other inmates and correction officers.					
43. Most people on the outside don't give someone who has been in here a fair chance.					
44. The administration does a good job of protecting the inmates' rights.					
45. If you disagree with a correction officer, you should keep it to yourself so you don't hurt your chances of getting parole.					
46. The staff members and correction officers show no understanding of inmates' needs and problems.					
47. Correction officers are very fair in their treatment of inmates.					
48. I think an inmate should tell a staff member what he wants to hear.					

Who Am I? Test

INSTRUCTIONS: There are twenty numbered blanks on the page below. Please write twenty different answers to the simple question, "Who am I?" in the blanks, answering as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. Write the answers in the order that they occur to you. Don't worry about "logic" or "importance." Please take no longer than fifteen minutes for this part.

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____
11. _____
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____
16. _____
17. _____
18. _____
19. _____
20. _____

Background Information

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are a series of questions concerning your personal history. Please answer them briefly and accurately. If any question is unclear to you, raise your hand and someone will explain it to you. Thank you very much for taking part in this study.

NAME _____ AGE _____ RACE _____

1. When were you admitted to this institution? _____
2. Were you transferred from another institution? _____
 - a. If yes, which institution were you transferred from? _____

 - b. When were you admitted to that institution? _____
3. When do you expect to be released? _____
4. Including your present sentence, how many times have you been in prison? _____
5. How old were you when you were first arrested? _____
6. How much time, in all, have you spent in prison? _____
7. Have you spent time in any other type of institution (mental hospital, reformatory, etc.)? _____
 - a. If yes, what type of institution? _____
 - b. How long did you spend in this institution? _____

8. What is the highest grade you completed in school? _____
9. What is your marital status (married, single, divorced, separated)? _____

10. While you are in prison, how often do you think about your life on the outside (your family, friends, work, etc.)?

___ all the time

___ very often

___ seldom

___ never

11. How many people do you write to? _____

a. What is their relationship to you (wife, mother, friend, etc.)?

12. In one month, how many letters do you write (approximately)? _____

13. In one month, how many letters do you receive (approximately)? _____

14. Do you receive any newspapers or magazines? _____

If yes, which ones? _____

15. What is your present work assignment? _____

16. Please list the activities or programs that you have been involved in at this institution, including sports, treatment programs, clubs, and recreational activities.

17. How many infractions (misconducts) have you committed since you have been at this institution?

_____ major infractions

_____ minor infractions

18. For what type of offense were you sentenced to this institution?

Current Events Questionnaire

1. What teams will be playing in the Rose Bowl this year?

2. Who won the World Series in 1974? _____
3. What is Gladys Knight and the Pips' most recent release? _____

4. Who is Nelson Rockefeller? _____
5. Who is Ella Grasso? _____
6. Who led the American League in batting average for 1974? _____

7. Who is Yassir Arafat? _____
8. What is currently wrong with the U.S. economy? _____
9. Who is the current heavy-weight champion of the world? _____

10. What team is Bill Walton currently playing for? _____

INMATE QUESTIONNAIRE--STUDY III

INTRODUCTION: You have been selected to participate in a research study designed to find out how inmates feel about themselves and about correctional institutions. The study should take about forty-five minutes. This study is not designed to evaluate you as an individual. The purpose of this research is to study group, not individual differences. This questionnaire has been designed for research purposes only and your responses will remain strictly confidential. No individual's questionnaire will be shown to any staff member at this, or any other, institution. Thank you for taking part in this study.

Inmate Attitude Scale

Instructions: Below are written a number of statements which relate to being an inmate in a correctional institution. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement by placing a check (✓) in the appropriate box to the right of the statement. If you strongly agree with the statement, place a check in the box on the extreme right. If you strongly disagree, place a check in the box on the extreme left. If you are somewhere in the middle, place a check in one of the three middle boxes that comes closest to your opinion.

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
1. Inmates are treated well in this institution.					
2. The counselors in this institution do a fine job.					
3. The other men are right when they say, "Don't do anything more than you have to."					
4. Correction officers show inmates a great deal of respect.					
5. It's easy for an inmate to get along with the correction officers and treatment staff members.					
6. An inmate should do whatever is necessary to better his chances of getting an early parole.					
7. It's a good idea to keep to yourself here as much as you can.					
8. The staff at correctional institutions make the inmates feel like animals.					
9. I would never go against my beliefs to get a quick release.					

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
10. It's not worth it for an inmate to anger the authorities about anything.					
11. An inmate can find rewarding things to do in the institution.					
12. It's very important for me to maintain a good institutional record.					
13. Correction officers never respect the dignity of inmates as human beings.					
14. Inmates can really benefit from their incarceration.					
15. I'd stick up for another inmate even if it meant receiving a misconduct.					
16. Lots of prison activities are very enjoyable.					
17. I probably spend more of my free time talking with people on the staff than most of the other men do.					
18. Regardless of how it looks, the correction officer is the inmate's enemy.					
19. I would never join a treatment program just because it would look good to the parole board.					
20. Because of the way he is treated, prison is constant hell for an inmate.					
21. On the whole, the staff treat the inmates very well.					
22. An inmate has to manipulate others in order to get what he wants.					

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
23. Anyone who talks about his personal problems with people on the staff is weak.					
24. Inmates should always obey the authorities in order to get released quickly.					
25. I like having a lot of friends among the correction officers and other inmates.					
26. I'd rather get an easy job assignment than a hard one, even though the hard one might help me when I go in front of the parole board.					
27. It's the smart inmate who always does what the staff members tell him to do.					
28. It's better to tell the staff members what they want to hear than to tell them the truth if you want to get out soon.					
29. I would go against what I thought was right if it meant being granted an early parole.					
30. Above all else, an inmate should try to enjoy his stay in the institution.					
31. I try to stay out of trouble but nobody is going to push me around and get away with it.					
32. I try to avoid fights because I know it would look bad on my institutional record.					
33. If I disagree with a correction officer, I tell him so.					
34. All institutional programs are a big waste of time.					

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
35. An inmate would be foolish to risk receiving a major misconduct for a matter of principle.					
36. I don't care what I have to go through in the institution as long as I can be released quickly.					
37. I try to stay out of the way of treatment staff members as much as possible.					
38. Most housepets are treated better than the inmates at this institution are treated.					
39. I have more in common with people on the staff than I do with most of the inmates.					
40. The institution offers a lot of opportunities for a man to improve himself.					
41. The best way to do your time is to relax and enjoy your stay in the institution.					
42. It is important to me to be well liked by both other inmates and correction officers.					
43. When a man deals with staff, he should stick up for his own beliefs and not let the staff tell him what's good and what's not.					
44. The administration does a good job of protecting the inmates' rights.					
45. If you disagree with a correction officer, you should keep it to yourself so you don't hurt your chances of getting parole.					
46. The staff members and correction officers show no understanding of inmates' needs and problems.					

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	SLIGHTLY DISAGREE	NEUTRAL	SLIGHTLY AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
47. Correction officers are very fair in their treatment of inmates.					
48. I think an inmate should tell a staff member what he wants to hear.					

Background Information

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are a series of questions concerning your personal history. Please answer them briefly and accurately. If any question is unclear to you, raise your hand and someone will explain it to you. Thank you very much for taking part in this study.

NAME _____ ID# _____ AGE _____ RACE _____

1. When were you admitted to this institution? _____
2. When did you begin serving your present sentence? _____
3. When do you expect to be released? _____
4. Have you been incarcerated in an adult prison before (state and federal institutions only)? _____
 - a. If yes, how many times were you incarcerated before? _____
5. How old were you when you were first arrested? _____
6. What is the highest grade you completed in school when you were on the street? _____
7. How much time, in all, have you spent in prison? _____
8. a. Have you spent any time in a reformatory, reform school, youth home, or other juvenile correctional facility? _____
 - If yes, how much time did you spend? _____
 - b. Have you spent any time in a mental hospital? _____
 - If yes, how much time did you spend? _____
9. Did you serve in the armed forces? _____
 - a. If yes, how much time did you spend? _____
10. What is your marital status? married ____; single ____; divorced ____; separated ____.
11. What persons did you live with before you came to prison? _____

12. What persons do you plan to live with after you are released? _____

13. While you are in prison, how often do you think about your family?
____ NEVER
____ ONCE IN A WHILE
____ SOMETIMES
____ OFTEN
____ EXTREMELY OFTEN
14. While you are in prison, how often do you think about your friends on the outside?
____ NEVER
____ ONCE IN A WHILE
____ SOMETIMES
____ OFTEN
____ EXTREMELY OFTEN
15. While you are in prison, how often do you think about your job or work on the outside?
____ NEVER
____ ONCE IN A WHILE
____ SOMETIMES
____ OFTEN
____ EXTREMELY OFTEN
16. In one month, how many visits do you receive? (If two people come together, count this as one visit.) _____
17. In the last month, how many different people came to visit you?

18. How many people do you write to? _____
What is their relationship to you (wife, mother, friend, etc.)? _____

19. In one month, how many letters do you write (approximately)? _____
20. In one month, how many letters do you receive (approximately)? _____
21. Before you came to prison, what type of job did you have, if any?

22. What other types of jobs have you held? _____

23. What is your present work assignment? _____
24. Please list the activities or programs that you have been involved in at this institution, including sports, treatment programs, educational programs, clubs, and recreational activities.

25. How many infractions (misconducts) have you committed since you have been at this institution?
_____ MAJOR infractions
_____ MINOR infractions
26. For what type of offense were you sentenced to this institution?

27. How do you feel about being in prison (check one)?
____ dislike it very much ____ slightly like it
____ slightly dislike it ____ like it very much
____ neither like it nor dislike it
28. How adjusted do you think you are to prison life (check one)?
____ not well adjusted ____ well adjusted

29. When you are talking with other inmates, how often do you talk about topics related to prison life, such as the staff, the food, rules and regulations, other inmates, etc.? (Check one.)

☐ NEVER
☐ ONCE IN A WHILE
☐ SOMETIMES
☐ OFTEN
☐ EXTREMELY OFTEN

30. When you are talking with other inmates, how often do you talk about your life on the outside, such as your family, friends, work, etc.? (Check one.)

☐ NEVER
☐ ONCE IN A WHILE
☐ SOMETIMES
☐ OFTEN
☐ EXTREMELY OFTEN

31. How upset were you when you first entered prison to serve the present sentence?

☐ EXTREMELY CALM
☐ MODERATELY CALM
☐ MODERATELY UPSET
☐ EXTREMELY UPSET

Current Events Questionnaire

(Place a Check Next to the Correct Answer)

1. What was the name of the American ship that was seized by the Cambodians?
 - a) The Continental _____
 - b) The Mayaguez _____
 - c) The Mercer _____
2. What political event recently occurred in Portugal?
 - a) communists won election _____
 - b) socialists won election _____
 - c) fascists won election _____
3. What fighter recently lost to Muhammed Ali?
 - a) Joe Frazier _____
 - b) Ron Lyle _____
 - c) Sonny Liston _____
4. What country recently made all its inhabitants leave the cities and go to the country?
 - a) Thailand _____
 - b) South Korea _____
 - c) Cambodia _____
5. What major U.S. industry has suffered great losses recently?
 - a) weapons _____
 - b) oil _____
 - c) automobile _____

6. What means of American transportation is on the brink of bankruptcy?
- a) airline _____
 - b) railroad _____
 - c) trucking _____
7. Who is Vice President of the United States?
- a) Nelson Rockefeller _____
 - b) Gerald Ford _____
 - c) Spiro Agnew _____
8. In ice hockey, what team won the 1975 Stanley Cup?
- a) Boston Bruins _____
 - b) Philadelphia Flyers _____
 - c) Pittsburgh Penguins _____
9. Who is the Governor of the state of Connecticut?
- a) Ribicoff _____
 - b) Grasso _____
 - c) Abzug _____
10. Who is generally considered the world's greatest tennis player?
- a) Arthur Ashe _____
 - b) Rod Laver _____
 - c) Jimmy Connors _____

INSTRUCTIONS: FOLLOWING ARE 86 STATEMENTS ABOUT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS. YOU ARE TO DECIDE WHICH STATEMENTS ARE TRUE OF YOUR INSTITUTION AND WHICH ARE NOT.

TRUE -- circle the T when you think the statement is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE

FALSE -- circle the F when you think the statement is FALSE or MOSTLY FALSE

-
- | | | | |
|---|---|-----|---|
| T | F | 1. | Inmates say anything they want to the counselor. |
| T | F | 2. | Staff have very little time to encourage inmates. |
| T | F | 3. | This unit emphasizes training for new kinds of jobs. |
| T | F | 4. | The staff make sure that the unit is always neat. |
| T | F | 5. | Inmates are rarely asked personal questions by the staff. |
| T | F | 6. | Inmates put a lot of energy into what they do around here. |
| T | F | 7. | Things are sometimes very disorganized around here. |
| T | F | 8. | Once a schedule is arranged for an inmate, he must follow it. |
| T | F | 9. | The staff discourage criticism. |
| T | F | 10. | Inmates are careful about what they say when staff are around. |
| T | F | 11. | Staff go out of their way to help inmates. |
| T | F | 12. | Staff care more about how inmates feel than about their practical problems. |
| T | F | 13. | The day room is often messy. |
| T | F | 14. | Inmates are expected to share their personal problems with each other. |
| T | F | 15. | Staff tell inmates when they're doing well. |
| T | F | 16. | The staff very rarely punish inmates by restricting them. |
| T | F | 17. | The staff act on inmates' suggestions. |
| T | F | 18. | Inmates rarely help each other. |
| T | F | 19. | Inmates here are expected to work toward their goals. |
| T | F | 20. | Inmates rarely talk about their personal problems with other inmates. |

- T F 21. Staff are involved in inmate activities.
- T F 22. Inmates are always changing their minds here.
- T F 23. Inmates will be transferred from this unit if they don't obey the rules.
- T F 24. When inmates disagree with each other, they keep it to themselves.
- T F 25. Staff are interested in following up inmates once they leave.
- T F 26. There is very little emphasis on making plans for getting out of the institution.
- T F 27. The staff help new inmates get acquainted on the unit.
- T F 28. Many inmates look messy.
- T F 29. Staff are mainly interested in learning about inmates' feelings.
- T F 30. Staff sometimes argue with each other.
- T F 31. If an inmate's program is changed, someone on the staff always tells him why.
- T F 32. Staff don't order the inmates around.
- T F 33. Inmates are expected to take leadership on the unit.
- T F 34. Inmates are encouraged to show their feelings.
- T F 35. Counselors have very little time to encourage inmates.
- T F 36. Inmates are encouraged to plan for the future.
- T F 37. The unit has very few social activities.
- T F 38. Inmates' activities are carefully planned.
- T F 39. The inmates are proud of this unit.
- T F 40. If one inmate argues with another, he will get into trouble with the staff.
- T F 41. New treatment approaches are often tried on this unit.
- T F 42. Inmates never know when a counselor will ask to see them.
- T F 43. All decisions about the unit are made by the staff and not by the inmates.
- T F 44. It is hard to tell how inmates are feeling on this unit.

- T F 45. The more mature inmates on this unit help take care of the less mature ones.
- T F 46. Staff encourage group activities among inmates.
- T F 47. The unit usually looks a little messy.
- T F 48. Personal problems are openly talked about.
- T F 49. Very few things around here ever get people excited.
- T F 50. If an inmate breaks a rule, he knows what will happen to him.
- T F 51. Inmates may criticize staff members to their faces.
- T F 52. Inmates here are encouraged to be independent.
- T F 53. Staff and inmates say how they feel about each other.
- T F 54. Counselors sometimes don't show up for their appointments with inmates.
- T F 55. Inmates must make plans before leaving the unit.
- T F 56. The staff set an example for neatness and orderliness.
- T F 57. The staff discourage talking about sex.
- T F 58. Discussions are pretty interesting on this unit.
- T F 59. Inmates never know when they will be transferred from this unit.
- T F 60. Staff rarely give in to inmate pressure.
- T F 61. The staff give inmates very little responsibility.
- T F 62. There is very little emphasis on what inmates will be doing after they leave the unit.
- T F 63. This is a friendly unit.
- T F 64. Staff try to help inmates understand themselves.
- T F 65. Inmates don't do anything around here unless the staff ask them to.
- T F 66. On this unit staff think it is a healthy thing to argue.
- T F 67. The inmates know when counselors will be on the unit.
- T F 68. Inmates can call staff by their first names.

- T F 69. Staff encourage inmates to start their own activities.
- T F 70. People say what they really think around here.
- T F 71. Inmates are encouraged to learn new ways of doing things.
- T F 72. This is a very well organized unit.
- T F 73. Inmates hardly ever discuss their sexual lives.
- T F 74. Inmates here really try to improve and get better.
- T F 75. Staff are always changing their minds here.
- T F 76. The unit staff regularly check up on inmates.
- T F 77. There is no inmate government on this unit.
- T F 78. Inmates tend to hide their feelings from the staff.
- T F 79. The staff know what the inmates want.
- T F 80. There is very little emphasis on making inmates more practical.
- T F 81. Inmates on this unit care about each other.
- T F 82. Discussions on the unit emphasize understanding personal problems.
- T F 83. There is very little group spirit on this unit.
- T F 84. When inmates first arrive on the unit, someone shows them around and explains how the unit operates.
- T F 85. Inmates are rarely kept waiting when they have appointments with the staff.
- T F 86. Inmates have a say about what goes on here.

SECOND VERSION OF INMATE ATTITUDE SCALES--STUDY II

Rebelliousness Scale

	<u>Item to Total r</u>	
	<u>Somers</u>	<u>Enfield</u>
1. The staff at correctional institutions make the inmates feel like animals. ^a	.645	.340
2. Correction officers never respect the dignity of inmates as human beings. ^a	.637	.556
3. Regardless of how it looks, the correction officer is the inmate's enemy. ^a	.680	.659
4. Because of the way he is treated prison is constant hell for an inmate. ^a	.801	.509
5. Correction officers show inmates a great deal of respect. ^{a,b}	.745	.556
6. All institutional programs are a big waste of time. ^a	.490	.264
7. I try to stay out of the way of treatment staff members as much as possible. ^a	.511	.571
8. Most housepets are treated better than the inmates at this institution are treated. ^a	.802	.706
9. The administration does a good job of protecting the inmate's rights. ^{a,b}	.586	.712
10. The staff members and correction officers show no understanding of inmates' needs and problems. ^a	.575	.475
11. Correction officers are very fair in their treatment of inmates. ^{a,b}	.706	.557

^aDerived from first version of scale (Attitudes towards Correctional Institution).

^bDirectional coding of item reversed.

Institutionalism Scale

	<u>Item to Total r</u>	
	<u>Somers</u>	<u>Enfield</u>
1. Inmates are treated well in this institution.	.764	.812
2. The counselors in this institution do a fine job.	.575	.681
3. It's easy for an inmate to get along with the correction officers and treatment staff members.	.507	.540
4. Correction officers show inmates a great deal of respect. ^a	.815	.633
5. An inmate can find rewarding things to do in the institution.	.302	.679
6. Inmates can really benefit from their incarceration.	.369	.377
7. Lots of prison activities are very enjoyable.	.465	.553
8. On the whole, the staff treat the inmates very well.	.647	.575
9. I like having a lot of friends among the correction officers and other inmates.	.639	.637
10. Above all else, an inmate should try to enjoy his stay in the institution.	.535	.310
11. The institution offers a lot of opportunities for a man to improve himself. ^a	.501	.737
12. The best way to do your time is to relax and enjoy your stay in the institution. ^a	.652	.451
13. It is important to me to be well liked by both other inmates and correction officers. ^a	.502	.584

^aDerived from first version of scale (Attitudes towards Correctional Institution).

Manipulative-Release Scale

	<u>Item to Total r</u>	
	<u>Somers</u>	<u>Enfield</u>
1. An inmate should do whatever is necessary to better his chances of getting an early parole.	.585	.586
2. It's very important for me to maintain a good institutional record.	.489	.487
3. Inmates should always obey the authorities in order to get released quickly.	.585	.759
4. It's the smart inmate who always does what the staff members tell him to do. ^a	.579	.436
5. It's better to tell the staff members what they want to hear than to tell them the truth if you want to get out soon. ^a	.498	.535
6. I would go against what I thought was right if it meant being granted an early parole. ^a	.545	.537
7. I try to avoid fights because I know it would look bad on my institutional record. ^a	.522	.603
8. An inmate would be foolish to risk receiving a major misconduct for a matter of principle. ^a	.457	.385
9. I don't care what I have to go through in the institution as long as I can be released quickly. ^a	.475	.484
10. If you disagree with a correction officer you should keep it to yourself so you don't hurt your chances of getting parole. ^a	.687	.584
11. I think an inmate should tell a staff member what he wants to hear. ^a	.290	.311

^aDerived from first version of scale (Attitudes towards Correctional Institution).

THIRD VERSION OF INMATE ATTITUDE SCALES--STUDY III

Satisfaction with Prison Scale

	<u>Item to Total r</u>		
	<u>Huntingdon</u>	<u>Enfield</u>	<u>Somers</u>
1. Inmates are treated well in this institution.	.660	.751	.630
2. The counselors in this institution do a fine job.	.622	.726	.427
3. Correction officers show inmates a great deal of respect.	.613	.703	.527
4. It's easy for an inmate to get along with correction officers and treatment staff members.	.638	.749	.529
5. The staff at correctional institutions make the inmates feel like animals. ^a	.452	.582	.428
6. An inmate can find rewarding things to do in the institution.	.564	.449	.526
7. Correction officers never respect the dignity of inmates as human beings. ^a	.468	.530	.629
8. Inmates can really benefit from their incarceration.	.396	.449	.454
9. Lots of prison activities are very enjoyable.	.499	.687	.506
10. Regardless of how it looks, the correction officer is the inmate's enemy. ^a	.596	.494	.558
11. Because of the way he is treated, prison is constant hell for an inmate. ^a	.544	.453	.387

	<u>Item to Total r</u>		
	<u>Huntingdon</u>	<u>Enfield</u>	<u>Somers</u>
12. On the whole, the staff treat the inmates very well.	.674	.618	.657
13. I like having a lot of friends among the correction officers and other inmates.	.576	.619	.420
14. Above all else, an inmate should try to enjoy his stay in the institution.	.430	.544	.438
15. All institutional programs are a big waste of time. ^a	.489	.616	.509
16. Most housepets are treated better than the inmates at this institution are treated. ^a	.648	.735	.601
17. The institution offers a lot of opportunities for a man to improve himself.	.629	.658	.696
18. The best way to do your time is to relax and enjoy your stay in the institution.	.308	.470	.237
19. It is important to me to be well liked by both other inmates and correction officers.	.556	.629	.555
20. The administration does a good job of protecting the inmates' rights.	.651	.661	.553
21. The staff members and correction officers show no understanding of inmates' needs and problems. ^a	.546	.625	.603
22. Correction officers are very fair in their treatment of inmates.	.658	.778	.597

^aDirectional coding of item reversed.

Release Orientation Scale

	<u>Item to Total r</u>		
	<u>Huntingdon</u>	<u>Enfield</u>	<u>Somers</u>
1. An inmate should do whatever is necessary to better his chances of getting an early parole.	.437	.528	.545
2. I would never go against my beliefs to get a quick release. ^a	.433	.409	.385
3. It's not worth it for an inmate to anger the authorities about anything.	.420	.282	.543
4. It's very important for me to maintain a good institutional record.	.474	.504	.498
5. I'd stick up for another inmate even if it meant receiving a misconduct. ^a	.334	.345	.427
6. I would never join a treatment program just because it would look good to the parole board. ^a	.385	.350	.443
7. Inmates should always obey the authorities in order to get released quickly.	.624	.608	.621
8. It's the smart inmate who always does what the staff members tell him to do.	.552	.533	.617
9. It's better to tell the staff members what they want to hear than to tell them the truth if you want to get out soon.	.305	.455	.443
10. I would go against what I thought was right if it meant being granted an early parole.	.525	.618	.672

	<u>Item to Total r</u>		
	<u>Huntingdon</u>	<u>Enfield</u>	<u>Somers</u>
11. I try to avoid fights because I know it would look bad on my institutional record.	.467	.454	.494
12. If I disagree with a correction officer, I tell him so. ^a	.440	.255	.339
13. An inmate would be foolish to risk a major misconduct for a matter of principle.	.548	.575	.618
14. I don't care what I have to go through in the institution as long as I can be released quickly.	.600	.568	.625
15. If you disagree with a correction officer, you should keep it to yourself so you don't hurt your chances of getting parole.	.527	.643	.653
16. I think an inmate should tell a staff member what he wants to hear.	.480	.439	.460

^aDirectional coding of item reversed.

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONALISM, REBELLIOUSNESS, AND MANIPULATIVE-RELEASE SCALES AND

SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS FOR TWO PRISONS--STUDY II

	<u>Institutionalism</u>		<u>Rebelliousness</u>		<u>Manipulative-Release</u>	
	<u>Enfield</u>	<u>Somers</u>	<u>Enfield</u>	<u>Somers</u>	<u>Enfield</u>	<u>Somers</u>
Time in Present Institution	.31*	-.07	-.10	-.08	.21	-.11
Time Expected to Serve	-.12	-.28	.59***	.32*	.01	.21
Phase	.03	.02	-.32*	-.46**	.09	-.24
Total Time in Prison	.10	-.23	.00	-.01	.09	-.38**
Thoughts of Home	-.23	-.34*	-.19	.13	-.11	.16
Correspondents	-.30*	-.38*	-.09	.18	.05	.15
Letters Written	.13	-.01	-.32*	-.03	.21	.31*
Total Number of Activities	-.33*	.08	-.10	-.12	-.17	-.30
Recreational Activities	.11	-.01	.05	-.02	-.16	-.33*
Treatment Activities	-.48***	.13	.40***	-.16	-.17	-.06
Current Events Score	-.39**	-.57***	-.05	.36*	-.10	-.15
Infractions/Month	-.29*	.01	-.14	.20	-.12	-.45***

* $p < .10$

** $p < .05$

*** $p < .02$

PAROLEE REPORTING FORM

INSTRUCTIONS TO PAROLE OFFICERS: This form is part of a follow-up study of inmate adjustment to prison and parole performance that has received the support of this state's correctional and parole agencies. The parolee listed below is being monitored for a period of six months after his release to determine his short term parole adjustment. Please answer the following questions briefly and accurately. The information which you provide will be used for research purposes only and your responses will remain strictly confidential. Please complete the form promptly and return it in the enclosed envelope. Results of the study will be made available to you upon completion of the research. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

NAME OF PAROLEE: _____ PAROLE NUMBER: _____

FOR MONTH OF: _____ REGIONAL OFFICE: _____

1. How does this parolee spend the major part of his time:

☐ Employed ☐ Employed ☐ Training ☐ School ☐ Unemployed
☐ Full Time ☐ Part Time ☐ Program

2. Has this parolee been involved with drugs or alcohol during the past month?

☐ Heroin or ☐ Other drugs ☐ Alcohol ☐ None
☐ other opiates

3. Has the parolee received any informal warnings from you during the past month?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, briefly describe the nature of the warnings.

4. Has this parolee been charged with any technical violations during the past month?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how many violations was he charged with? _____

Describe the nature of the violations (list separately): _____

Was a misconduct report issued? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

Was a parole violation warrant issued? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not applicable

5. Has this parolee been arrested by any police department for any criminal offenses during the past month? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what type of offense was he arrested for? _____

6. Was his parole revoked? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what was the date and nature of the violation? _____

If you wish to include any additional comments concerning this parolee, please use the reverse side of this form. Thank you very much for your cooperation. Completed forms, as well as questions or comments regarding this study, should be addressed to Ms. Lynne Goodstein, Parole Performance Project, Box 49, Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania, 16652.

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Lynne Goodstein, Researcher
TO: Work Supervisors
SUBJECT: Inmate work performance

Please give your impressions of the GENERAL WORK PERFORMANCE of the following inmates who are assigned to your work detail. This information is strictly confidential and to be used for research purposes only. These ratings will not be seen by any other staff members or inmates in this, or any other, institution. After you have completed the form, seal it and return it in the enclosed envelope to Mr. Tozier no later than Monday, July 14. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

GENERAL WORK PERFORMANCE

NAME OF INMATE	POOR	FAIR	AVERAGE	GOOD	EXCELLENT

July 28, 1975

Dear Classification Committee Member:

As you may know, a research study was carried out in your institution during the month of July, 1975. One topic of importance in the study is inmate work assignments. The following questionnaire is designed to obtain more information about inmate jobs.

Please complete this brief questionnaire as accurately as you can. The information you provide is strictly confidential and to be used for research purposes only. This research project has received the support of the Department of Correction in this state as well as the administration of this institution.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Lynne Goodstein
Researcher

INMATE JOB RATING FORM (SKILL LEVEL)

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of inmate work assignments at this institution. Please indicate the category to which each assignment most closely corresponds by placing a category number in the space to the left of each work assignment. If there are different skill levels within one job assignment, use the skill level which reflects most of the inmates who work at that job. The five categories are:

1. School or training program
2. Clerk or bookkeeping
3. Skilled
4. Semi-skilled
5. Unskilled

_____ garage _____
 _____ yard man _____
 _____ barber _____
 _____ C.E.T.A. _____
 _____ maintenance _____
 _____ farm detail _____
 _____ construction _____
 _____ carpentry shop _____
 _____ paint _____
 _____ dental assistant _____
 _____ electrician _____
 _____ janitor _____
 _____ sign shop _____
 _____ farm gang _____

_____ sewage plant _____
 _____ lawn _____
 _____ dairy _____
 _____ school _____
 _____ print shop _____
 _____ farm driver _____
 _____ bus driver _____
 _____ kitchen _____
 _____ detail _____
 _____ window wash _____
 _____ plumber _____
 _____ garage _____
 _____ clerk _____
 _____ gym _____

Now please review the above list, this time rating the work assignments on their degree of desirability to inmates, that is, how much inmates want to obtain each job. Of course, different inmates will prefer different jobs, but please rate the assignments on the basis of inmates' preferences in general. The ratings should be made in the spaces to the right of the work assignments. The five possible ratings are:

1. Highly undesirable
2. Mildly undesirable
3. Neutral (neither desirable nor undesirable)
4. Mildly desirable
5. Highly desirable

Thank you very much for your cooperation. Please return this questionnaire to Mr. Tozier upon completion.

REFERENCES

- Agus, B. and Allen, T. The effect of parole notification on the somatic symptoms in federal prisoners. Corrective Psychiatry, 1968, 14(2), 61-67.
- Atchley, R. C. and McCabe, D. Socialization in correctional communities. American Sociological Review, 1968, 33, 774-785.
- Ball, S. The E.T.S. Head Start longitudinal study and the Westinghouse study, disadvantaged children and their first school experiences. Educational Testing Service Bulletin, 1969, August, 275-280.
- Banister, P. A., Smith, F. V., Heskin, K. J., and Boulton, N. Psychological correlates of long term imprisonment: I. Cognitive variables. II. Personality variables. British Journal of Criminology, 1973, 13(4), 312-330.
- Barton, R. Institutional neurosis. Bristol: Wright Publishing Co., 1959.
- Bennett, L. The application of self-esteem measures in a correctional setting: Changes in self-esteem during incarceration. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1974, 11, 9-15.
- Bennett, L., Sorunson, P. E., and Forshay, H. The application of self esteem measures in a correctional setting. I. Reliability of the scale and relation to other measures. Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 1971, 8, 1-9.
- Berk, B. Organizational goals and inmate organization. American Journal of Sociology, 1966, 71, 522-534.
- Bondeson, U. Fagan i fangsamhället (Captive in the Prison Community). Norstedt, Stockholm, 1974. 631pp.
- Boulton, N., Smith, F., Heskin, K., and Banister, P. Psychological correlates of long-term imprisonment. British Journal of Criminology, 1976, 16, 38-47.
- Braginsky, B., Braginsky, D., and Ring, K. Methods of madness: The mental hospital as last resort. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- Brown, B., DuPont, R., Kozel, N., and Spevacek, J. Staff and client views of the role of the correctional client: Conflict and its implications for treatment. Social Psychiatry, 1971, 6(2), 83-88.
- Carney, F. Predicting recidivism in a medium security correctional institution. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1967, 58(3), 338-348.

- Caudill, W. The psychiatric hospital as a small society. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Cicirelli, V. G., Evans, J. W., and Schiller, J. S. The impact of Head Start: A reply. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40(1), 105-129.
- Clemmer, D. The prison community. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1940.
- Clinard, M. and Quinney, R. Criminal behavior systems. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Cline, H. The determinants of normative patterns in correctional institutions. In N. Christie (Ed.), Scandinavian studies in criminology. Oslo: Oslo University Press, 1968. Pp. 173-184.
- Cloward, R. Social control in the prison. In Theoretical studies in the social organization of the prison, Pamphlet #15, 1960. Pp. 20-48.
- Cohen, B. J. Differential correctional treatment programs and modification of self-image. Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Cohen, H. M. The relationship of the prison program to changes in attitudes and self concepts of inmates. Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1957.
- Connecticut Department of Correction. The Connecticut Department of Correction: An introduction. 340 Capitol Ave., Hartford, 1973. 25pp.
- Cooper, B. Social class and prognosis in schizophrenia. British Journal of Preventive and Social Medicine, 1961, 15(1), 17-41.
- Coser, R. L. A home away from home. Social Problems, 1956, 1, 3-16.
- Driscoll, P. J. Factors related to the institutional adjustment of prison inmates. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47(3), 593-596.
- Duffee, D. Unpublished manuscript, 1975.
- Edwards, A. E. Statistical methods. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Faine, J. A self consistency approach to prisonization. Sociological Quarterly, 1973, 14(4), 576-588.
- Fairweather, G. Community life for the mentally ill. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform crime reports. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

- Fichtler, H., Zimmerman, R., and Moore, R. Comparison of self esteem of prison and nonprison groups. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1973, 36(1), 39-44.
- Gallup Opinion Index. Special report on crime. Princeton: Gallup, 1972, 82.
- Garabedian, P. Western penitentiary: A study in social organization. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1959.
- Garabedian, P. Social roles and processes of socialization in the prison community. Social Problems, 1963, 11, 139-152.
- Garrity, D. The effects of length of incarceration upon parole adjustment and estimation of optimum sentence: Washington State Correctional Institutions. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1956.
- Giallombardo, R. Society of women. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Gibbons, C. and Garrity, D. Some suggestions for the development of etiological and treatment theory in corrections. Social Forces, 1959, 38, 57-58.
- Glaser, D. The effectiveness of a prison and parole system. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1964.
- Goffman, E. Asylums--Essays on the social situations of mental patients and other inmates. New York: Anchor Books, 1961.
- Grisso, T. Characteristics of institutionalized delinquents in conflict about their release. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975a, 43(2), 267-272.
- Grisso, T. Conflict about release: Environmental and personal correlates among institutionalized delinquents. Journal of Community Psychology, 1975b, 3(4), 396-399.
- Gruenberg, E. M. The social breakdown syndrome. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1967, 123, 1481-1489.
- Haney, C., Banks, C., and Zimbardo, F. Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison. International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 1973, 1, 69-97.
- Hautaluoma, J. and Scott, W. Values and sociometric choices of incarcerated juveniles. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 91(2), 229-237.
- Hayner, N. and Ash, E. The prison as a community. American Sociological Review, 1940, 5, 577-583.

- Hayner, S. Characteristics of five offender types. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 96-102.
- Hazelrigg, L. E. An examination of the accuracy and relevance of staff perceptions of inmates in a correctional institution. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1967, 58, 204-210.
- Heffernan, E. Making it in prison: The square, the cool and the life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.
- Heskin, K. J., Boulton, N., and Smith, F. V. Measuring attitudes of prisoners by SD. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 12(1), 73-77.
- Hollingshead, A. B. and Redlich, F. C. Social class and mental illness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.
- Horsch, A. and Davis, R. Personality traits and conduct of institutionalized delinquents. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1938, 29, 241-244.
- Huff, R. Inmate stratification: Some policy implications for correctional administrators and staff. Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Behavior Therapy, 1974, 20(2), 9-14.
- Irwin, J. The felon. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Irwin, J. and Cressey, G. Thieves, convicts and the inmate culture. Social Problems, 1962, 10, 145-155.
- Jacobs, J. Stratification and conflict among prison inmates. Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 1976, 66(4), 476-482.
- Jaman, D. Behavior during the first year in prison--Report II--MMPI Scales and behavior. California Department of Corrections, Research Report No. 34, 1969.
- Jaman, D. Behavior during the first year in prison. Technical Report of the Research Division, Dept. of Corrections, State of California, 1971.
- Karmel, M. The internalization of social roles in institutionalized chronic mental patients. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 1970, 11(3), 231-235.
- Kassebaum, G., Ward, D., and Wilner, D. Prison treatment and parole survival. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.
- Kerns, R. D. Changes in concept of self and others as a function of incarceration in a correctional institution. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1958.

- Kuhn, M. H. and MacPartland, T. S. An empirical instrument of self attitude. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19(1), 68-76.
- Landau, S. Future time perspective of delinquents and non-delinquents: The effects of institutionalization. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1975, 2(1), 22-36.
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., and Wilks, J. The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies. New York: Praeger Publishing Co., 1975.
- Martinson, R. What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. The Public Interest, 1974, (35), 22-54.
- Mathieson, T. Across the boundaries of organizations. Berkeley: Glendessary Press, 1971.
- Mendenhall, W. and Ramey, M. Statistics for psychology. North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1973.
- Mikulic, M. Reinforcement of independent and dependent behaviors by nursing personnel. Nursing Research, 1971, 20(2), 162-165.
- Miller, S. and Dinitz, S. Measuring institutional impact: A follow-up. Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 1973, 11(3), 417-426.
- Miller, W. Adaptation of young men to prison. Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Applied Behavior Therapy, 1973, 19(4), 25-26.
- Miller, W. B. Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency. Journal of Social Issues, 1958, 14(3), 5-19.
- Morello, M. A study of the adjustive behavior of prison inmates to incarceration. Ph.D. dissertation, Temple University, 1958.
- Morello, M. A study of adjustive behavior of prison inmates to incarceration. The Prison Journal, 1961, 41(2), 61-64.
- Morris, N. The future of imprisonment. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- NCCD. You asked for it--1970 parolees. NCCD Newsletter, 1972.
- Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Ohlin, L. Sociology and the field of corrections. New York: Russel Sage, 1956.
- The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Crime in America. The challenge of crime in a free society. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967. Pp. 17-46.

- Quinney, R. The problem of crime. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1970.
- Reckless, W., Allen, H. E., and Eynon, T. G. Measuring impact of a juvenile institution by perceptions of inmates and staff. Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 1971, 8, 93-107.
- Reiss, A. and Duncan, O. D. Occupations and social status. New York: Free Press, 1961.
- Robison, J. and Smith, G. The effectiveness of correctional programs. Crime and Delinquency, 1971, 17(1), 67-80.
- Rudoff, A. The effect of treatment on incarcerated young adults as measured by disciplinary history. Master's thesis, University of California, 1960.
- Sarri, R. and Vinter, R. Group treatment strategies in juvenile correctional institutions. Crime and Delinquency, 1965, 11, 326-340.
- Schrag, C. A preliminary criminal typology. Pacific Sociological Review, 1961, 4, 11-16.
- Shiloh, A. Sanctuary or prison--Responses to life in a mental hospital. Transaction, 1968, 6(2), 28-35.
- Simon, F. H. Prediction methods in criminology. Home Office Study #7, Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1971.
- Simpson, J., Eynon, T., and Reckless, W. Institutionalization as perceived by the juvenile offender. Sociology and Social Research, 1963, 48(1), 13-23.
- Sommer, R. and Osmond, H. Symptoms of institutional care. Social Problems, 1961, 8, 254-263.
- Spitzer, S., Crouch, C., and Stratton, J. The assessment of the self. Iowa City: Sernoll, 1971.
- Strauss, R. Escape from custody. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974.
- Street, D. The inmate group in custodial and treatment settings. American Sociological Review, 1965, 30, 40-55.
- Street, D., Vinter, R., and Perrow, C. Organization for treatment. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Strinden, D. Parole prediction using criminological theory and manifold classification techniques. Master's thesis, University of Washington, 1959. (Reported in Schrag, 1961.)

- Sykes, G. Men merchants and toughs: A study of reactions to imprisonment. Social Problems, 1956, 4, 132-133.
- Sykes, G. The society of captives--A study of a maximum security prison. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.
- Sykes, G. and Messenger, S. The inmate social system. In Theoretical studies in the social organization of the prison. Social Science Research Pamphlet #15, 1960.
- Thomas, C. W. and Foster, S. C. The importation model perspective in inmate social roles: An empirical test. The Sociological Quarterly, 1973, 14, 226-234.
- Thomas, C. W. and Foster, S. C. On the measurement of social role adaptation in the prison community--A research note. Unpublished manuscript, 1974.
- Thomas, C. W. and Zingraff, M. Organizational structure as a determinant of prisonization. Unpublished manuscript, 1974.
- Tittle, C. R. Society of subordinates. Inmate organization in a narcotic hospital. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1972a.
- Tittle, C. R. Institutional living and self esteem. Social Problems, 1972b, 20, 65-77.
- Tittle, C. R. and Tittle, D. Social organization of a prison: An empirical test. Social Forces, 1964, 43, 216-221.
- Von Hirsch, A. Doing justice: The choice of punishments. New York: Hill and Wang, 1976.
- Walker, E. The Terman-Miles M-F Test and the prison classification program. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1941, 59, 27-40.
- Waller, I. Men released from prison. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- Wellford, C. Factors associated with adaptation of inmate code: A study of normative socialization. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1967, 58(2), 197-203.
- Wenk, E. and Moos, R. Social climates in prisons: An attempt to conceptualize and measure environmental factors in total institutions. Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 1972, 9(2), 134-148.
- Wheeler, S. Social organization and inmate values in a correctional community. Proceedings of the 89th Congress of Correction, 1959, 189-198.

- Wheeler, S. Socialization in correctional communities. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 697-712.
- Wilkins, L. Evaluation of penal measures. New York: Random House, 1969.
- Wing, J. K. A simple and reliable sub-classification of chronic schizophrenia. Journal of Mental Science, 1961, 107, 862-875.
- Wing, J. K. and Brown, G. W. Institutionalism and schizophrenia: A comparative study of three mental hospitals. Cambridge: The University Press, 1970.
- Wolfgang, M. Quantitative analysis of adjustment to the prison community. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1961, 51, 607-618.
- Wood, B. S., Wilson, G. G., Jessor, R., and Bogan, J. B. Trouble-making behavior in a correctional institution: Relationship to inmates' definition of their situation. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1966, 36, 795-802.
- Wulbert, R. Inmate pride in total institutions. American Journal of Sociology, 1965, 71, 1-9.
- Zald, M. and Street, D. Custody and treatment in juvenile institutions: An organizational analysis. Crime and Delinquency, 1964, 10, 249-256.
- Zingraff, M. T. Prisonization as an inhibitor of effective resocialization. Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 1975, 13(3), 366-388.
- Zingraff, M. T. Unpublished manuscript, 1976.