



Perspectives on Inmate Culture: A Study of Women in Prison

Author(s): Gary F. Jensen and Dorothy Jones

Source: *Social Forces*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Mar., 1976), pp. 590-603

Published by: University of North Carolina Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2576284>

Accessed: 20/10/2008 22:44

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=uncpress>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of North Carolina Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social Forces*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

*Perspectives on Inmate Culture: A Study of Women in Prison**

GARY F. JENSEN, *University of Arizona*

DOROTHY JONES, *North Carolina Correctional Center for Women*

ABSTRACT

This study explores a range of issues bearing on prisonization research based on male populations but does so using cross-sectional questionnaire data gathered from 172 female felons and misdemeanants incarcerated in a prison for women in Raleigh, N. C. The analysis tackles three major issues: (1) the relation of traditional situational variables (career phase and group contact) to inmate perspectives, (2) the relative impact of situational and non-institutional characteristics on inmate perspectives, and (3) variation in traditional patterns among different categories of inmates. In general, we found that the patterns involving career phase and group contact were similar to those found in Wheeler's early research among males and similar to one recent analysis of females. Moreover, of all situational variables examined the traditional situational variables were the most strongly related to inmate perspectives. Several of the background variables examined were, however, more strongly related than the situational variables. On the other hand, the relationship between career phase and subscription to the inmate code was quite variable among different categories of inmates. The variation noted appears relevant for reconciling divergent findings in prisonization research among female inmates.

The sociological study of prisons and prisoners in the United States has concentrated primarily on male inmates. Thus, while there is a long tradition of quantitative research on the prisonization of males there are only a few quantitative studies relevant to similar issues among females. In fact, since the two major works in the mid-sixties (Giallombardo, a; Ward and Kassenbaum) there have been only two studies of adult female inmates—Tittle's (a) study of voluntarily and involuntarily committed narcotic addicts and Heffernan's study of felons in a reformatory for women.¹ While the scarcity of research alone would seem to justify further inquiry about female prisonization it should also be recognized that there are a number of inconsistencies in prior research. For example, neither Ward and Kassenbaum (42-43) nor Heffernan (10) could find any evidence of the widely cited relationship between institutional career phase and subscription to an inmate code. On the other hand, Tittle (502) did find evidence of such a pattern.

Not only is further inquiry necessary for addressing inconsistencies but for extending the analysis of divergent perspectives on inmate culture and organization as well. For example, research on male inmates (Ellis et al; Schwartz; Thomas and Foster; Wheeler, b) supports the notion that inmate culture, organization, and experiences are influenced by characteristics imported into institutions *as well as* by

*This research was supported by funds from a National Science Foundation faculty development grant at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill.

factors indigenous to the prison setting itself.² And, in the only quantitative analysis of the institutional-product-versus-diffusion issue among females,³ Tittle confirms the view that an understanding of inmate culture and organization must draw on *both* internal and external variables. Accordingly, he argues that the most important question in dealing with the issue is "how much influence each set of variables has and what interactions between the two produce characteristic inmate behaviors in a given context" (168). We know little concerning the *relative* impact of different categories of variables among either men or women in prison and even less about the interaction of situational and nonsituational factors.³

THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

This study, then, will attempt to build on and extend prisonization analysis by examining three interrelated issues suggested by previous analysis: (1) the relationship of traditional "situational" variables to inmate perspectives among women in prison, (2) the impact of such variables relative to legal and extra-legal background characteristics of inmates, and (3) variation in traditional relationships among different categories of inmates. We will examine these issues using data gathered from female felons and misdemeanants imprisoned in a correctional center for women in Raleigh, N. C. It is a minimum security institution and the only women's prison in North Carolina.

The institution studied provides a number of programs aimed at rehabilitation including academic and vocational education, study release and community volunteer programs. Participation in certain educational programs is required for inmates who are under 16 or who have not completed the fourth grade. Participation in other programs requires permission and/or qualification. In addition, each inmate is given a job assignment to one of a variety of traditionally female activities such as laundress, seamstress, cook, waitress, or beautician. The stated policy on job assignments gives precedence to the prison's needs although staff indicate that, when possible, inmates' preferences are considered.

The listed inmate population is 304. However, when those inmates housed in halfway houses elsewhere in the state, those no longer in the institution and those who had participated in a pretest were eliminated, the available population was considerably reduced. Data were ultimately obtained from a random sample of 175 (82% of those available). Since some data on all listed inmates were available through official records, we were able to assess the representativeness of the final sample on a limited set of characteristics. The differences between the total population and the final sample appear slight:

	Percent Black	Felons	Completed 12th Grade	Mean Age	Attempted Escape
<i>Present Study</i>	64	61	24	28	4
<i>Official Records</i>	65	64	27	27	4

Thus, at least in terms of these characteristics the sample appears to represent the total inmate population listed by the institution.

The measures used in this research are based on responses to questionnaire items. Each inmate filled out a questionnaire designed to deal with those issues which have dominated prisonization research among male inmates. On the basis of an earlier study of the women's prison and pretest we concluded that we should vary the administration of the questionnaire depending on reading ability of the inmates. Thus some inmates completed the questionnaire in groups of 25 and others in groups of 2 to 6. Those who had a great difficulty understanding the questionnaire were either read the items and allowed to indicate their responses on separate cards or were interviewed individually. Moreover, the questionnaire was administered in private rooms with no correctional personnel allowed. Inmates were guaranteed anonymity and instructed not to communicate or sit close to one another. At the end of a session each inmate received a token remuneration of \$1.00 for cooperating in the study.

The dependent variable in the present analysis is similar to that examined by Wheeler (a), Tittle (a), Ward and Kassenbaum, Schwartz, and others and has been referred to variably as "subscription," "embracement," or "commitment" to an inmate code. In the literature such a code consists of five maxims (Cressey, 174-75): (1) Do not divulge information, (2) Do not respect the staff, (3) Do not weaken, submit, or accept, (4) Refrain from quarrels with other inmates, and (5) Do not exploit fellow inmates. Since the latter two maxims are generally consistent with official norms and expectations (Cloward) we limited our measure to items reflecting *conflict* with authority and organizational expectations at the correctional center. The final measure used in the present analysis was based on responses to four items selected on the basis of a factor analysis: (1) "The officers here deserve respect because they are only doing their job," (2) "If an inmate knows that another inmate is planning to escape, she should tell an officer," (3) "Inmates should tell the staff when somebody breaks the rules," and (4) "I enjoy taking part in the activities that go on around here." These items were weighted in terms of their factor loadings and added to form an index of subscription to the inmate code. For the tabular analysis the index was dichotomized at the mean with approximately 50 percent of the inmates falling in the high category and 50 percent in the low category. The full range of scores (0-9) was used when conducting multiple correlation and regression analyses.

FINDINGS

TRADITIONAL SITUATIONAL VARIABLES

Functional theories of prisonization have focused on experiences during confinement but particularly on processes thought to reflect time spent in the institution and temporal isolation from the outside world. While the original focus was on time served in the institution, early research by Wheeler (a) led to a conceptual re-

formulation combining time served with time remaining to reflect an inmate's institutional career phase. Inmates in the middle of their institutional careers are viewed as more isolated from the non-prison world than those early or late in their careers. While such a pattern is widely cited in research, it is by no means universal among males (e.g., Atchley and McCabe) and of the three studies examining career phase among female inmates only Tittle (a) reports such a pattern.

Our findings resemble Tittle's. Using several different procedures⁴ for examining the relationship between career phase and embracing of the inmate code, the data consistently suggest the traditional pattern with acceptance highest for the synthetic cohort of middle phase inmates. Since the procedure used by Tittle and the second procedure summarized in Table 1 could result in a disproportionate number of long-term inmates in the middle phase we felt it particularly important to examine certain key categories which seemed clearly to represent each of the career phase cohorts. While the number of inmates in such categories was small, the pattern of findings was quite similar to that noted for the larger sample. Middle-phase inmates are more likely to embrace views contrary to official expectations than inmates in the early or late phases of their institutional careers. We should note, however, that the differences were statistically insignificant (chi-square) for all three procedures as was the case in Tittle's analysis. Thus, while the two studies suggest similar patterns the relationship is not impressive.

Table 1. PERCENT SUBSCRIBING TO INMATE CODE BY CAREER PHASE (THREE PROCEDURES AND TITTLE'S STUDY)

<i>Procedure*</i>	<i>1: Ratio</i>	<i>2: Months</i>	<i>Key Categories</i>	<i>Tittle's Study</i>
<i>Career Phase</i>				
Early	45%(53)	38%(37)	50%(10)	50%(24)
Middle	62%(48)	60%(78)	65%(25)	64%(36)
Late	55%(40)	58%(26)	39%(18)	50%(30)

*Procedures described in note 4.

OTHER SITUATIONAL VARIABLES

In Table 2 we have summarized the relationships involving a wide range of additional situational variables including contact with outside friends and relatives, contact with staff, participation in special programs and inmate interaction as well as the coefficients relating the temporal variables to inmate perspectives.⁵ In general, contact with friends and relatives, relationships with staff and participation in special programs make little or no difference for inmate perspectives. In fact, when group contact and career phase are entered into a multiple-correlation analysis together with frequency of contacts with treatment staff, letters sent and received and emotional support from friends and relatives, those two account for about 6 percent of the variance while the others collectively explain only 2 percent.⁶ In sum, while

situational variables do not make much difference for inmate perspectives, those variables *most* central to previous situational research did turn out to be the most strongly related to subscription to the inmate code.

Table 2. INMATE CODE BY SITUATIONAL VARIABLES*

	<i>Gamma</i>	<i>(Tau C)</i>
<i>Contact with Outsiders</i>		
Letters received	+ .11	(+.08)
Letters sent	-.14	(-.04)
Visits	+ .08	(+.06)
Different visitors	+ .08	(+.06)
Emotional support	+ .12	(+.08)
<i>Contact with Staff</i>		
Staff friends	-.09	(-.06)
Contact with treatment staff	+ .13	(+.10)
<i>Participation in Special Programs</i>		
	+ .09	(+.04)
<i>Interaction with Inmates</i>		
Group contact	+ .35	(+.26)
Inmate friends	+ .15	(+.14)
<i>Temporal Variables</i>		
Career phase	+ .24	(+.18)
Time served	+ .28	(+.19)
Time remaining	+ .11	(+.08)

*Operational procedures described in note 5.

NON-INSTITUTIONAL VARIABLES

As noted earlier, several theorists have argued that characteristics imported into the prison are related to variable acceptance of the inmate code and recent analyses of diffusionist perspectives among males in prison (Schwartz; Thomas and Foster) have, in fact, supported such arguments. Our analysis centers on several general features of a person's social position in the outside world as well as certain basic offense characteristics. As summarized in Table 3, three of the background variables and one of the legal status variables are fairly strongly related to acceptance of the inmate code.⁷ Younger inmates, educated inmates, and inmates with urban backgrounds are more hostile towards the institution and its staff than older, less educated, nonurban inmates. Similarly, felons appear to be more hostile than misdemeanants. Race, previous prison experience and the violent-nonviolent offense dichotomy made virtually no difference for the embracing of the inmate code among these female inmates.

Since such background variables are interrelated we carried out a multiple regression analysis to gain some idea of the amount of variance explained by the en-

Table 3. INMATE CODE BY NON-INSTITUTIONAL VARIABLES*

	<i>Gamma</i>	<i>(Tau C)</i>
<i>Basic Background</i>		
Race	-.06	(-.03)
Age	-.54	(-.38)
Education	+.44	(+.31)
Urban experience	+.43	(+.27)
<i>Legal Status</i>		
Felon-misdemeanant	+.51	(+.26)
Violent-nonviolent	-.03	(-.01)
Previous imprisonment	+.07	(-.04)

*Operational procedures described in note 7.

tire set. Collectively these four variables accounted for slightly over 20 percent of the variance in inmate perspectives ($R = .45$). When introduced together with the two situational variables (career phase and group contact) the six variables collectively account for close to one-fourth of the variance in acceptance of the inmate code ($R = .49$). Thus, we can conclude that (1) *both* situational and background variables make an independent contribution to inmate perspectives but (2) background variables explain relatively more variance than situational variables.

The most strongly and persistently related background variable among our female inmates was age and it appears to have had an impact on attitudes towards the staff and institution which cannot be attributed to its association with other background or situational variables.⁸ This finding is consistent with research among males in that age has been cited as one of the most significant correlates of behavior within prison and of recidivism after release (e.g., Glaser; Glueck and Glueck; Wolfgang, a). In fact Marvin Wolfgang (b) found age to be the *most* significant correlate of his measure of adjustment to prison among males incarcerated for homicide. The fact that older inmates are more likely to accord respect to institutional staff, express verbal agreement with system rules and enjoy the activities offered in the prison is particularly interesting in view of the widespread belief that young offenders should be separated from older offenders *for the protection of the young*. The age difference in embracing anti-institutional views is paralleled by similar age patterns for rule-breaking and punishment in prison. Younger inmates are more likely than older inmates to indicate that they have violated prison rules ($-.33$) and to report having been punished by staff ($-.42$). In sum, age, like sex, appears to be one of those general features of American society which has consequences for inmate behavior, reactions to behavior, and normative orientation towards the prison and its staff.

SPECIFICATION

We mentioned earlier that there are inconsistencies in research concerning situational variables and prisonization among both males and females. Atchley and McCabe report that their research "was able to sustain neither Clemmer's nor Wheeler's theories concerning the development of prisonization." They and others have suggested a number of possibilities which might specify the conditions under which the situational prisonization model may be most applicable. As Garrity notes, the most commonly advanced model seems most relevant to maximum security institutions and least adequate for minimum security or open institutions. Similarly, Atchley and McCabe (788) cite Street et al. (212) to the effect that traditional models may be limited to institutions oriented towards obedience or treatment rather than re-education and development. In fact, it does appear that the correctional center we studied requires a far more complete deprivation of personal possessions and greater role dispossession (Goffman) than the institution studied by Ward and Kassebaum. However, Tittle's analysis was based on a federal institution consisting of both voluntarily as well as involuntarily incarcerated narcotic addicts which allowed supervised interaction among males and females and considerable freedom of choice within the institution. Hence, we might be able to reconcile our results with Ward and Kassebaum's by focusing on characteristics of the institution but, at least based on descriptions of the institutions, such a comparison does not seem to account for Tittle's findings.

Atchley and McCabe also raise the possibility that differences in the nature of the inmate populations studied may make a difference for patterns of prisonization such that the situational model may be more applicable to some inmate populations than to others. We attempted to explore such possibilities by examining the relationships between career phase and subscription to the inmate code among categories of inmates differentiated on the basis of the legal and extra-legal background characteristics. In carrying out such an analysis we will focus first on the difference between early and middle phase inmates. In his early research on prisonization, Wheeler (a) argued that changes from early to middle phase characterize prisonization and reflect influences within the institution but that changes near release are likely a response to the external world (anticipatory resocialization). Our aim here will be to assess the persistence of the pattern noted in Table 1 and to spot any major variations which might specify the traditional pattern.

In Table 4 we have summarized the percentage "high" in subscription to the inmate code for each phase category within various subcategories. We can observe, first of all, that the percentage high in subscription to the code is higher among middle phase inmates than early phase inmates in *every* subcategory examined. Thus, it appears that if we take such a difference as indicative of prisonization (as most research has), then we can conclude that inmates tend to undergo some degree of prisonization in this particular institution irrespective of race, education, urban-nonurban status, prior prison experience, legal status, and offense. On the other hand, there is obviously considerable variation in the magnitude of the differ-

ences between early and middle phase categories. The differences are particularly variable by legal status, race and offense.⁹ There is relatively little difference between the early and middle phases for blacks, felons, and violent offenders. The most striking differences occur among whites, misdemeanants, and property or victimless offenders. Thus, divergent findings in previous prisonization research may reflect variation in the nature of the inmate populations studied. The data here seem to suggest that the prisonization process is somewhat selective by social background. Such a pattern appears least prominent among blacks and among felons.

Table 4. PERCENT "HIGH" IN SUBSCRIPTION TO INMATE CODE BY CAREER PHASE BY BACKGROUND*

Career Phase		Early	Middle	Late
<i>Background Variable</i>				
Race	Black	46%(33)	52%(26)	54%(26)
	White	50%(18)	82%(11)	57%(29)
Legal Status	Misdemeanant	0%(14)	62% (8)	47%(17)
	Felon	62%(39)	64%(39)	61%(23)
Offense Type	Violent	39%(18)	47%(17)	27%(11)
	Property	53%(19)	74%(19)	89%(18)
	Victimless	50%(10)	73%(11)	29% (7)
Age	Under 22	62%(16)	72%(18)	80%(10)
	22-29	53%(19)	72%(18)	77%(13)
	Over 29	22%(18)	33%(12)	24%(17)
Urban Status	Urban	52%(27)	70%(30)	76%(21)
	Non-urban	38%(24)	53%(17)	32%(19)
Education	Jr. high or less	27%(11)	50%(18)	31%(13)
	Some high school	45%(29)	62%(21)	64%(14)
	High school or more	73%(11)	88% (8)	69%(13)
Prior prison	Yes	46%(13)	64%(22)	53%(19)
	No	46%(39)	64%(25)	55%(20)

* Numbers in the parentheses refer to the bases for the percentage indicated.

To show sizeable variation is, however, quite a different matter than making sense out of such patterns. Different patterns may require drawing on quite different perspectives. For example, since the most striking variation can be noted when examining the patterns among felons as compared to misdemeanants we might conclude that the prison acts as a school for crime contributing to the hardening of minor offenders through their association with relatively more serious offenders. However, this explanation does not seem to be relevant to the divergent patterns by race and type of offense.¹⁰ Blacks and whites in the early phase categories are quite comparable in their degrees of subscription to the inmate code but differ markedly in the middle phase. Violent offenders are actually lower in subscription to the code in

the early phase than property or victimless offenders and the difference is even greater in the middle phase.

Thus, while some variations seem readily derived from common notions about differential socialization and prisonization the explanation of others may require additional considerations. For example, there may be differences by race, legal status and offense category in expectations concerning the appropriate response to lawbreaking. In fact, such a possibility was hinted at in Tittle's (b) analysis of prisonization among narcotic addicts. Tittle suggests that variable responses to prison may depend on inmate expectations concerning their prison experiences. Furthermore, in his recent research on Scandinavian prisons Wheeler (b) could find no evidence supporting traditional models of inmate culture and suggests that this departure from commonly cited patterns may reflect cultural differences in definitions of deprivation and appropriate response to law-breaking. Along similar lines, labeling theorists have argued that the impact of reactions to deviance will vary depending on the fit between the response and expectations as to the just or appropriate response to deviance. Lemert suggests that labeling is most likely to enhance commitment to deviant values when there are inconsistencies or disparities between the punishment and the deviant actions toward which it is directed. Matza argues that the violation of commonly held expectations about adjudication gives rise to a sense of injustice which further attenuates the moral bind of the law. Thus, to the degree that there are varying views about the impropriety of different criminal acts and appropriate responses to different types of people and behavior, imprisonment may be defined as a more appropriate, just or, at least, expected response for some acts, situations, and offenders than others.

Finally, we must also acknowledge that there may be differences in the deprivational nature of the prison experience. For example, the contrast between prison life and the outside world may be germane in explaining variation in the prisonization pattern between blacks and whites. Wheeler noted that there may be cultural differences in definitions of deprivation and we can posit a similar possibility for these inmates as well. The prison experience may be less depriving among southern black women than southern white women. Thus, not only might there be variation in expectations concerning punishment but variation in the deprivational aspects of imprisonment. Further research will be necessary to isolate the impact of each—differential socialization, variation in norms or expectations concerning just punishment and variations in the deprivational nature of imprisonment to various groups—in shaping the prisonization process.

While middle phase inmates were more prisonized than early phase inmates in every category examined, Wheeler's pattern of anticipatory resocialization could be noted in only 11 of 17 subcategories examined. Middle phase inmates tend to exceed late phase inmates in the proportion subscribing to the inmate code but this tendency is far from universal. However, for those cases where late phase inmates are higher in subscription to the inmate code the differences are slight, ranging between 2 and 8 percent. There were *no* instances where the prisonization pattern could be interpreted as continuing, unaltered, between the middle and late phases. Thus,

the data are remarkably consistent with Wheeler's advocacy of a curvilinear model. In most instances late phase inmates are less accepting of the inmate code than middle phase inmates. However, examining both the early-middle and middle-late patterns it appears that blacks and felons exhibit neither a progressive prisonization pattern nor an anticipatory socialization pattern. The proportion high in subscription to the code is fairly similar for all three phase categories. Moreover, there is a greater proportion high in subscription to the inmate code in the late than the middle phase for the younger inmates, urban inmates, inmates with some education and property offenders.

While we cannot make sense out of all such variation we can attempt to address the striking variation by race and legal status by drawing on research by Thomas and Foster. In their study of adult male felons they note that negative post-prison expectations are associated with opposition to the prison and its staff. In view of their research we might speculate that as misdemeanants and whites approach release their opposition to the system falls off due to more positive post-release expectations than may characterize blacks and felons. The prison experience may be irrelevant in the social world from which blacks and felons were removed and into which they are likely to return. Such a possibility is consistent with recent research which suggests that official intervention has different consequences by race (Harris). Thus, inmate expectations may play a part in shaping both aspects of the traditional pattern.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The analysis reported above suggests a number of conclusions about the prisonization of women. First, the findings relevant to traditional situational variables were quite consistent with the bulk of prisonization research among males: (1) Subscription to the inmate code was highest in the synthetic cohort of inmates in the middle of their institutional careers; (2) Group interaction with other inmates promoted acceptance of the code; (3) The two traditional situational variables were more strongly related than other situational variables examined; (4) Both situational and background variables were relevant to acceptance of the code although background variables were superior in terms of explained variance; and (5) Age was the most strongly related background variable examined.

Moreover, Wheeler's original finding concerning career-phase and subscription to an inmate code was not only replicated but persisted through numerous subdivisions. Subscription to the inmate code was greater in the middle phase categories than the early phase in every subcategory examined and Wheeler's anticipatory socialization pattern persisted in most categories as well. Thus, on the surface, our findings appear to run counter to Ward and Kassebaum, and Heffernan, but support Tittle (a, b). There is a persistent relationship which is quite variable among different categories of inmates.

The variability among different categories of inmates may provide some

clues to reasons for inconsistencies in research thus far. Had our study been limited to felons or violent offenders the findings would have been consistent with the two studies reporting no difference. However, the institution we studied included misdemeanants as well as felons and all types of female offenders. In fact, it is interesting to note that the institution studied by Tittle encompassed a limited range of offenders (narcotic addicts) and voluntarily as well as involuntarily incarcerated inmates. On the other hand, the studies by Heffernan and Ward and Kassebaum were based on a variety of incarcerated female felons. Thus, our findings might be interpreted as consistent with all three studies. The very types of inmates studied by Heffernan, Ward and Kassebaum are those which fail to exhibit the expected career-phase pattern in the present analysis. Those inmates most clearly exhibiting the traditional pattern tend to be misdemeanants and victimless offenders.

Of course, there are other characteristics of the inmate populations, of the institutions studied and, finally, of the studies themselves which might account for divergent findings. For example, neither Heffernan nor Ward and Kassebaum indicate the procedures used to operationalize career-phase although they imply a straightforward replication of Wheeler. However, it is obvious from Tittle's study that what is early, middle and late in an institutional career may be variable from one setting to another such that a complete replication might be misleading. Since the procedures resulting in negative findings were not detailed it may be that differences among the several studies of women in prison result from variable operational and analytic procedures.

While our analysis supports the speculation of numerous authors that variable characteristics of inmate populations may be relevant in reconciling divergent findings, further research will be necessary to test possible explanations of such variation. Are differential responses a reflection of personality characteristics, variable norms and expectations concerning reactions to deviance, variable definitions of deprivation or some other aspect of the social context? Further research might draw on emerging notions of retributive justice reflected in the writings of labeling theorists. Thomas and Foster have already shown that post-prison expectations shape attitudes towards prison and Tittle suggests that pre-prison expectations may shape the prison experience as well. The impact of imprisonment may be contingent on the fit between such a reaction to law-breaking and variable norms or expectations concerning retributive justice. Thus, we hope that the present inquiry not only can add to our body of knowledge concerning prisonization and women in prison but that it suggests some new lines of inquiry and theoretical integration in the study of retributive justice and reactions to deviance.

NOTES

1. The most recent study of female inmates is Giallombardo's *The Social World of Imprisoned Girls*. However, that work is limited to adjudicated delinquent girls and does not deal with the specific issues examined here.

2. "Prisonization" was originally defined by Donald Clemmer (299) as "the taking on, in greater or lesser degree, of the folkways, mores, customs and general culture of the penitentiary." The original emphasis was on the "taking on" or assimilation of an inmate code over time in the institution. However,

the concept is also widely used to refer to the degree to which an inmate embraces certain attitudes towards the institution, its staff and other inmates *regardless of the source of that variation*. For example in summarizing his earlier research, Wheeler (b, 1906) states that "An attitude measure of attitudinal conformity versus non-conformity to the values of the staff . . . was developed to serve as an empirical indicator reflecting Clemmer's concept of prisonization." However, in the strictest sense prisonization does not refer to a set of attitudes but *the taking on of a set of attitudes as a result of the prison experience*. The present study examines correlates of attitudinal conformity to the values of staff but treats "prisonization" as an hypothesis central to functional theories rather than as a dependent variable. The existence of certain *relationships* between inmate attitudes and situational variables is the indicator of prisonization—not the attitudes themselves.

3. A recent study by Akers et al. notes that institutional characteristics (type of prison) are more important than inmate characteristics in explaining amounts of homosexual and drug behavior on an *organizational* level. Research reported by Ellis et al. suggests that some organizational and background characteristics are related to violence in prison on an organizational and an individual level.

4. These data were gathered at one point in time and follow the same basic procedures in defining career-phase cohorts as earlier studies of prisonization. However, one problem in replicating and integrating previous research on career phase is the lack of any clear rationale for differentiating the cohorts. For example, in Tittle's analysis early phase inmates are those who have served less than four months and have more than two remaining. Middle phase inmates have served more than four and have more than two remaining. Late phase inmates have served more than one and have less than two remaining. Given the cutting points for early and middle phase inmates we would have expected late phase inmates to be those who have served more than four and have less than two months remaining. The change in cutting points creates a situation where late phase inmates may have shorter terms. In our analysis we experimented with several procedures and report the results of each. For the "Months" procedure in Table 1 early phase inmates were those who had served less than four months and had more than three remaining. Middle phase inmates were those who had served more than four and had more than three remaining and late phase consisted of those with more than four served and less than three remaining. The "ratio" procedure merely created categories by taking the ratio of a time served trichotomy to a time remaining trichotomy. The "key" category for early phase were those who had served less than four and had more than thirteen months remaining. The key middle phase category were those who had served more than four and had four to twelve months remaining and the key late phase inmates were those who had served more than nine and had less than four remaining. Moreover, we eliminated inmates with short terms from the measure of career-phase since they did not clearly belong in any of the career phase categories and used constant cutting points in creating the three categories. Since neither Ward and Kassebaum nor Hefernan present the data relevant to their measure of career phase it is possible that variations in the procedures used to measure career phase could lead to inconsistent findings. Our analysis shows the traditional pattern to persist despite alternative procedures.

5. In Table 2 the measure of *emotional support* from outsiders was based on the item "Do you feel you can depend on friends and relatives outside the prison for help and support when you really need it?" *Staff friends* was based on responses to the question "Have you developed any strong friendships with staff since you have been in the institution?" *Special programs* consisted of work release, study release, basic education or vocational education. *Group contact* was measured identically to Wheeler (a, note 17). *Time served* was trichotomized into categories of less than or equal to three months, four to nine months and ten or more months. *Time remaining* was trichotomized into less than or equal to three months, four to twelve months and thirteen or more months. The "ratio" procedure described in the preceding footnote was used to create *career-phase* categories and for purposes of generating measures of association the categories were ordered with early phase first, late phase second, and middle phase last.

6. For purposes of the multiple regression analysis non-interval variables were entered as "dummy variables."

7. In Table 3 whites were the first category and blacks the second. Age was trichotomized into 22 or younger, 23 through 29, and 30 or older. Education consisted of eight categories ranging from 0 to 16 years. Urban experience was based on whether they had spent most of their lives in a city, small town, or rural area. Violent offenders were considered those incarcerated for murder or assault. Non-violent offenders were considered those incarcerated for other offenses. Previous imprisonment consisted of five categories ranging from 0 to 2 years.

8. The importance of age is further highlighted by multiple regression analysis where its relation to acceptance of the inmate code persisted despite controls for all other significantly related background and situational variables. In fact, the association of the two variables education and urban status with acceptance

of the inmate code appears to be a product of their association with age. The zero order correlation coefficients for age, education, urban and felony status were $-.38$, $+.22$, $+.20$ and $+.26$ respectively. However, the standardized regression coefficients were $-.31$, $+.06$, $+.11$ and $+.18$. The coefficients for age and felony status were significant at the .05 level.

9. While there were too few cases to have much confidence in the outcome of further subdivisions, the variation by offense within legal status categories persisted. Career phase was related to subscription to the inmate code only among misdemeanants and, within the misdemeanor category, only among property and victimless offenders. Similarly, the specification by offense and legal status persisted within racial categories. For example, the Gamma coefficient relating career phase to acceptance of the inmate code was $+.78$ among black misdemeanants and $+1.00$ among white misdemeanants. In comparison, the Gamma coefficients were $-.16$ and $+.22$ for black and white felons respectively. The variation by offense was especially prominent among whites with Gamma coefficients of $.00$ among violent offenders, $+.21$ among property offenders and $+1.00$ among victimless offenders. The persistence of such patterns despite further controls and small cell frequencies suggests that the variations noted are not due merely to chance.

10. While we have been concentrating on variations in the career-phase-inmate-code relationship it should be noted that the same patterns of variation were found relating the group contact variable to embracement of the inmate code. For example, among blacks Gamma was $+.22$ as compared to $+.60$ among whites. Among felons it was $+.24$ as compared to $+.66$ among misdemeanants. Among violent offenders Gamma relating group contact and subscription to the inmate code was $+.12$ as compared to $+.17$ and $+.67$ among property and victimless offenders respectively. These variations by offense and legal status persisted within racial categories. However, when career phase and group contact were entered as dummy variables in a multiple regression analysis within legal status, offense and racial sub-categories it was career phase which varied most in its contribution to explained variance and career phase was related to code subscription independent of group contact. Thus, the variations noted in Table 4 as well as the association of career phase with embracement of the inmate code could not be attributed to group contact as measured by Wheeler (a, note 17) and others.

REFERENCES

- Akers, R. L., N. S. Hayner, and W. Gruninger. 1974. "Homosexual and Drug Behavior in Prison: A Test of the Functional and Importation Model of the Inmate System." *Social Problems* 21:410-22.
- Atchley, R. C., and M. P. McCabe. 1968. "Socialization in Correctional Communities: A Replication." *American Sociological Review* 33(October):774-85.
- Clemmer, Donald. 1940. *The Prison Community*. New York: Rinehart.
- Cloward, R. A. 1960. "Social Control in the Prison." In *Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison*, Social Science Research Council Pamphlet 15.
- Cressey, Donald R. 1969. *Theft of the Nation: The Structure and Operations of Organized Crime in America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Ellis, D., H. G. Grasmick, and B. Gilman. 1974. "Violence in Prisons: A Sociological Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 80(July): 16-43.
- Giallombardo, Rose. a: 1966. *Society of Women: A Study of a Women's Prison*. New York: Wiley.
- . b. 1974. *The Social World of Imprisoned Girls*. New York: Wiley.
- Gibbons, Don C. 1968. *Society, Crime and Criminal Careers*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Glaser, Daniel. 1965. *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*. Indianapolis:Bobbs-Merrill.
- Glueck, Sheldon, and Eleanor Glueck. 1937. *Later Criminal Careers*. New York: Commonwealth Fund.
- Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. New York: Doubleday.
- Harris, A. R. 1974. "Imprisonment and Criminal Rationality." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.

- Heffernan, Esther. 1972. *Making It in Prison*. New York: Wiley.
- Lemert, Edwin. 1967. *Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Matza, David. 1964. *Delinquency and Drift*. New York: Wiley.
- Schwartz, B. 1971. "Pre-Institutional Vs. Situational Influence in a Correctional Community." *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science* 62(December):532-42.
- Street, David, Robert D. Vitner, and Charles Perrow. 1966. *Organization for Treatment*. New York: Free Press.
- Thomas, C. W., and S. C. Foster. 1972. "Prisonization in the Inmate Contraculture." *Social Problems* 20(Fall):229-39.
- Tittle, Charles R. a: 1969. "Inmate Organization: Sex Differentiation and the Influence of Criminal Subcultures." *American Sociological Review* 34(August):492-504.
- _____. b: 1972. *Society of Subordinates*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Ward, David A., and Gene G. Kassebaum. 1965. *Women's Prison: Sex and Social Structure*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Wheeler, S. a: 1961. "Socialization in Correctional Communities." *American Sociological Review* 26(October):697-712.
- _____. b: 1971. "Socialization in Correctional Institutions" In David A. Goslin (ed.), *Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Wolfgang, Marvin E. a: 1964. "Age, Adjustment and the Treatment Process of Criminal Behavior." *Psychiatry Digest* (July):21-35.
- _____. b: 1964. "Age, Adjustment and the Treatment Process of Criminal Behavior, Part II." *Psychiatry Digest* (August):23-36.