This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

THE CRISIS OF IMPRISONMENT: COPING WITH STRESS

ADJUSTMENT TO FORCED SEPARATION

presented by

Cosandra Irene Douglas

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Psychology

Lawrence K. Hall
Major professor

Date October 18, 1983

THE CRISIS OF IMPRISONMENT: COPING WITH STRESS ADJUSTMENT TO FORCED SEPARATION

By

Cosandra Irene Douglas

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1983

ABSTRACT

THE CRISIS OF IMPRISONMENT: COPING WITH STRESS

ADJUSTMENT TO FORCED SEPARATION

By

Cosandra Irene Douglas

The purpose of this research was to explore the potential relationships between (a) marital stability and good familial support and (b) the incarcerated male offender's participation in prison programs and prison misconduct. More specifically, the research investigated the link between an inmate's marital stability and the amount of familial support received on the one hand and his participation in recommended prison programs and the number of tickets (major misconducts) he received on the other. Coping strategies utilized by both the inmates and their families were also discussed.

Questionnaires were developed by reviewing the male offender literature and conducting extensive interviewing of inmates, parolees, parole officers, and other key prison administrators. These instruments were administered to felony-convicted male offenders ages 21 to 49 years at a state-directed minimum-medium-maximum security correctional facility. The design of the study was correlational, employing multiple regression analyses, discriminant function, and analyses of variance techniques. These procedures examined factors related to the changes experienced by

inmates and their families following incarceration of the male "head-of-household". The independent, predictor variables--the background factors--were (1) the ages of the inmate and his wife, (2) their educational levels, (3) the size of the family income before and during the period of imprisonment, (4) the presence or absence of children, (5) whether the inmate is a repeat offender or not, (6) the amount of contact (communication) maintained by mail or visits during the inmate's imprisonment, (7) the couple's race, (8) the number of earlier marriages, (9) the length of the couple's acquaintance before marriage, (10) the wife's social participation before and during the inmate's imprisonment, (11) residential mobility, and (12) inmate's perception of wife's attitude toward imprisonment as well as feelings about the "justness" of his sentence.

The criterion variables were the personal and institutional adjustment of the husband to prison life, as evidenced by misconduct reports, as well as a set of more subjective indices, including the inmates' perceptions of their wives adjustment regarding (1) their children, (2) the inmates' relatives, (3) the wives' relatives, (4) their friends, and (5) their sexual needs.

The results of the research revealed the following: (1) Marginal support for the prediction that "inmates whose marriages are perceived as intact and who experience good familial support have greater program participation than those whose marriages lack in emotional support", and (2) support for the hypothesis that "inmates whose marital relationships are described as intact (good) receive fewer misconduct reports (tickets) than those whose marriages are not-intact (not good).

These results were discussed in terms of possible (1) implications for providing optimal prison experiences, given limited resources and (2) directions for future research.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to

MY FAMILY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with a great sense of accomplishment that I have undertaken and successfully completed this project after numerous hours of research and dedication. I would never have succeeded had it not been for the encouragement and enthusiasm expressed by my beloved family. At this time, I would like to extend my sincerest thanks to my Mom and Dad without whose financial resources and committment to my completion of this degree, I am certain that I could not have made it. A very special thanks to my siblings, Beth, Dianna, Sylvester and Floyd for your continued support throughout this project.

To my committee Chairman, Dr. Lawrence A. Messe, I can't thank you enough for your continued and reassuring beliefs in my talents. Larry, thanks also for allowing me the freedom during my academic and professional career development to pursue a program of study to which I was most committed. Deeply felt thanks are also extended to my committee members, Dr. Jeanne Gullahorn, Dr. Dozier Thornton and Dr. David Kalinich.

Special thanks are also expressed to Dr. John Prelesnik, Superintendent at the State Prison of Southern Michigan and to the Michigan Department of Corrections for granting approval to conduct this research. For his statistical expertise and assistance, a sincere thanks to Dr. John Condon.

And, to my adorable husband Mr. Robert Leon Gordon, very special acknowledgement is hereby given to you. I

can't thank you enough for your love, patience, and unselfish support throughout the various phases of this research.

Above all, I lift up mine eyes unto the heavens and give thanks to GOD from whence cometh all help. . .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted to explore the impact of marital stability and good familial support on the incarcerated male offender's prison program participation and prison misconduct. Few would argue that confinement in prison necessitates certain negative consequences which are often presumed to lead to stress. Stress, in the context of this research, referred to any situation that frustrated or impeded the satisfaction of vital needs and that required various strategies of coping to overcome the impediments to need satisfaction. The study was useful in distinguishing between factors that led to relatively adaptive functioning with good prison adjustment from those that led to maladaptive functioning and poor prison adjustment.

The task of identifying those inmates who have managed to adapt relatively well to a forced separation from their spouses, families and loved ones is a complex assignment. The chief aim of this research was to identify changes inmates experienced following their incarceration and to gain knowledge regarding their perceptions of their ability to cope with the crisis of imprisonment. In as much as the focus of this research was on the married incarcerated offender, the conceptualization of the family was limited to the traditional nuclear family (which consisted of the inmates' wives and children with whom he had resided prior to his arrest and subsequent confinement). Additionally, for those single inmates who were interviewed as a part of this research, the conceptualization of these

families was too in terms of the traditional nuclear family (having consisted of the inmates' parents and/or siblings). A secondary goal of the research was to measure inmates' perceptions of the effects of imprisonment on their families. Also of interest to the researcher, was the identification of specific coping strategies utilized by imprisoned male offenders as they contend with numerous deprivations inherent to life within the walls of a large maximum security prison.

Imprisonment is a significant life experience whose adverse effects on the individual and his family probably depend largely on the extent to which these people have been able to cope with other crises. It is likely that these coping experiences are relevant to adjustment in prison, irrespective of whether the imprisonment itself is a unique or recurrent event. Also, I expected that adjustment to prison would be smooth or rough, depending on the quantity and/or quality of services and resources available both within and outside of the prison community. A third likely moderator of adjustment was the manner in which the individuals perceive the crisis generated by imprisonment relative to their status and objectives within a given community.

According to statistics for prisoners in the United States, the marital status of adult persons appears to have a substantial relationship with incarceration rates. The rate of commitments to prisons and reformatories per 100,000 population of the same marital status is lowest for the married, next to the lowest for widowed, next for the single, and highest for the divorced. These ranks, moreover, are not affected very much by age factors. Di-

vorced persons have the highest commitment rate at each age, and this is true for each of the sexes. Divorced males, aged twenty to twenty-four, have a rate of commitment about six times as high as either single males of the same age or married males of the same age, while divorced females of that age have a rate about ten times as high as either single females or married females of the same age. Married males have a lower commitment rate than single males in all age groups except fifteen to nineteen; the rate is only slightly lower in the twenty to twenty-four age group, but is significantly lower in later ages (Sutherland and Cressey, 1974).

It has also been found that married persons succeed on parole more frequently than persons of any other marital class, and that those who are compatibly married succeed more often than do the incompatibly married. It is not possible, however, to conclude from these statistics that marital status is a direct causative "factor" in imprisonment. Instead, it can be concluded that marital status is important to criminality because it determines the kind of behavior patterns with which persons come into contact (Sutherland and Cressey, 1974).

Of major concern in any study attempting to ascertain the influence of imprisonment on inmates and their families is the question of change within the family structure. To what extent has the inmate's imprisonment (forced separation) affected changes in (1) social acceptance, (2) economic status, and (3) the amount of sexual and emotional frustration.

While the number of studies conducted over the last quarter of a century that deal with prisoners and their families have steadily increased, purely investigative

studies of the impact of imprisonment on prisoners and their families have been relatively limited. Furthermore, there is a high concentration of cross-referencing among those available.

Review of Literature

Of the eight studies dealing with prisoners and their families most cross-referenced in the literature, two are outdated, having been conducted thirty-seven and twenty-seven years ago. Of the four most current, two were conducted in the United States, one was conducted in Australia and one in Great Britain. Table 1 summarizes the salient features of this work.

The Bloodgood Study

The first empirical study of prisoners' families was conducted in 1928 by Ruth Bloodgood for the United States Department of Labor. Its chief concern was to determine what effect the State of Kentucky's system of compensation for prison labor had on the families of prisoners. Bloodgood found that most families were undergoing severe financial difficulties and were barely "eking out an existence." The State of Kentucky, as a result, increased the rate of payment for prison labor (Bloodgood, 1928).

The Sacks Study

The second study, which was conducted in 1938 by Jerome G. Sacks at the District of Columbia Reformatory for Men, also revealed that a majority of prisoners' families could not adequately take care of their financial needs and responsibilities. He consequently argued that while many of the problems families encountered were problems subject to treatment, none of the families had been assisted appropri-

TABLE 1.--Previous Studies of Prisoners' Families

Name of Researcher	Year	Place of Study	Type of Study	Number of Inmates Studied	Number of Families Studied
Bloodgood	1928	Kentucky	Interviews and case studies	210	210
Sacks	1938	District of Columbia	Interviews and case studies	23	23
Blackwell	1959	Spokane County Washington	Question-naires	80	48
Zalba	1964	Alameda and Los Angeles Counties California	Interviews	124[a]	124
Morris	1965	England and Wales	Interviews	932	676
Anderson	1965	Melbourne Australia	Interviews	84	59
Schneller	1976	District of Columbia	Interviews and question-naires	93	93
Swan	1981	Alabama and Tennessee	Interviews	192	192

[a]Zalba studied female prisoners and their children.

[b]None of the studies utilized a strict random sample.

ately through parole services or through any prison-connected agency. A basic misgiving appeared to be that generally when any outside assistance was rendered (which was seldom), it was given through public and private agencies functioning in the community. Moreover, Sacks pointed out that these families' economic and social adjustment to the imprisonment was indeed bound to be highly unsatisfactory (Sacks, 1938).

The Blackwell Study

James E. Blackwell's study "The Effects of Involuntary Separation on Selected Families of Men Committed to Prison from Spokane County, Washington," involved administering questionnaires to 80 men imprisoned in the State of Washington, as well as to 48 of their wives.

Blackwell's chief aims were to determine family adjustment to imprisonment and to discern those factors that could be used to predict adjustment level. The Burgess-Cottrell Marital Adjustment Scale and an adaptation of Hill's Adjustment Scale were used to measure the variables of interest (Blackwell, 1959). Other variables that were measured (the background factors) were marital adjustment before imprisonment, the size of the family income before and during the period of separation, residential mobility, whether the woman was pregnant at the time of marriage, the length of the husband's minimum term in prison, whether this was a first offense or not, the amount of contact maintained by mail during the couples' separation, marital status at the time of imprisonment, the couple's race, the presence of siblings in couples' parental families, the number of earlier marriages, the institutional adjustment of the husband to prison life, the wife's social activities before and

during imprisonment, the wives' attitudes toward imprisonment as a crisis (Blackwell, 1959).

Blackwell concluded from his study that marital and family adjustment during and after imprisonment could be predicted with a significant degree of accuracy.

He found the following variables positively related to good adjustment to the separation: (1) High family income before separation, (2) High level of education by the couple, (3) Wife pregnant at time of marriage, (4) Couple divorced at the time of incarceration, (5) Good marital adjustment before separation, (6) Short minimum sentence, (7) Separation not seen by wife as a crisis, (8) Present marriage of long duration, (9) Large amount of mail correspondence during incarceration, (10) Good institutional adjustment by inmate, and (11) The wife's social participation during husband's absence.

The validity of some of these findings may be questioned in view of the fact that Blackwell used quantitative analysis for both quantitative and qualitative variables (Pearson's r was used for all variables. This is a statistical formula used to determine the relationship of two quantitative variables or factors).

The Zalba Study

Of the eight studies reviewed in this chapter, the study by Serapio Zalba (1964) is the only one which had prisoners' children as its primary focus. Zalba's study concerned the problems faced by children who were separated from their mothers because of the woman's imprisonment. She also investigated what community services were available to help these children of women prisoners. Her results pointed out a definitive need for family-

oriented planning, both for the welfare of the children and the rehabilitation of the mothers. She also recommended increased cooperation among various social agencies responsible for working with mothers and their children.

The Morris Study

Pauline Morris of Great Britain completed perhaps the most intensive study of prisoners and their families to date (Morris, 1965). Morris interviewed some 932 inmates from 17 of the 45 prisons in England and Wales, and also 676 of these inmates' wives. The study is a major contribution to the knowledge of prisoners' families both because of the large number of wives included in the study and because of the extensive nature of the wives' interviews, which lasted from two to two-and-one-half hours in each case.

Methodologically, the Morris study has much in common with a study conducted by Nancy Anderson in Australia, but Morris' was larger in scope and in some cases utilized more intensive interviewing, thus permitting greater generalization.

Though Morris studied 17 prisons, she did not utilize random sampling. Prisons were chosen for their ability to fill certain quotas of different types of criminals. These quotas, established by Morris, weighted the group she studied with certain types of criminals. This lack of random sampling rendered tests of significance problematic, but some were useful nevertheless. (Only approximately 16 percent of the men in her sample were Black, whereas the number of Blacks in Jackson Prison, the site of the present study, was significantly higher. There are approximately 65 percent Black inmates

housed at Jackson.)

Morris studied the families of three types of inmates: recidivists, non-recidivists or "status" offenders, and a separate category of inmates who were civil, not criminal, offenders (e.g., a man who was arrested for non-support).

Morris separately analyzed the data from the three different subgroups. The largest of these groups consisted of the recidivists and non-recidivists, 726 inmates and 534 of their wives. The second group consisted of 171 civil prisoners and 107 of their wives. A third group consisted of 35 inmates and their wives from the London area who were studied quite intensively over an eighteen-month period.

The study of recidivists and non-recidivists utilized short interviews with the inmate and long semi-structured interviews with the wives. Seventy-five percent of the inmates and sixty-two percent of the wives were under the age of forty. Thirty percent of the wives were employed at least part-time. Almost all wives had experienced pressure to go to work, and those who did not work generally gave needing to care for their children as the reason for staying at home. Most of the wives that were employed held domestic jobs. Seventy-eight percent of the families were receiving aid from National Assistance and the average number of children per family was 3.2.

Morris found that about 18 percent of the families lived in conditions of "considerable dirt and squalor," but she felt that the percentage would be about the same

for equivalent families of non-prisoners.

The difficulties most often mentioned by the wives were (in order of decreasing frequency): finances, management of their children in their husband's absence, loneliness and sexual frustration, fears about their husband's release, and housing concerns.

The women's adjustment to being prisoners' wives was rated on a seven-point scale in thirteen different areas: housing, finances, attitude toward welfare agencies, employment, the children's behavior, the wife's attitude toward her marriage and the future, the wife's relationship with her husband's family, her relationship with her own parents, the children's relationship with their father in prison, the extent of the wife's present social activities, and her relationship with neighbors and friends (Morris, 1965).

Thirteen different background variables that might contribute to adjustment were then correlated with the average of the thirteen scale scores. The variables were: the length of the prison sentence; the length of time the couple had already been separated; the type of offense; the husband's former occupation; the duration of the marriage; how long the couple had known each other before marriage; the wife's age; the husband's previous record of imprisonments, if any; the geographical mobility of the family; the couple's marital status at the time of imprisonment; the husband's previous marriages, if any; the wife's previous marriages, if any; and the size of the family (Morris, 1965).

The intense study of 35 wives during an eighteen-month period produced several findings with regard to family relationships. With the passing of time, material

conditions, physical health, sexual frustrations and the feelings of loneliness appeared to worsen. Those wives who had been very dependent on their husbands were more apt to show signs of constant deterioration than did wives who had been less dependent on their husbands. The initial stage of separation was the most crucial, especially for non-recidivists. The personality of the wives appeared to be a more important factor than the quality of the families' adjustment in sustaining the impact of separation. Families appeared to be loosened by each additional prison sentence, and the personalities of both the inmates and their wives were found to be important factors in achieving successful adjustment to reunion.

Two of Morris' hypotheses were supported by the findings of her study: (1) family relationships following conviction and imprisonment followed a pattern set by the family relationships existing before imprisonment; and (2) wives with wide kinship networks sought additional support from them during the husband's imprisonment.

The Anderson Study

The study published by Nancy Anderson, When Father Goes to Gaol, was conducted in Melbourne, Australia (Anderson, 1965). Eighty-four prisoners, 59 prisoner wives, and 12 employees from agencies dealing with prisoners or prisoners' families were interviewed in an effort to determine whether community services were meeting the needs of prisoners' families. Only a few of the wives interviewed were wives of the men studied. For the most part they were selected from welfare rolls, and their husbands were in various jails and prisons.

The prisoners and the wives in the study were predominantly young and poorly educated. Only nine of the inmates and fifteen of the wives had gone beyond the eighth grade, and only two wives and fifteen inmates were over forty years old.

According to the answers given by the wives to unstructured questions, the most difficult problems faced by the families, in order of frequency mentioned were: money, loneliness, illness, taking care of the children, and disapproval of friends and relatives.

Fifty of the fifty-five wives judged their adjustment to their husband's incarceration to be average or above. Twenty-three wives considered their families in a state of crisis as a result of their husbands' imprisonment. Some of the factors which wives found helpful in making an adjustment to their husbands' incarceration were: children, help from relatives, and being independent persons.

Anderson argues, "The extent which family and non-family roles are disrupted is directly related to how much crisis the family experiences." Variations in the amount of crisis seem to rest in differences in social class and the husband's previous criminal record. Some wives adjusted well to the imprisonment and separation because they did not expect to resume the relationship after their husbands were released from prison.

The Schneller Study

Donald P. Schneller's study, The Prisoner's Family: A Study of the Effects of Imprisonment on the Families of Prisoners, examined the effects of imprisonment on the families of ninety-three men who were in a medium-security prison in Washington, D.C. From prison records, Schneller collected the names of inmates who were living with their wives at the time of arrest and had been in prison for five years or less (Schneller, 1976).

He developed "a Likert-type scale" to measure any change that occurred within these families. This scale was composed of fifteen items and was divided into three subscales. The items were discussed with the wives and the families were then rated on these dimensions. The families were also given scores on each of the three subscales. These procedures were designed to measure three components of change: (1) change in social acceptance, change in economic status, and change in the amount of sexual and emotional frustration felt by the wife.

Schneller found that the families experienced little, if any, hardship in the realm of social acceptance--poor Black families, especially, tended to view imprisonment as part of the overall system of discrimination over which they have no control. Happily married couples, however, suffered real hardship in the economic and sexual-emotional areas.

Moreover, Schneller found that financial status and sexual-emotional frustration were significantly altered and presented real problems for a majority of wives, and this was especially true for happily married respondents.

The Swan Study

L. Alex Swan's study, Families of Black Prisoners: Survival and Progress, appears to be the most recent project to study the effects of imprisonment on the families of prisoners, specifically, the families of Black prisoners. The Swan study attempted to identify the crises in each stage of imprisonment -- arrest, arraignment, trial, and imprisonment -- and assessed the role played by family members as they adjusted to each of these phases, particularly to the loss of the person (usually male) on whom the rest of the family typically had depended for

psychological and material support (Swan, 1981).

Swan found that the greatest impact of imprisonment on the prisoners' families was financial. Other serious problems which affected a great many of the wives was anxiety regarding ill-health, insufficient financial resources, or the lack of a male parent to help in the children's upbringing. Swan's recommendations included prompt intervention services at each stage in the imprisonment crisis and workshops for prisoners and their families to strengthen family solidarity and to reduce the possibilities of recidivism. Also increased communication and referral systems among those agencies and individuals who deal with prisoners and their families on a consistent basis was recommended.

The studies reviewed here had various emphases, but all were concerned with the impact of imprisonment on the families of the incarcerated. All have made some contribution to the knowledge and understanding of the subject and the whole process of family adjustment. However, because these studies varied in emphasis and methodology, it is difficult, if not impossible, to compare and contrast their results. They have similarities, but their differences require that other research be conducted using similar, but more methodologically sound techniques and procedures.

It is felt that the present research conducted was an attempt to do a better job of sorting out the myriad of data on the incarcerated offender, while additionally providing new information that can be of help to prison officials as they strive to maintain internal order with-

in their institutions. Also a survey of the coping strategies utilized by incarcerated male offenders, as well as records of the kinds of behavior pa terns exhibited within the mileau of a maximum-security prison setting, was undertaken to provide those working in the prison community with information that could enhance prison adjustment, while simultaneously lowering the incidence of prison misconduct and maladaptive behavior.

The Inmate Social System

Prisons have always proved to be exciting laboratories for social scientists, criminologists, and more recently psychologists, and psychiatrists, yet not everyone views this laboratory in quite the same way. Presented below is a description of the prison as a kind of social environment.

A prison is a physical structure in a geographical location where a number of people, living under highly specialized conditions, utilize the resources and adjust to the alternatives presented to them by a unique kind of social environment. For some researchers, the prison represents a microcosm of the larger society. Donald Cressey makes the following position explicit in his introduction to a collection of studies of the prison:

> The prison is a microcosm of the larger society which has created it and which maintain it, for this larger society also remains as a unit and continues to "work", despite numerous individual disagreements, misunderstandings, antagonisms, and conflicts. The most general aim of the book is to contribute to a better understanding of the larger society through analyses of its microcosm, the prison (Cressey, 1961).

Other researchers deny that the prison can be considered in any real sense a microcosm of the larger society. They deny the use of the term prison community to refer to what, from their viewpoint, can only be considered a unique type of formal organization. Hillery asserts:

> If communities are seen as generally composed of conformists, and if total institutions are generally composed of deviants, then it is not surprising that total institutions are really anti-communities . . . The concept of total institution . . . at least has the value of suggesting the most extreme form of non-community (Hillery, 1968).

The majority of researchers, without explicitly rejecting the microcosm approach, examine the prison as a particular form of social organization (Cloward, 1960). Some of these researchers use the model of Erving Goffman, which emphasizes the particular characteristics of the "total institution" as a social organization. The prison, like other total institutions, is a "place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life (Carter, 1972).

The people enmeshed in, and creating this environment include administrative, custodial, and professional employees, habitual petty thieves, one-time offenders, gangsters, professional racketeers, psychotics, pre-psychotics, neurotics, and psychopaths, all living under extreme conditions of physical and psychological compression. The more formal administrative structure of the prison may be understood in a brief glance at its table of organization. Such a table reveals a series

of bureaucratically arranged positions with the warden at the top, and formal flow of power downward from his position. An even more penetrating glance at the social structure of the prison reveals an ongoing complex of processes that cannot be described by a static enumeration of formal powers and functions. For interacting with this formal administrative structure, and in many ways ind pendent of it, is another social structure, the inmate social system, which has evolved a complex of adaptational processes with which inmates attempt to cope with the major problems of institutional living.

Perhaps the first and most obvious characteristic of the inmate social system is the absence of escape routes from it. Not only is the offender incarcerated in a physical structure without exit, he is enmeshed in a human environment and a pattern of usages from which often times the only escape is psychological withdrawal. Another aspect of the inmate social system is its rigidly hierarchical character, in which vertical mobility, while possible, is highly difficult. The causes of this immobilizing rigidity are varied.

The number of roles an individual may play are severely limited and, once assigned, are maintained -- particularly at the lower status levels--through enormous group pressure. From the very moment a new inmate arrives at prison from the court or county jail, he is exposed to a series of very defining experiences.

It is of interest that those inmates who participate in and administer these experiences are frequently those who recognize that the inmate is somewhat near their level, a perception which stimulates anxiety in them. For instance, an obviously tough hoodlum will

create no special problems to the majority of lower-status inmates who, responding to minimal cues, will either avoid him or immediately acknowledge his higher status. However, the arrival of this type of inmate pose a threat to the block's chief "bad man", who will be expected to challenge the newcomer to a battle of mutual definitions.

Moreover, there is an additional aspect of this defining process which sheds light on another characteristic of the social structure, namely, its extreme authoritarianism. The role-defining conflicts carried on by inmates on or near the same status level point up the fact that any situation of equality is a situation of threat which must be resolved into a relationship of superordinance and subordinance. However vehemently inmates in groups demand equal treatment and condemn favoritism, inmates as individuals continuously press for special personal advantages.

Generally, where demands for increased permissiveness have been granted by authorities, the results have almost invariably been that the rigid authoritarian patterns have not been destroyed, but simply transferred to a new and less stable center of gravity. This type of authoritarian character of inmate relstionships suggests that members of the system afford no exception to the general psychological observation that the victims of power tend to regard its possession as the highest personal value.

Gresham Sykes, in his study, The Society of Captives, suggests that is is this systematic deprivation of goods and services that provides much of the incentive for the

development of a subordinate system and an inmate attitude that helps alleviate what he describes as "the pains of imprisonment." According to Sykes, any inmate entering prison is faced with five major problems involving "deprivation or frustration in the areas of social acceptance, material possessions, heterosexual relations, personal autonomy, and personal security (Sykes, 1958).

Social Acceptance

According to Sykes, the mere fact that the prisoner's movements are restricted, is far less serious than the fact that imprisonment means that the inmate is cut off from family, relatives, and friends, not in the self-isolation of the hermit, but in the involuntary seclusion of the outlaw. While it is certain that visiting and mailing priviliges do partially relieve the prisoner's isolation--that is if he can find someone to visit him or write to him and who will be approved as a visitor or correspondent by the prison officials--it seems that for many inmates, as the months and years pass by, their links with persons in the free community often weaken.

Seeing this isolation as painfully depriving or frustrating in terms of lost emotional relationships, of loneliness and boredom, is not that difficult. But what makes this pain of imprisonment much harder is the fact that the confinement of the criminal represents a deliberate, moral rejection of the criminal by the free community. Indeed, it seems that the moral condemnation of the criminal, however it may be symbolized, is what converts into punishment, i.e., the just consequence of committing an offense, and it is this condemnation that

confronts the inmate by the fact of his seclusion.

Many have argued that many criminals are so alienated from conforming society and so identified with a criminal subculture that the moral condemnation, rejection, or disapproval of legitimate society does not phase them; they are, it is said, indifferent to the penal sanctions of the free community, at least as far as the moral stigma of being defined as a criminal goes. This may indeed be true for a small number of offenders, such as the professional thief described by Sutherland (1937) or the psychopathic personality studied by William and Joan McCord (1956). However, for the great majority of inmates in prison, the evidence suggests that neither alienation from the ranks of the law-abiding nor involvement in a system of criminal values is sufficient to eliminate the threat to the prisoner's ego posed by society's rejection (Reckless, 1955).

Sykes further postulates that the signs pointing to the prisoner's degradation are many--the anonymity of a uniform and a number rather than a name, the shaven head, the insistence on gestures of respect and subordination when addressing officials, and so on. The prisoner in essence is never allowed to forget that by committing a crime, he has forgone his claim to a full-fledged, trusted member of society. It is true that in the past the imprisoned criminal literally suffered civil death, and and, although the doctrines of attainder and corruption of blood were largely abandoned in the 18th and 19th Centuries, the inmate is still stripped of many of his civil rights -- the right to vote, to hold office, to sue in court, and so on (Tappan, 1954). But as important as the loss of these civil rights may be, the loss of that more

diffuse status which defines the individual as someone to be trusted or as morally acceptable is the loss which hurts most.

So, it appears that the wall which seals off the criminal, the contaminated man, is a constant threat to the prisoner's self conception, and the threat is continually repeated in the many daily reminders that he must be kept apart from "decent" men. Somehow this rejection or degradation by the free society must be warded off, turned aside, rendered harmless. If the imprisoned criminal is to endure psychologically, he must somehow find a device for rejecting his rejectors (McCorkle and Korn, 1962).

Material Possessions

Now it is true that the prisoner's basic material needs are met in the sense that he does not go hungry, cold, or wet. He generally receives adequate medical care and he has the opportunity for exercise. But a standard of living constructed in terms of so many calories a day, so many hours of recreation, so many cubic yards of space per individual, and so on, misses the central point when one is discussing individual feelings of deprivation, however useful it may be in setting minimum levels of consumption for the maintenance of health. Admittedly, there are many problems in attempting to compare the standard of living existing in the free society and the standard of living which is supposed to be the lot of the inmate in prison. This is to say, for example, how does one interpret the fact that a covering for the floor of a cell usually consists of a scrap from a discarded blanket and that even this possession is forbidden by prison authorities? A standard of living can be hopelessly inadequate, from the inmate's

viewpoint, because it bores him to no end or fails to provide those subtle symbolic overtones which we invest in the world of possessions. Thss remains a very real prisoner problem in the area of goods and services. He wants, or needs if you will, not just the so-called necessities of life but also the amenities: such things as cigarettes and liquor as well as calories, interesting foods as well as sheer bulk, individual clothing, individual furnishings for his living quarters as well as shelter, privacy as well as space.

While the "rightfulness" of the prisoner's feeling of deprivation can be questioned, Sykes maintains that such criticisms are irrelevant to the major issue, namely that legitimately or illegitimately, rationally or irrationally, the inmate population defines its present material impoverishment as a painful loss. Sykes further maintains that because in modern Western culture, material possessions are so large a part of the individual's conception of himself that to be stripped of them is to be attacked at the deepest layers of personality.

It is true that our society, as materialistic as it may be, does not rely exclusively on goods and services as a criterion of an individual's value; and, ultimately the inmate population does defend itself by stressing alternative or supplementary measures of merit. But impoverishment remains as one of the most devastating attacks on the individual's self-image that our society has to offer and the inmate cannot ignore the implications of his straitened circumstances (Komarovsky, 1940).

Heterosexual Relations

It can be argued that if the inmate, then, is rejected and impoverished by the facts of his imprisonment, he is also figuratively castrated by his involuntary

celibacy. Unlike the prisoner in many Latin-American countries, the inmate in most American prisons does not enjoy the priviledge of the so-called conjugal visit. And during those moments when the prisoner is allowed to see his wife, mistress, or "female friend", the woman must often sit on one side of a plate glass window and the prisoner on the other, often communicating by means of a phone under the scrutiny of a guard.

A number of writers have suggested that men in prison undergo a reduction of the sexual drive and that the sexual frustrations of prisoners are therefore less than they might appear to be at first glance. It should be noted, however, that largely these reports of reduced sexual interest have been confined to accounts of men imprisoned in concentration camps or similar extreme situations where starvation, torture, and physical exhaustion have reduced life to a simple struggle for survival. Lindner has noted that in the American prison these factors are not at work to any significant extent; and he further notes that the inmate's access to mass media, pornography circulated among inmates, and similar stimuli serve to keep the inmate's sexual impulses alive (Lindner, 1951). It is quite clear that the lack of heterosexual intercourse is a frustrating experience for the incarcerated criminal, particularly the married incarcerated criminal, and that it is a frustration which weighs heavily and painfully on his mind during his prolonged confinement. (For some, namely, the "habitual" homosexuals in the prison--men who were homosexual before their incarceration and who continue their particular behavior within the all-male society of the custodial institution--perhaps, the deprivation of heterosexual intercourse cannot be counted as one of the pains of impri-

sonment.)

In addition to the frustrations which in the sexual sphere can be described in physiological terms, theer also are a number of psychological problems created by the lack of heterosexual relationships. It is not uncommon that latent homosexual tendencies may be aroused in the individual in a society composed exclusively of men. This type of situation tends to generate anxieties in its members concerning their masculinity, regardless of whether or not they are coerced, bribed, or seduced into an overt homosexual liason. There are few inmates who can escape the fact than an essential component of a man's conception, his status of male, is called into question. And if an inmate has engaged in homosexual behavior within the walls not as a continuation of a habitual pattern, but as a rare act of sexual deviance under the perceived intolerable pressure of mounting physical desire, the psychological onslaughts on his ego image will be particularly acute.

Additionally, yet another problem the deprivation of heterosexual relationships carries with it has to do with the fact that the inmate is cut off from the world of women which by its very polarity gives the male world much of its meaning. Like most men, the inmate must search for his identity not simply within himself but also in the picture of himself which he finds reflected in others; and since a significant half of his audience is denied him, the inmate's self-image is in danger of becoming half complete.

Personal Autonomy

Sykes maintains that the inmate suffers from a loss of autonomy in that he is subjected to a vast body of rules and commands which are designed to control his be-

havior in minute detail. To the casual observer, however, it may seem that such things as the rules about language used in letters, the hours of sleeping and eating, or the route to work, are controlling relatively trivial and unimportant areas of life. And, perhaps it might be argued that like material deprivation, the inmate in prison is not much worse off than the individual in the free society who is regulated in a great many aspects of life by sheer custom. Some writers even argue that for a number of imprisoned criminals the extensive control of the custodians provides a welcome escape from freedom and that the prison officials thus serve as a kind of external Super-Ego which serves to reduce the anxieties arising from an awareness of deviant impulses.

Regulation by a bureaucratic staff is felt much differently than is regulation by custom. From the viewpoint of the inmate, it is precisely the triviality of much of the officials' control which often proves to be most unwelcome. Most prisoners, in fact, express an intense hostility against their far-reaching dependence on the decisions of their captors, and the restricted ability to make choices must be included among the pains of imprisonment, along with restrictions of physical liberty, the posession of goods and services, and heterosexual relationships.

The loss of autonomy experienced by the inmates of the prison does not represent a grant of power freely given by the ruled to the rulers for a limited and specific end. Rather, it is total and it is imposed, and for these reasons it is often less endurable. The nominal objectives of the custodians are not, in general, the objectives of the prisoners. Because so many of

the regulations and orders do not "make sense" from the inmate's point of view, they often arouse the inmate's hostility. Indeed, though, the incomprehensible order or rule is a basic feature of life in prison.

Personal Security

While it is true that every inmate does not live in the constant fear of being robbed or beaten, the constant companionship of thieves, rapists, murderers, and aggressive homosexuals is far from reassuring. However strange it may appear that society has chosen to reduce the criminality of the offender by forcing him to associate with more than a thousand other criminals for extended periods of time, there is one meaning of this kind of involuntary union which is obvious, namely, that the individual inmate is thrown into prolonged intimacy with other men who in many cases have long histories of violent, aggressive behavior. This certainly creates a situation which can prove to be quite anxiety-provoking even for the hardened recidivist.

An important aspect of this general lack of feelings of security is the fact that the inmate is acutely aware that sooner or later he will be "tested," that others will "push" him to see how far they can go, and that he must be prepared to fight for the safety of his person and his possessions. If he fails, he will forever thereafter be an object of contempt, constantly in danger of being attacked by other inmates who view him as an "easy mark," as a man who cannot or will not defend his rights. And, on the other hand, if he succeeds, he may well become a target for the prisoner who wishes to prove himself, who seeks to enhance his own image by defeating the man with a reputation for toughness.

Very succinctly, the inmate's loss of security arouses acute anxiety, not just because violent acts of aggression and exploitation occur, but also because behavior constantly calls into question the individual's ability to cope with it, in terms of his own inntr resources, his courage, his "nerve", if you will. Regardless of the nature or extent of his own criminality, the uncertainties of whether he can take it or not, and will he prove to be tough enough, constitute an ego threat for the individual forced to live in prolonged intimacy with other criminals. He often is unable and unwilling to rely on prison officials for protection, uncertain of whether today's joke will be tomorrow's bitter insult, and such feelings do indeed contribute to the prisoner's inability to feel safe.

In summary, the formal system's rules, regulations, and methods of control can never fully anticipate or coordinate all possible forms of behavior. And, thus, an informal system develops in an attempt to ameliorate and eliminate the deprivation of goods and services, autonomy, and security (McCorkle and Korn, 1954; Sykes 1958; Cloward 1960; Grosser 1960; Dunheim and Weinburg 1960; Shoblad 1970; Kalinich 1980). The informal system becomes an avenue to cover some of the more complex interactive patterns with which the formal system cannot deal with (Berk, 1966).

It seems that in all studies of inmate subcultures, the same basic sociocultural system, regardless of the location and characteristics of the institution, is described. This is to say that inmates usually must conform or give the impression of conforming to the convicts'

codes or be ostracized and/or face isolation from fellow inmates. Such codes generally summarize the behavioral expectations current in the system. Sykes and Messinger (1960) finds five main groups of expectations:

1. Don't interfere with inmates interests.
2. Don't lose your head.
3. Don't exploit inmates.
4. Don't weaken.
5. Don't be a sucker.

Based on these expectations, the perfect prisoner is strongly pro-prisoner, anti-administration, tough, cool, dependable, and one who never uses others prisoners unfairly. Obviously, few prisoners approximate this ideal man, but most give verbal allegiance to the model.

It is well documented that within the inmate culture there does exist a social hierarchy. The highest order inmates are considered politicians or merchants. They have influence with the guards and professionals and manipulate the power structure in an effort to minimize the frustrations caused by incarceration by gaining power for themselves and delivering favors in the form of goods and services to fellow inmates. It may be necessary for leaders in the power structure to violate certain portions of the inmate code to facilitate long-term goals. Below the leaders in the social and power structure are the "thugs" whose primary behavior is violence, descending in order to the "right guys" who follow the inmate code but attempt to avoid interacting in the subculture, to the "square-johns" who try to conform to the inmate social structure and follow institutional rules, to the "low class" made up of sex offenders, stoolies, punks, and homosexuals (McCleary 1968; Clemmer 1958; Haynes 1948).

Again, the inmate social structure includes the development and selection of leaders who facilitate and support the inmate culture. Peer pressure toward conformity to the inmate code is strong. In prison jargon, the leaders are appropriately referred to as "politicians," as they are capable of developing favorable interpersonal relationships with inmates, guards, and treatment personnel. They typically are older than most inmates, have spent "long bits" in the institution, and have usually been involved in criminal behavior that gives them status with their peers. Sometimes, they have been important members of criminal gangs or organizations on the outside. According to McCleary (1968), by and large, inmate leaders hold key administrative or clerical positions and have access to avenues of communication and administrative decision making through relationships of trust and power persuasion.

It appears that inmates conform to official rules and procedures for the first and last six months of their incarceration. However, such conformity may be more symbolic than substantive as inmates attempt to facilitate their release through the power system. A number of studies suggest that the longer the prison term, the younger the inmate at first conviction, the lower the social class of the offender's origin, the fewer number of contacts with persons outside prison, and the lower the inmate's postprison expectations, the more likely he is to conform to the prison culture and inmate code (Wheeler 1961; Garabedian 1963; Tittle and Tittle 1975; Welford 1967; Irwin 1970).

The indigenous origin theory of prisoner subcultures, as posited by Cloward, Sykes, and others holds

that the prisoner subculture was largely a response to conditions within the prison. This perspective remained essentially unchallenged until 1962, when Irwin and Cressey first published their opposing theory, the importational model (Irwin and Cressey, 1962). Irwin and Cressey's position is that the convict code is part of a more general criminal code that exists outside the prison, one that is imported into the prison from the streets by newly sentenced felons. They also suggest there is a more general utilitarian and manipulative "hard core," lower-class culture in free society, from which most criminals are drawn. The indigenous theory, they say, has more to do with the maintenance of the prisoner subculture than with its origin.

According to Irwin and Cressey, in fact, there are really three prisoner subcultures, not one. These are the thief subculture, the convict subculture, and the conventional subculture. The thief subculture is composed of various professional criminals who share with their friends, who are loyal to other thieves, and who do not seek leadership within the prison. In contrast, the members of the convict subculture manipulates others for their own gain and seek maximum power and status while incarcerated. And, conventional subculture inmates are "square johns" who bring the legitimate culture of the streets into the institution with them (Irwin and Cressey, 1962).

This challenge to the indigenous origin model was not long unanswered. Roebuck argued, for example, that the prison experience is what teaches thieves how to "do easy time" and that the "right guy" image of nonmanipulative sharing is a prisoner-created myth. Roebuck countered that Irwin and Cressey offered no real evidence for their model, that their theory was contradicted by much of the penological literature, and that it was inconsistent with his own prison experience and

research (Roebuck, 1963). Lending some support for Roebuck's position was a long series of reports derived from a study conducted by Tittle and Tittle (1964) which reported that belief in the convict code increased directly with time incarcerated for first offenders and that the more prisoners accepted the convict code, the less likely they were to reach a satisfactory therapeutic adjustment, and the less they subjectively experienced the pains of imprisonment (Tittle and Tittle, 1965). Not all the predicted relationships were found at statistically significant levels, but the general trend of the data was supportive of the indigenous origin theory.

No matter what the prison experience is for thousands of inmates throughout the country, it seems likely that there are general factors that contribute to all these stressful situations.

Factors Contributing to Stress in Prison

Deprivations

As has been mentioned earlier, confinement in prison necessitates certain negative consequences which are often presumed to lead to stress. These negative dimensions, inherent in the prison environment, have been frequently described (Reimer, 1937; Clemmer, 1940; Sykes, 1958).

Toch (1977) identified seven "environmental concerns," comparable to the deprivations identified by Sykes, to be integral features of living in prison. These concerns, which produce different levels of stress on inmates, were privacy, safety, structure, support, emotional feedback, activity and freedom. Interviews with inmates revealed that freedom was their most salient concern (Toch, 1977). However, elements of imprisonment do not

always create acute stress in each inmate throughout his incarceration. First, deprivations cannot be isolated from other pressures which may increase or decrease the impact of deprivations/concerns on inmate stress. Certainly, the inmate's background or stage of his prison term may render him more or less susceptible to prison pressure. Second, strategies of coping may ameliorate prison stress. Finally, the institution, itself, also has some flexibility in its own policies and regulations to reduce the severity of deprivations. Through furloughs and work release programs, the prison can diminish to some extent the pain of loss of freedom. In a similar fashion, an effective classification system reduces safety/security concerns by identifying and isolating those inmates likely to exhibit violent tendencies.

Without question, the institution as well as the inmate has a vested interest in reducing tension. However, prison officials do not have control over most of the means to ameliorate adverse conditions. The number of inmates sentenced to confinement, the number of inmates released by the parole board, legislative provisions dictating policy, budgetary constraints, and public attitudes toward crime and corrections can seriously restrict the ability of any institution to implement tension-reducing procedures.

In sum, elements of imprisonment contribute to pressure in prison. Although these factors are inherent in the environment, they are subject to modifications and can differentially affect inmates.

Management Concerns

Many researchers argue that the focus of the administrative and custodial staff is the maintenance of internal order. To promote internal order, institutions must have at their discretion a number of alternatives. This range of options, their availability, and their application subsequently affects the overall climate of the facility.

Principally, institutions rely on two types of incentives to elicit cooperative behavior (Forst, 1980). First, there are the incentives that shape the "quality of time" and address the level of comfort of the inmate. These rewards or punishments include segregation, cell lock-up, privileges (i.e., night recreation), work assignments, cell assignments and program opportunities. Second, "quantity of time" incentives are typically either credits for good behavior (good time) that lowers the minimum or maximum time to be served, or consideration of the inmate's prison behavior at parole board hearings. Both qualitative and quantitative incentives are intended to encourage compliant behavior by the inmate.

Empirical evidence on the actual or relative effect of these various rewards and punishments on inmate cooperation is scant. Forst (1980) argued that quality of time incentives may become more important during periods of overcrowding because of the pressure to release inmates regardless of their prison behavior. Restrictions on incentives affecting the quality of life were recently cited as being a contributor to inmate frustrations prior to the 1980 New Mexico prison riot. The New Mexico Attorney General (1980) in part attributed

the riot to a narrowing of privileges, such as transfers to more desirable satellite facilities.

There also is some evidence that discriminatory or perceived discriminatory application of rewards and punishments may add stress to the inmate's adjustment to prison (Toch, 1977; Attorney General of New Mexico, 1980). McCarthy (1979) noted that inconsistent decisions regarding eligibility and selection of inmates for furloughs can contribute to inmate anxiety.

Another source of stress is the lack of certainty regarding what behavior will be considered an indicator of rehabilitation by the parole board, an especially critical concern in jurisdictions with boards which do not have guidelines concerning offense and offender characteristics (New York State Special Commission on Attica, 1972).

In the last decade, legislative, judicial and parole board actions have resulted in significantly more admissions to prison, longer average sentences, and fewer releases. Overcrowding, produced by these and other factors, can lead to stress in numerous ways. It certainly limits opportunities for privacy, which we know to be a basic concern of inmates. Additionally, overcrowding restricts rehabilitative and work assignments, adding to idleness and boredom, and of course tension. Moreover, overcrowding frequently can reduce the institution's ability to classify prisoners and separate violent inmates from others. It becomes a simple matter of bed space.

Post Release Concerns

Concerns about the future may also create stress for inmates. Waller's (1974) Canadian study of ex-prisoners found that both parolees and dischargees were concerned most about finding employment and about returning to their families (Goldstein, 1980). Managing financially also was reported to be a major issue for those discharged. Only a small portion of Waller's sample had been worried about returning to prison before they were released (Waller, 1974). According to Glaser (1969) and Irwin (1970), the inmates they interviewed had a very pessimistic view of the probability of their successful readjustment. Whether this pessimism translates into pressure in prison has not actually been investigated. For certain types of inmates, however, there appear to be more acute levels of "anxieties about the uncertainties of a future lifestyle" (Irwin, 1970).

In sum, to some degree external factors do affect the inmate's level of tension inside prison. Employment and family concerns are the most often reported sources of this tension.

Strategies of Coping

There is no question that each inmate has to adapt in some fashion to the institutional life of prison. Over the course of his sentence, an inmate may choose one or a combination of different adaptations. Isolating distinct strategies is not very practical because prisoner interactions are so complex. Just the same, though, distinguishing various strategies aids in their understanding. For example, certain strategies are more suited to extreme levels of frustration perhaps because they have serious negative or highly unpredictable consequences. Presented below is

a brief discussion of styles of coping.

Litigation. Beginning in the 1960's, courts, especially federal courts, became increasingly receptive to inmate suits. This receptivity, thus, encouraged inmates to file more and more petitions.

Litigation can have benefits at two levels. First, inmate writ writers may see litigation as a method of coping in the institution. The time consuming nature of suits may actually be positive in the sense of keeping inmates occupied. The status of writ writers can also help to relieve tension generated by the degradation of being an inmate. Also, litigation might just win the sought-after relief. Secondly, successful litigation may improve prison conditions for the entire prison population.

Grievance Procedures. Similarly, another way of reducing tension for some inmates is to resort to formal grievance procedures. Support for such procedures is derived in part from the perspective that these "devices are safety valves that can relieve the patterned dissatisfaction, deprivations and problems that occur in penal settings, and that, if unheeded, might go to litigation or to riots" (Robin, 1980; McArthur, 1974; Keating, et. al., 1975; Deneberg, 1975).

While both litigation and grievance procedures require planning and a willingness to await a response, prison stresses may dictate that inmates develop more immediate responses. Inmates may derive one or a number of individual non-violent roles as strategies of coping. Occasionally, inmates may also resort to non-violent collective action when extremely frustrated.

Withdrawal. For safety and/or privacy needs, which are among the most important inmate concerns (Toch, 1977), inmates may choose some form of withdrawal, depending in part on the individual's level of stress.

Activity. The opposite of withdrawal is activity, meant here as a nonviolent strategy of daily coping. Activity may take different styles. One inmate may prefer a particular work assignment, another a hobby, another physical exercise, and etc. Such activities are intended to relieve stress by keeping the inmate so occupied and exhausted that there are neither time nor resources to devote to prison frustrations (Toch, 1977). Although there are no reliable trend data on the proportion of inmates adopting one or another strategy, it seems a reasonable inference from recent research that the violent prison has fostered withdrawal as the primary style of most inmates today.

Collective Nonviolent Action. Collective nonviolent action by inmates refers to strikes, slow-downs, and similar disruptive behavior by a group of inmates. Such a strategy would be considered short-term and typically would require a relatively high level of frustration. Very frustrating conditions would definitely be a prerequisite in order to obtain consensus. Both strikes and their violent equivalent, riots, sporadically manifest and ventilate collective frustrations.

In summary, as mentioned earlier, both internal and external factors contribute to prison stress and tension and can be manipulated in either a positive or negative way. Perhaps the single most significant pressure threatening to cancel out the benefits of any ameliorative efforts is overcrowding. (Already in Michigan this year, the Emergency Powers Act to ease overcrowding in Michigan's prisons has been invoked six times. The Emergency

Powers Act is utilized anytime the prisons exceed intended capacity for more than thirty (30) consecutive days. It reduces the minimum sentence of prisoners by ninety (90) days, resulting in their early release from the institution.) Overcrowding restricts or destroys institutional and inmate efforts to reduce tension, and, because there are no signs that this conditinn will change in the immediate future, we certainly need to explore means by which internal order and greater inmate compliance can be obtained. The present research sought to accomplish this goal.

Inmate Stress and Outside Contact

It should not be surprising that imprisonment generates some degree of pressure in each and every inmate. We know that most of life's changes or transitions produce some disequilibrium and require adjustment. Most of us have made, with varying degrees of success, transitions from grammar school to high school, old neighborhood to new neighborhood, friend to foe, and lover to exlover. Some of these changes are painful and require the use of considerable coping resources to endure. It is likely however, that the transition from the street to prison is among the most unsettling. Prison pressures may lead inmates to choose one or more strategies of coping with their environment. The array of interactions in prison is a mixture of both pressures and reactions to pressure. The available evidence on one measure of psychological breakdown, self-injury, indicates that (1) self-destructive breakdowns are relatively more common at the beginning stage of incarceration than in other stages of confinement (Esparza, 1973; Heilig, 1973; Martin, 1971), and (2) those who do injure themselves in prison

tend to do it relatively early inttheir period of confinement (Biegel and Russell, 1973; Danto, 1973; Esparza, 1973; Heilig, 1973; Martin, 1971). These findings suggest that the initial period of incarceration may be especially stressful.

Many argue that persons who exhibit certain life styles or engage in illicit occupations should realistically anticipate arrest and confinement; however, criminologists report that they seldom do (e.g., Gibbs, 1978). Still following the actual incarceration, many cope with the experience by rationalizing it as a cost of doing business or a consequence of their lifestyle.

Prior to arrest and incarceration, however, the possibility of eventual confinement is in some ways similar to perceptions of death. This is to say that although death happens to all of us, very few are prepared for its arrival. The early period of conefinement in prison, like death, may be reacted to with disbelief and shock when it does arrive.

Certainly one group of prisoners who are especially susceptible to this type of disbelief and shock are those whose pre-prison lifestyles involved a heavy chemical component (Gibbs, 1978). In addition to their inability to satisfy their physical cravings for drugs, once incarcerated, these men must face the consequences of confinement without the assistance of the substance(s) that they used to cope with the stresses of life on the streets.

Some of the interviewed prisoners claimed that the constant activity involved in obtaining drigs and the effects of the drugs blinded them to the consequences of their actions. For many, drugs alleviated the pain associ-

ated with previous periods of incarceration and distorted future time perspective.

Another group of persons who are susceptible to crisis upon confinement are those who suffer from psychological problems. Gross psychological disturbances are not uncommon responses to abrupt shifts in life conditions. Where psychotic symptomatology or tendencies already exist, the setting in which even psychologically stable individuals have difficulty separating what is real from what is not can immobilize and aggravate schizophrenic delusions. Granted, addicts and psychotics are expecially vulnerable to the stresses of the transition from street to prison, but the sudden change is stressful for most other people as well.

Stress and Outside Contact

Stress, in the context used here, refers to any situation that frustrates or impedes the satisfaction of vital needs and that require extraordinary efforts to allow the system to continue to function. Stress requires the marshalling of emergency resources in order for a system to maintain equilibrium and to overcome the impediments to need satisfaction (Oken, 1962). If the system is so imbalanced by stress that it cannot provide for essential needs, the system breaks down. People, in this sense, may be considered systems and they may suffer physical and psychological breakdowns as the result of stress. If the flow of blood to a vital organ, for instance, is restricted and the system cannot overcome or remove the impediment, the organ may cease to function. A person who is constantly

frustrated in his attempts to fulfill certain basic emotional needs, due to the myriad of rules and constraints placed upon him in prison, may also cease to function. He may become withdrawn and lose touch with reality and, thus, experience a psychological breakdown.

Changes in environment or circumstances can affect the ability to satisfy certain needs and to distinguish the relative importance of various needs. In certain settings, certain needs predominate or become survival requisites. Within the confines of the maximum security prison, without question maintaining a sense of security in a threatening environment requires more vigilance than is necessary in less dangerous settings. However, increased vigilance can have unintended consequences. Scanning the environment for threats can result in increased sensitivity to danger cues, and thus produce even greater insecurity.

Whenever a person must contend with either chronic or acute stress, there is a possibility that the individual will fail to cope. The chances that a person will break down are related to (1) the severity of the stress; (2) the characteristics of the person experiencing the stress; and (3) the nature of the stress.

As has been mentioned, certain needs can become more salient than usual in certain environments. The transition from street to prison poses an adjustment problem for the newly confined that goes beyond the immediate prison environment. Incarceration may change a number of the individual's established relationships. Upon incarceration, a man accustomed to possessing real

or imagined power or resources on the streets may become dependent on individuals in the prison community for many important functions. This sudden role reversal may have implications for his sense of adequacy.

During periods of transition, people often experience feelings of lack of control. "Stability zones" or "certain enduring relationships that are carefully maintained despite all kinds of other changes" can become important coping resources during times of transition (Toffler, 1970). It has also been observed that people in threatening or stressful situations center their attention and energy almost exclusively on the resources necessary to overcome the stress and reestablish psychological equilibrium. This narrowing of focus is known as the "shrinking phenomenon" in which the elements which are most important to the satisfaction of vital needs become all-consuming (Bahnson, 1964).

If the assistance and support of those in the community become predomina t needs upon incarceration, they may attain crucial significance, and an inmate may experience a psychological "shrinking phenomenon." The street-to-prison transition may result in the reallocation of the importance and meaning attached to family and friends.

The importance of family can sometimes reach metaphysical proportions in the eyes of the confined. Distortions of reality may take place, and the person may regress to the point where symbolic mother's milk create a secure and predictable niche in the threatening world of prison.

The importance of family support is documented in the findings of a study of self-destructive breakdowns

in penal settings conducted by Toch (1975). The most prevalent of the sixteen problems that were identified in the content of interviews with the self-destructive prisoners was Self-Linking:

> A person's protest against intolerable separation from significant others, against perceived abandonment by them, or against his inability to function as a constructive member of a group. The person rejects the possibility of an independent life, feels that his well-being is inconceivable without the continuation of certain vital relationships, and that no satisfactory existence is possible without them. (Toch, 1975)

Outside links or contacts are of central importance for dealing with the disruption of making the street-to-prison transition. The satisfaction of the need for support is a stabilizing element during a time of psychological instability. Two additional environmental qualities, predictability and activity, have been found to be associated with psychological stability. Granted these are rare commodities in prison, but a description is presented below.

Stability

Some measure of environmental predictability is necessary for psychological survival. Toch has noted:

> If we wish to live sane lives, we must have environments that respond sensibly and predictably to what we do. We must know what to look for, what to expect, and when and where to expect it. Hadley Cantril has observed that "it is necessary for us to maintain some degree of stability and continuity in our assumptive world if any of our value judgements are to make sense; if any of our actions are to be effective" (Toch, 1977).

Prisons certainly contain many features that constitute impediments to satisfying the need for stability and predictability. It is a world filled with numerous doubts and much disorganization. Often during the seemingly eter-

nal nights in prison, a person's need for information and certainty concerning a variety of issues may amplify. The morning may bring only more noise, uncertainty, and confusion as the "tiers erupt into a world of discordant sound richocheting between steel and concrete" (Gibbs, 1975). In such a situation, a man may find that his ability to think clearly and make decisions is impaired.

Activity

The inability to satisfy essential needs often result in tension and anxiety. Reduction of the tension resulting from frustration can become a primary need in itself. The inability to diminish tension constitutes a frustration that produces more anxiety and tension.

No matter what the source of anxiety, and there can be numerous sources in prison, its level can be reduced by engaging in physical activity. A variety of forms of activity will do; it does not matter whether the activity is related to the original source of tension (Stotland, 1969). In prison, however, chances for anxiety-reducing activity are limited. Lack of activity for inmates ranked third in average seriousness of the 24 problems assessed by a group of prison personnel, and boredom was considered the most common problem faced by inmates (Gibbs, 1981).

Unoccupied time and lack of diversion establish propitious conditions for dwelling on one's problems. Such preoccupations can spawn counterproductive reactions. Toch has described the pattern as "Sanctuary Search":

> An effort by the inmate to escape from redundant preoccupations particularly with re ard to problems in the outside world or in his own situation to which he finds no solution or closure. The effort is to break the unproductive cycle and secure peace of mind (Toch, 1975).

Toch described "Sanctuary Search" as representing a classic example of unconstructive rumination or worry "a problem eating away at a man." A person may find himself in a position in which the tension produced by attempts to deal with a problem become a problem in itself. The difficulty is no longer simply one of solving, resolving, or in some way coping with a difficulty with the courts or family, for example, but develops into an issue of escaping from an unrelenting bombardment of painful thoughts and feelings. In this situation, one begins to feel trapped. Relief from tension becomes all important. Thought patterns of this kind can be the result of dwelling on any of the number of problems associated with prison incarceration. Barred for the most part from the kinds of activity that could assist one in coping, the inmate must make do.

It should be noted that nearly two thirds (63-65 percent) of the inmates entering American prisons each year have been in prison before (Fox, 1962). An even higher proportion, approximately four out of five (80 percent) of the prisoners who are sent to solitary confinement, the jail within the prison, it has been estimated by prison administrators, have been in solitary confinement or punishment status before (Fox, 1962). Such a high proportion of failure indicated that the problem of inducing conforming behavior from persons exposed to our punishment programs remains unsolved.

The disciplinary problems in a prison constitute the manifest culmination of all the problems faced by the inmates and the administration of the institution. Disciplinary problems constitute a threat to an administration because they disrupt the order, tranquility, and security

of the institution. In many prison facilities, the reaction to this threat is immediate and drastic. Very often in a majority of adult penal institutions in the United States, psychological and social treatment ceases when rules are violated, and the offenders are placed in solitary confinement or in some other punishment status. Thus, upon violation of rules, many prisons are confronted with a policy dilemma, in that they withdraw treatment from those who, by their maladaptive behavior, have demonstrated that they need treatment most.

Many prison personnel and parole boards have displayed a tendency to evaluate the prospects of successful adjustment outside the prison on the basis of an inmate's lack of misconduct reports in the prison. Many wardens regard the institution as a small community which gives practice to prisoners in getting along wtth others, the effect of which can be transferred to the larger community.

The term, "discipline," has frequently been confused with some of the techniques by which it is achieved. "Discipline" is group order. Traditionally, the prison is characterized by exaggerated discipline (Fox, 1962). Practices and techniques by which order may be achieved vary widely from institution to institution, from philosophy to philosophy, and from administrator to administrator. More often than not, the most desirable motivation for group order within the prison lies in good morale, good food, a cahllenging and interesting program, and excellent spontaneous communication and relations between all individuals and sub-groups of which the total group is comprised -- this of course, including wives and families of inmates. When there is a breakdown in any of these

areas, usually some type of force is administered by the administration to maintain group cohesion. The most frequent types of force used in prisons are: (1) Solitary confinement, frequently with dietary restrictions; (2) Locking-in own cell with loss of yard privileges; (3) Loss of visiting, correspondence, canteen, and/or other privileges; (4) Transfer to another institution; (5) Assignment to a "discipline squad" for menial labor; (6) Down-grading in a grading system and/or forfeiture of earned good time; and (7) Corporal punishment, formal in some southern prisons, informal in several others (Fox, 1962).

Controlled movement of inmates and segregation procedures are the two broad classifications of techniques used by custody to maintain order in an institution. Moving lines of prisoners, gate control, and the pass system constitute the controlled movement of prisoners. Segregation includes the prisoners in solitary confinement; in the mental ward, hospital, and other special facilities; and those prisoners held away from the general population because of chronic incorrigibility or safekeeping. The persons in solitary confinement are those who have been found guilty of violation of prison rules. It is this group and this relationship to which many persons refer as "disciplinary procedures."

The rules of conduct in most prisons are fairly standard and are set to define inappropriate behavior for which an officer should arrest and report an inmate. The offenses most frequently reported in custodial summary courts are: fighting, gambling, homosexual practices, stealing (from cells, kitchen, library, work assignments, and "high-jacking"), smuggling in contraband

or possession of contraband, skating (being in an unauthorized area without a pass), disobedience, refusal to work, making alcoholic beverages (spud-juice, canebuck, raisin-jack, etc.), bartering with other inmates without permission, escapes, planned escapes, or attempted escapes, etc.

These offenses appear fairly frequently in all institutions. The types of offenses committed by each individual may be psychiatrically diagnosed according to the area in which the individual finds conformity most difficult. Fox (1952) found evidence to support his contention that the specific nature of the offenses committed by each individual is partially dependent upon the personality of the offender. There appears to be a tendency for each offender, outside prisons and within prisons, to repeat the same types of offenses, some to a greater extent than others.

Approximately three percent of the inmate population is involved in misconduct reports in any given year. This means that there is a high incidence of repeating, an indication which is confirmed by the observation of experienced prison personnel and an examination of the records of inmates who have accumulated misconduct reports. The three most common major disciplinary problems in prison are gambling, sex, and fighting. The fighting frequently results from the gambling and sex problems.

Research Rationale

The focus of this research was to explore the impact of marital stability and good familial support on the incarcerated male offender's prison misconduct and

participation in various prison programs. This study also served to delineate specific coping strategies utilized by imprisoned male offenders as they contend with numerous deprivations inherent to life behind walls. Concomitantly, inmates' perceptions of the effects of imprisonment on their families were also explored.

A chief limitation of previous research in this area has been the use of post-incarceration file data to generate possible indicators of ways people are not "successful" in the prison community. Also, generally, this type of data has served as the primary basis for recidivism literature; and these files, for the most part, tend to be unreliable in terms of giving sufficient and accurate information (Brecochea and Spencer, 1972). It is hoped that by directly interviewing inmates, an accurate account of their perceptions regarding the impact of imprisonment on not only themselves but their families as well, may be obtained.

While a point of departure for this research was provided by the theoretical background of a number of studies, actually the number of purely investigative studies of the impact of imprisonment on prisoners and their families has been relatively limited. Also, another shortcoming of previous literature in this area is that the focus has been almost exclusively upon the families, rather than being primarily interested in the inmates' perceptions of their experiences of loss and their understanding of various familial changes undergone due to their being "locked-up."

Therefore, in view of these and other methodological limitations of previous research, the focus of the study was directed on the hypotheses presented herein.

HYPOTHESES

1. Inmates whose marriages are perceived as "intact" and who experience good familial support have greater program participation than those whose marriages lack in emotional support.

2. Inmates whose marital relationships are described as "intact" (good) receive fewer misconduct reports (tickets) than those whose marriages are "not-intact" (not good).

CHAPTER II

METHOD

In this study, questionnaires were administered to incarcerated male offenders of the world's largest, maximum-security walled prison, the State Prison at Southern Michigan. This prison is under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Corrections and is located in Jackson, Michigan. (The official name of the prison is the State Prison at Southern Michigan, but its more popular name, Jackson Prison, is the title which will be used in this dissertation when reference is made to the prison.) An interview format was utilized to study the impact of imprisonment on the lives of the inmates and their perceptions of the "crisis" of imprisonment on the lives of their wives and loved ones.

Subjects

The participants for this study were felony-convicted male offenders. The men were chosen from an inmate population of a state-directed minimum-medium-maximum security men's correctional facility. The institution houses men who are at least 21 years of age and have a sentence longer than one year for a felony offense. Approximately 5,000 inmates were incarcerated in the correctional facility (Jackson Prison) at the time this study was conducted.

Sampling - Determination of a Universe

Since there was no ready-made means by which to identify the population of married men in the prison, it was necessary initially to randomly choose inmates

with a starting point, determined by having chosen every fifth inmate from a list of approximately 500 inmates housed in the prison's Reception and Guidance Center. The inmate's prison file was then examined to ascertain his marital status. Only legally married inmates were interviewed for participation in this research. Common-law relationships were excluded primarily due to the researcher's feelings that perhaps the level of commitment to the marriage and the influence of familial support was somewhat less, in as much as the two parties in such a relationship, for whatever reason, were unwilling to give legal sanction to the relationship via a simple civil ceremony. A screening interview was then conducted with the inmate to limit the sample to approximately 70 married inmates who: (1) were living with their wives at the time of arrest; and (2) were incarcerated in the prison at the time the study was being conducted.

Also 40 single inmates were interviewed in an effort to obtain additional information related to the hypothesis regarding their incidence of prison misconduct.

Design

The primary design in this study was correlational, specifically involving multiple regression, discriminant function, and analysis of variance techniques. The goal of these procedures was to examine factors related to the changes experienced by prisoners and their families following the incarceration of the male "head of household." The independent, predictor variables -- the back-

ground factors -- of interest to the researcher were (1) the ages of the inmate and his wife, (2) their educational levels, (3) the size of the family income before and during the period of imprisonment, (4) the presence or absence of children, (5) whether the inmate is a repeat offender or not, (6) the amount of contact (communication) maintained by mail or visits during the inmate's imprisonment, (7) the couple's race, (8) the number of earlier marriages, (9) the length of the couple's acquaintance before marriage, (10) the wife's social participation before and during the inmate's imprisonment, (11) residential mobility, and (12) inmate's perception of wife's attitude toward imprisonment as well as the "justness" of his sentence.

The criterion variables were the personal and institutional adjustment of the husband to prison life, as evidenced by misconduct reports, as well as a set of more subjective indices, including the inmates' perceptions of their wives' adjustment regarding (1) their children, (2) the inmates' relatives, (3) the wives' relatives, (4) their friends, and (5) their sexual needs.

Data Collection

Interview

Each man was randomly selected from a prison list of inmates compiled weekly by the institution. Because of the large number of inmates incarcerated and housed in the Reception Center at Jackson Prison (approximately 500), the starting point was determined by having chosen every fifth inmate from the weekly prison list. The inmate's file was then located to ascertain his marital

status. After the subject was selected, the inmate was placed "on call" for a screening interview which was held in a private office. Upon arrival, the purpose of the research and participation requirements were explained to the subject. (See Research Explanation, Appendix A.) At this point if the man did not wish to participate, he was granted permission to return to his housing unit. If he stated his interest in participating, a "Participation Agreement" (see Appendix B) outlining his rights and the researcher's responsibilities were read. If at this point he declined participation, he was then instructed and allowed to return to his unit. Those who did agree to participate in the study signed the "Participation Agreement" form.

For each inmate who agreed to participate in the study, the following explanation of the study's format was given (see Appendix A).

Hello:

You are being asked to participate in a research study designed to look at the means by which you cope with being locked up at Jackson Prison. I will also ask you questions about how you feel your wife and family are getting along without you while you are imprisoned.

The purpose of the study is to identify some of the things you do to help you "do your time" and also to learn about some of the changes you have experienced since being here at Jackson. Hopefully, this study will help develop programs within the prison which may help out in this regard.

All of your responses to this interview are confidential and it is hoped that you will be as frank and open as possible.

The interview format consisted first of acquiring various demographic data on each subject and secondly, a series of questions designed to ascertain the impact of

imprisonment on the lives of inmates, as well as the inmates' perceptions of the impact of imprisonment on the lives of their wives and loved ones were examined.

Instrument Construction

In order to ascertain the impact of the "crisis" of imprisonment on male offenders, the researcher conducted an extensive review of the male offender literature and designed a demographic and informational sheet useful for recording the background data of interest in this study. Questions for the interview were developed by interviewing incarcerated and paroled males, interviewing parole officers, prison superintendents and other key administrators within the Department of Corrections regarding their perceptions of some of the problems and concerns of inmates and how imprisonment impacted upon the lives of inmates and their families.

The "Family-Change Scale" used in this research is an adaption of a scale developed by Donald P. Schneller, 1976 (see Appendix D). This scale has three sections, each consisting of five questions. The first section is the social-change section, the second is the economic-change section, and the last section is the emotional-sexual-change section. The total family-change scale yields scores which can range from 15 to 75. Each section of five questions yields scores with a range of 5 to 25. Using this scale, it is possible to obtain an overall family-change score, and at the same time specific subscale scores on the three types of change, social, economic, and emotional-sexual.

A second scale used in this research was the Short Marital Adjustment Test developed by Harvey J. Locke and Karl M. Wallace, 1959. The scale measures marital ad-

justment. It has been tested for validity and reliability and rates high on both (see Appendix E). The scale consists of 15 items and has a possible score range of 2 to 158.

A third instrument, the "Perceptual Prison Adjustment Questionnaire", developed by the researcher is the result of extensive reviewing of male offender literature which addresses the areas of interest in the present research (see Appendix F).

Each of these scales were administered verbally during interviews. The inmate was allowed to discuss any question on the various scales he cared to talk about. The answers were recorded on mimeographed forms by the researcher.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

In this section, the data are organized and presented in two parts. Part One presents descriptions of the demographic characteristics of the respondents (i.e., the incarcerated male offenders) and their families. Any unusual features of the subjects are also noted. Part Two presents the results of the systematic data analyses and tests of the hypotheses.

Part One: Descriptive Statistics

In an effort to effectively analyze the perceptions of the impact of imprisonment on incarcerated male offenders and their families, it is necessary to gain some insight into the general family structure and lifestyle prior to the incarceration. Thus, presented below is background inofrmation about the social and emotional characteristics of the men and their families in this sample, their financial and economic standing, basic composition and reaction of the members of these families, as well as their ability to cope with the crisis of imprisonment.

It should be noted that a series of cross tabulations were performed utilizing this information with inmate family groups (intact, not-intact, single). However, no significant differences were found. Thus, the demographic material presented below was primarily seen as providing a descriptive backdrop for the tests of the hy-

potheses that are presented in a later section. Additionally, data analyses yeilded no significant correlations (systematic differences) between the independent, predictor variables --the background factors-- and the criterion variables.

Geographic Profile

Although more than 200 men initially were interviewed for this research, approximately 90 offenders were eliminated from further study because they failed to meet the criteria of inclusion in the sample. Thus, final analyses yielded data from 110 incarcerated male offenders. Of the 110 respondents, approximately half (53.6 percent) were from the Wayne-Oakland county area. The remainder principally had resided in Kent (4.5 percent), Genessee (2.7 percent), and Ingham (2.7 percent) counties.

General Characteristics

An important factor in determining the relevant characteristics of the respondents' families is the need to isolate certain relevant facts about the men and their families who participated in the study. The first factor considered was age. The ages of the men interviewed ranged from 21 to 49 years. Their wives' ages ranged from 19 to 52 years. Tables 2 and 3 present a more detailed categorization of the ages of the respondents and their wives, respectively.

The data in Table 2 clearly show the relative youthfulness of the inmates who participated in this study. The majority (55.5 percent, or 61) of them were no more than thirty years old, and approximately 89 percent were below the age of forty. This finding is similar to those re-

ported by Pauline Morris and Nancy Anderson in their studies conducted in England and Australia respectively. The average age of respondents in Anderson's study was thirty, and more than half of the women in the Morris study were thirty years old and under.

TABLE 2.--Age Distribution of Respondent Inmates

Ages	Frequency	Percentage
21-25	26	23.7
26-30	35	31.9
31-35	25	22.6
36-40	12	10.8
41-45	8	7.2
46 yrs or older	4	3.6
TOTAL	110	100

The wives of the inmates were also quite youthful as can be viewed from the data in Table 3.

TABLE 3.--Age Distribution of Inmates' Wives

Ages	Frequency	Percentage
19-23	11	15.7
24-28	25	35.7
29-33	19	27.1
34-38	8	11.4
39-43	5	7.1
44 yrs or older	2	2.9
TOTAL	70	100

Since this study was principally interested in the impact of imprisonment on married incarcerated offenders, it is relevant that at the time of the interviews, some 63.6 percent of inmates reported being legally married, with apporximately 10 percent of those indicating they had been separated from their spouses prior to their current incarceration. Table 4 depicts the marital status categories of the sample studied.

TABLE 4.--Marital Status of Inmates at Time of Interviews

	Frequency	Percentage
Married	59	53.6
Single	33	30
Divorced	6	5.4
Widowed	0	0
Separated	11	10
No Answer	1	1
TOTAL	110	100

The 11 inmates who were separated at the time of this research reported that the relationships were on relatively shaky grounds, primarily because of infidelity on the part of the inmate or wife, hardship due to financial troubles, disagreements about "running partners" and disputes among in-laws.

Tables 5 and 6 present information about the duration of the relationship and the length of acquaintance prior to the marriage. While 60 percent (42) had lived together for five years or more, the data in Table 5 also show that couples were rather unevenly distributed with respect to the number of years they had spent together

prior to incarceration.

TABLE 5.--Duration of Marital Relationship

	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 2 yrs	7	10
2-4 yrs	20	28.6
5-7 yrs	16	22.9
8-10 yrs	9	12.9
More than 10 yrs	17	24.3
No Answer	1	1
TOTAL	70	100

With regard to the amount of time inmates generally "courted" their wives prior to marriage, this analyses revealed that in general the length of acquaintance with their prospective spouses was from about two to four years. This statistic suggests that many inmates did in fact know their spouses fairly well prior to committing themselves to a long-term relationship with them.

TABLE 6.--Length of Acquaintance Prior to Marriage

	Frequency	Percentage
Less than 2 yrs	22	31.4
2-4 yrs	20	28.6
5-7 yrs	8	11.4
8-10 yrs	3	4.3
More than 10 yrs	10	14.3
No Answer	7	10
TOTAL	70	100

Marital Stability

Another set of data that is related to the general marital characteristics of these couples concerns the level of marital stability and perceived familial support. Table 7 presents this information. It is felt that these particular characteristics have a direct influence upon the families' basic composition.

These data suggest that a majority of the men were concerned about maintaining intact marital relationships and reported having never left their wives for any reason, other than a previous incarceration, but having chosen instead to "stick it out" and work through any marital difficulty.

TABLE 7.--Number of Separations from Family Prior to Incarceration

	Number	Percentage
0	35	50
1	23	32.8
2	6	8.6
3	3	4.3
4 or more	3	4.3
TOTAL	70	100

Although most of the wives were in their twenties, the combined time that the majority of these couples had been together was from two to seven years, that is, when the time the families spent together prior to incarceration was combined with the time the inmates had been incarcerated, the entire period was comparatively short. This finding is similar to that reported by Alex Swan in his study of Black prisoner families in Alabama and Tenne-

ssee. It would appear that if these couples had a relatively good relationsiip prior to the incarceration, perhaps the unplanned crisis of imprisonment could not help but to bring about a major disruption in the familial relationship, one requiring an immediate reorganization in order to survive and maintain the family scheme of life.

During the interview, inmates were asked if their wives and/or families provided emotional support. A vast majority of inmates, about 79 percent (87) reported in the affirmative; in contrast, the remaining 20 percent reported virtually little, if any, support at all.

Factors Pertaining to Separation

As was cited previously, of the 32 percent of married inmates who reported having been separated at least once from their wives (for reasons other than a previous incarceration), the men reported a variety of circumstances that led them to separate for a period of time. The major reasons cited were for infidelity, disagreements regarding "run ing partners", financial woes and in-law difficulties.

Again, while this study was primarily interested in the effects of incarceration on inmates and their families, data were recorded about the number of prior incarcerations which resulted in the inmates being separated from their families on prior occasions. This information is summarized in Table 8. Not surprisingly, virtually 52.7 percent (58) of the inmates had been incarcerated at least once. Some 18.2 percent (20) had been incarcerated at least twice and an incredible 29.1 percent (32) had been previously incacerated some three times or more! Table 9 presents the types of crimes committed by the inmates who

TABLE 8.--Record of Inmates' Previous Incarcerations

	Number	Percentage
None (1st Offense)	43	39.1
Once	15	13.6
Twice	20	18.2
Three X's	10	9.1
Four X's	7	6.4
Five X's	6	5.5
Six X's or More	9	8.2
TOTAL	110	100

TABLE 9.--Types of Crimes Committed by Inmates (by Groups)

INTACTS

Types of Crimes	# of Inmates
Armed Robbery	6
Unarmed Robbery	1
Felonious Assault	2
Criminal Sexual Conduct	4
Manslaughter	2
Murder	1
Narcotics Violation	3
Possession Stolen Property	3
Larceny	3
Breaking and Entering	10
Unlawful Driving Away Automobile	2
Forgery	1
Uttering and Publishing	1
Violation of Credit Card Act	1
TOTAL	40

NOT-INTACTS

Types of Crimes	# of Inmates
Armed Robbery	10
Felonious Assault	1
Criminal Sexual Conduct	4
Attempt Murder	1
Murder	2
Narcotics Violation	1
Larceny	1
Burglary	1
Breaking and Entering	5
Carrying a Concealed Weapon	2
Uttering and Publishing	1
Violation of Credit Card Act	1
TOTAL	30

SINGLES

Types of Crimes	# of Inmates
Armed Robbery	3
Felonious Assault	3
Criminal Sexual Conduct	2

TABLE 9.--(Cont'd.).

SINGLES (Cont'd)

Types of Crimes	# of Inmates
Assault Less Murder	2
Murder	5
Narcotics Violation	2
Receiving & Concealing Stolen Property	3
Larceny	6
Breaking and Entering	10
Carrying a Concealed Weapon	3
Arson	1
	40

TABLE 10.--Criminal Offenses and Statutory Sentence Lengths

Code	Offense	Tanner Minimum	Statuatory Maximum	Explanation of Offenses
1	Murder, 1st degree		Life	Premeditated, intentional killing
2	Murder, 2nd degree		Life or any term of years less than life	Murder not premeditated, e.g., bar-room brawls.
3	Attempted murder			Assault with intent to do great bodily harm.
4	Assault with intent to commit murder			
5	Robbery armed		Life or any	
6	Assault to rob, armed		term of years	
7	Rape		"	
8	Kidnapping		"	
9	Conspiracy		"	
10	Bank safe or vault robbery			
11	Narcotics, unlawful sale, distrib., manufacturing	13.3 yrs.	20 years	
11	Burning a dwelling house	13.3 yrs.	20 years	Threatening a person with injury in order to obtain property.
11	Extortion	13.3 yrs.	20 years	
11	Accept earnings of a prostitute pandering	13.3 yrs.	20 years	Pimping
12	Robbery, unarmed	10 yrs.	15 years	
12	Assault to rob	10 yrs.	15 years	
12	Manslaughter	10 yrs.	15 years	Killing but offender was provoked. Retaliation.
12	Breaking and entering an accupied dwelling	10 yrs.	15 years	
12	Sodomy	10 yrs.	15 years	Sexual assault (not violent).
12	Perjury	10 yrs.	15 yrs.	Lying in a situation when you're under oath to tell the truth.
12	Place explosive by property with intent to discharge	10 yrs.	15 years	
12	Firearm, cause death w/o malice	10 yrs.	15 years	e.g., gun goes off by mistake and someone is killed.
13	Uttering and publishing	9.3 yrs.	14 years	Passing a bad check.
13	Forgery of records	9.3 yrs.	14 years	
14	Breaking and entering	6.66 yrs.	10 years	
14	Possession of burglary tools	6.6 yrs.	10 years	
14	Larceny from a person	6.6 yrs.	10 years	Stealing from a person, e.g., purse snatching. Bargained down robbery.
14	Assault less than murder	6.6 yrs.	10 years	
14	Assault committing rape, sodomy, or gross indecency	6.6 yrs.	10 years	
14	Assault to commit a felony	6.6 yrs.	10 years	Assault with a dangerous weapon, without intent to commit murder, and without intent to inflict great bodily harm, i.e., less than murder.
14	False pretense to defraud	6.6 yrs.	10 years	Falsely obtaining money, goods, or services from an individual. No theft because given articles voluntarily

TABLE 10. (Cont'd)

Code	Offense	Tanner Minimum	Statuatory Maximum	Explanation of Offenses
14	Indecent liberties with child	6.6 yrs.	10 years	
14	Burning other real property	6.6 yrs.	10 years	
14	Drunk driving-third offense	6.6 yrs.	10 years	
14	Possession of a stolen auto	6.6 yrs.	10 years	
14	Incent	6.6 yrs.	10 years	
15	Non-narcotic drug, illegal sale, distribution	4.66 yrs.	7 years	
15	Hallucinogens, sales, distri., and manufacturing	4.66 yrs.	7 years	
16	Escape from prison	3.33 yrs.	5 years	
16	Carrying a concealed weapon	3.3 yrs.	5 years	
16	Receiving stolen property	3.3 yrs.	5 years	Commonly called attempted B&E. Usually bargained down from B&E.
16	Unlawful driing away auto	3.3 yrs.	5 yrs.	
16	Larceny over $100	3.3 yrs.	5 years	
16	Larceny from motor vehicle	3.3 yrs.	5 yrs.	
16	Larceny by conversion over $100		5 years	Receiving money, goods, or other property and wrongfully applying it to a purpose other than that for which it was delivered to him. e.g. defendant given funds to buy stock for someone but uses money to buy himself a car.
16	Attempted gross indency between male and female	3.3 yrs.	5 years	
16	Carrying weapon w/unlawful intent	3.3 yrs.	5 years	
16	Possession of forged notes	3.3 yrs.	5 years	
16	Transport drugs into prison	3.3 yrs	5 years	
16	Mfg. or poss. illegal weapon	3.3 yrs.	5 years	
16	Possession of bomb	3.3 yrs.	5 years	
16	Common law offense	3.3 yrs.	5 years	
16	Gross indecency between females	3.3 yrs.	5 years	
17	Larceny from a building	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Felonious assault	2.6 yrs.	4 years	Hitting a person
17	Nargotic drugs, possession of	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Intent to sell or use credit cards	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Marijuana, illeg. sale, distr., mfg.	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Mal. dest. property over $100	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Burning of personal property	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Prepare to burn property over $50	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Sale or use of credit cards	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Cruelty to children	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Mal. dest. house, barn, other bldg.	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	False statement to obtain relief over $500	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Larceny of livestock	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Theft of credit cards	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
17	Obscounding or forfeiting bond	2.6 yrs.	4 years	
18	U.D.A.A. w/o intent to steal	1.3 yrs.	2 years	Joy-riding.
18	Checks w/o account or suff. funds	1.3 yrs.	2 years	Checks that bounce.
18	Non-narcotic drug possession	1.3 yrs.	2 years	
18	Resisting or obstructing officer	1.3 yrs.	2 years	
18	Negligent homicide	1.3 yrs.	2 years	Death due to reckless driving
18	Careless use of firearms	1.3 yrs.	2 years	
18	Larceny of rented motor vehicle under $100	1.3 yrs.	2 years	
18	Felonious driving	1.3 yrs.	2 years	
19	Misdemeanor	.66 yrs.	1 year	

SOURCE: Michigan Department of Corrections.

participated in this research and Table 10 presents the various sentences for these crimes.

Returning to our focus on the married inmates who participated in this study, the majority of inmates perceived their marriages as being rather egalitarian in nature. When asked to report which one of them was usually the one to give in when a disagreement arose, most of them answered that they generally reached an agreement by "mutual give and take" (See Table 11, which summarize responses to this question). This finding appears to be in line with observations made by Ernest Burgess and Harvey Locke that the trend in the Black family (63 percent of the married subjects were Black) is toward the egalitarian type family, the type of family in which decisions are made jointly by husband and wife.

TABLE 11.--Dominance-Submission Patterns in Inmates' Families

	INTACT	NOT-INTACT
Patterns of Behavior in Solving Disagreements	Number of Responses By Inmates	Number of Responses by Inmates
Husband Gives In	6	6
Wife Gives In	5	9
Mutual Give and Take	29	15
TOTAL	40	30

The mean marital adjustment score for the researcher's study was 109 in contrast to a mean marital adj t-ment score of 116 for the couples who participated in the original Locke-Wallace study. Unlike the Locke-Wallace study, the husband's and wives scores for the present research could not be averaged together. Also in testing the validity of their scale, they found a happily married group to have a mean score of 135.9. Realizing of course that the inmates in the present study answered the marital-adjustment scale questions according to their perceptions, it would appear that the couples studied in the present research were only slightly below average in marital adjustment. An interesting finding of the present study was that for those inmates who revealed significant problems in their marriages and who reported them as not-intact, the average score was 97.5, much higher than the 71.5 score recorded by Locke-Wallace for the unhappily married group in their study. For the inmates who reported their marriages without major problems and intact in the researcher's study, their average score of 119.2 was somewhat below the average score for Locke-Wallace's happily married group (135.9). Table 12 show the distribution of mean marital adjustment scores for the period prior to incarceration classified by race. The lowest possible score on the scale is two and the highest possible score is 158 (Locke and Wallace, 1959).

Level of Education

Table 13 depicts the level of educational attainment of the inmate respondents. Of those inmates interviewed a large majority 63.6 percent (70) reported having either

TABLE 12.--Marital Adjustment Scores Prior to Incarceration by Race

Black Inmates

Range of Scores	Frequency
40 - 59	2
60 - 89	6
90 - 109	13
110 - 129	10
130 - 149	12
150 - 158	2
TOTAL	45

White Inmates

Range of Scores	Frequency
40 - 59	2
60 - 89	3
90 - 109	8
110 - 129	6
130 - 149	4
150 - 158	
TOTAL	23

completed high school or earned the general equivalency diploma (GED). These results are certainly above and beyond most reported statisitics in this area, which indicate that the average prison inmate has approximately an eighth grade education. Perhaps even more surprising was the finding that 36.4 percent (40) of the inmates reported having achieved at least one year of college course work.

TABLE 13.--Level of Education of Inmates

	Number	Percentage
Up to 7th grade or less	3	2.7
8 - 9 grade	12	10.9
10 - 11 grade	24	21.8
12th grade	30	27.3
1 - 3 years college	33	29.9
College degree	7	6.4
No Answer	1	1
TOTAL	110	100

TABLE 14.--Level of Education of Inmates' Wives

	Number	Percentage
Up to 7th grade or less	2	2.9
8 - 9 grade	2	2.9
10 - 11 grade	13	18.6
12th grade	32	45.7
1 - 3 years college	1	1
College degree	4	5.7
No Answer	16	22.8
TOTAL	70	100

When asked to report on their wives educational status, 16 of the men indicated that they were uncertain and thus no information was recorded. Of those who were able to supply the interviewer with this information, 32 (45.7 percent) reported that their wives had completed high school and only 17 (24.3 percent) had a 7th grade-11th grade education. Also it was reported that 5 of the wives had completed 1 year or more of college course work. Table 14 presents a more complete summary of this information.

The Wives

For the most part, the prisoners gave the researcher the impression that their wives were emotionally stable and law-abiding citizens. A majority 70 percent (49) reported that their wives had not sought any kind of treatment for major medical or psychiatric treatment since

their incarceration, rather their was an effort on the part of the wives to generally seek emotional, and when needed, financial support from other family members. Of those inmates 30 percent (21) who had indicated that their wives had sought psychiatric treatment, a majority attributed that such treatment was directly related to difficulties experienced due to the husband's incarceration.

Another rather interesting finding of the study was that 54 percent (38) of inmates reported being aware of their wives seeking greater support (either/both financial and/or psychological from family members during the husband's incarceration.)

The most frequently reported matters of concern for the wives as reported by their incarcerated husbands were in order of frequency, financial matters, whether or not inmates would become reinvolved in crime upon his release, how she would meet her social and sexual needs, and worries regarding whether the husband intended to leave his wife upon his release to "sow his wild oats."

When inmates were asked to describe the amount of overall support (both psychological and financial) given to them by their wives, the majority reported that it had been in keeping with their expectations of at least hearing from them on a weekly basis, and often times more than they would have expected.

Generally after good rapport was established between the researcher and the inmate, some rather sensitive topics were explored. When asked to respond to the question of how often they discussed their wives dating other men during their absence, some 35.5 percent of inmates reported that this rather sensitive topic was never even broached with their wives.

Another sensitive topic which was asked of married inmates concerned how willing they were to discuss the sexual needs of their wives during their incarceration which ranged in time from a minimum of 1 month to a maximum time served of 142 months. When specifically asked to respond to the question of "how do you think your wife is coping with her sexual needs since your incarceration at Jackson prison?" the majority of inmates 41.4 percent (29) responded by saying that they felt their wives were abstaining from sex in their absence; in contrast 25.7 percent (18) admitted that they felt their wives were getting their sexual needs met and 30 percent (21) stated that for whatever reasons, they never discussed the issue with their spouses. Perhaps for some of those 30 percent of inmates who reported being unable to discuss the issue of their wives sexual needs during their incarceration, there was an underlying fear that indeed since they were not able to satisfy their spouse's sexual needs, maybe their wives would turn to other men "on the streets" for satisfaction. Again, some inmates openly admitted such to the researcher and added that if this were true, many simply would not want to know. Several inmates, depending on the length of their sentences, revealed that "if the shoe were on the other foot" and their wives were the one incarcerated, they certainly felt as if they would not abstain from seeking sexual fulfillment. This last finding is interesting in that it contrasts with another question asked of inmates regarding how much they missed having sex with their wives since being "locked-up" in prison. The overwhelming response (48.2 percent) was that, indeed, inmates reported missing sex with their wives much more often since

they were separated and some 49.1 percent reported that they frequently longed to be able to show love and affection towards their mates during their period of incarceration.

It would appear that the wives had similar longings since 74 percent of inmates reported receiving either mail or visits from their families at least once a week or oftener. Some 78 percent reported hearing from their wives at least twice monthly either via mail or through prison visits. It is unquestionably true that for married offenders, their relationships with their wives is a source of social-emotional support and it would appear that the wives' potential for assisting in the adjustment of their husbands to incarceration has not been fully realized.

The Children

The 70 couples (married-intact and married not-intact groups) in this study had 60 children, an average of less than one child per family. The majority were less than twelve years of age, with only 17 being in their teens. Table 15 shows the distribution of ages for the children. All but one child was reportedly living with their mothers and that child lived with relatives. While none of the children was reported as being in the custody of the courts, several fathers noted that their wives were experiencing some difficulty in managing their young children, with sons posing more difficult problems. (Perhaps this may be the result of sons, more so than daughters, identifying with their fathers and feeling a greater need to "be tough" like their fathers,

"to get into trouble", etc.)

Furthermore, it is likely that most of the children were at an age when the presence or absence of their fathers would have an important influence on their lives (see Table 15). The majority of the inmates, due to their incarceration, as is shown in Table 16, had been away from their families for less than two years. But again, any period, whatever the duration, could be of great consequence to the children, a large number of whom were quite young.

TABLE 15.--Age Distribution of Children

Age	Number of Children
1 - 3 yrs	8
4 - 6 yrs	10
7 - 9 yrs	14
10 - 12 yrs	5
13 - 15 yrs	11
16 - 18 yrs	6
19 - 21 yrs	4
22 and over	
TOTAL	60

TABLE 16.--Duration of Separation from Fathers (Due to Incarceration)

Time Served	Number	Percentage
Less than 2 years	51	72.8
2 - 5 years	17	24.2
6 - 8 years	2	2.8
More than 8 years		
TOTAL	70	100

Familial Conditions

Family Income

The majority of inmates (some 57 percent) in this study reported that prior to their incarceration they were employed in either skilled or semi-skilled positions and had contributed to the support of their families. Subsequent to their absences, reportedly the greatest source of primary income for their families was welfare payments in the form of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (ADC). Table 17 shows the various sources of income and the number of families dependent upon each.

Table 18 shows the distribution of jobs held among the employed wives following their husbands' incarceration.

TABLE 17.--Primary Source of Present Family Income

	Source	Number of Families	Percentage
1.	Welfare (Aid to Families with Dependent Children)	30	42.9
2.	Wife Working	27	38.6
3.	Combination 1 and 2	0	
4.	Other	9	12.9
5.	No Response	4	5.7
	TOTAL	70	100

TABLE 18.--Types of Jobs Held by Inmates' Wives

Types of Jobs	Number of Wives
NONE-- ON AID	32
FACTORY WORKER	6
STUDENT	4
HAIRDRESSER	2
NURSES AID	2
CLERK	2
HOUSEWIFE	1
BARTENDER	1
LABORATORY TECHNICIAN	1
SECRETARY	1
BABYSITTER	1
JANITOR	1
HOUSEKEEPING	1
NURSE	1
MAIL DELIVERER	1
COOK	1
TEACHER	1
TICKET RESERVATIONIST	1
SEAMSTRESS	1
STOCK PERSON	1
RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY	1
RECEIVING DISABILITY	1
NO RESPONSE	6
TOTAL	70

Table 19 shows the data supplied by the inmates on their past employment. Over half the men (57.1 percent) had been employed in skilled positions, working primarily in factory positions, as carpentry workers, and as general laborers. The three professionals had worked as teachers.

TABLE 19.--Employment of Married Inmates Prior to Incarceration

	Number	Percentage
Unemployed	16	22.9
Unskilled	7	10
Semi-skilled	19	27.1
Skilled	21	30
Professional	3	4.3
On Aid	1	1
No Answer	3	4.3
TOTAL	70	100

Few would argue that a key element in any family stability is the steady flow of financial resources to adequately meet household expenses and maintain an adequate life-style. As is shown in Table 20, which presents the combined monthly income of husbands and wives prior to incarceration, a large number of inmates reported that they had helped financially support their families and the loss of their contribution to the combined household income was noticeably felt in their absence. Many men reported during the interview that the loss of

their contribution to familial expenses was indeed a contributor to their crimes and such losses (primarily due to lay-offs, plant closings, firings, etc.) played havoc with the inmates' sense of self-worth. Perhaps not too surprisingly, a majority of the inmates' wives had to resort to welfare (ADC) in an effort to make ends meet for their families during their husbands' incarceration.

TABLE 20.--Combined Monthly Income of Husbands and Wives Prior to Incaceration

	Number	Percentage
Under $500	11	15.7
500 - 600	8	11.4
601 - 700	4	5.7
701 - 800	5	7.1
801 - 900	1	1.4
901 - 1000	3	4.2
1001 - 1500	14	20
1501 - 2000	9	12.9
2001 - 2500	5	7.1
2501 - and greater	6	8.6
Unreported	4	5.7
TOTAL	70	100

Effects of Imprisonment Upon Children

The families of the incarcerated offender is often faced with considerable difficulties, be they financial or emotional or social. Moreover, these problems tend to be compounded when children are involved. As previous studies making clinical observations of children of imprisoned parents have revealed (e.g., Seedler and Thomas, 1976; Sack, 1977), a high percentage of these children showed short-term behavioral symptoms soon after a parent was confined. The majority of these symptoms were mild disruptions, expressions of sadness, withdrawal, and/or a drop in school performance.

Previous research in this area also indicates that it is not uncommon for children of incarcerated parents to be stigmatized or be made the target of cruel teasing. Granted that the degree to which any one child may suffer debilitating injuries, either socially or emotionally, will depend in part on the child's age, personality, prior relationship with the father, the length of time the child is separated from the father, the type of care the child receives while the father is incarcerated, in addition to the opportunities the child has for continuing contact with the father or other significant persons in his or her life. As a society we can ill afford not to study and address the issue of the impact of imprisonment upon children (particularly in terms of father absence). To neglect it and be faced in the future with a generation of youngsters who suffered a lifetime of rejection and neglect may be a severe consequence not many of us are willing to risk. That this is an area which merits future systematic research cannot be emphasized enough.

Coping Strategies Utilized

In an effort to explore the numerous ways by which both the inmate and his family adjusted to his forced separation, a number of specific questions proved insightful. They are presented below.

It seems the most significant adjustment for the inmate and his family was in the financial realm. Many inmates reported having been major contributors to financial household responsibilities and when asked to respond to the question of "how much has your family's income changed since you have been incarcerated," the majority (intacts, 60 percent; not-intacts, 53 percent) reported that their families were being forced to survive on much less money than when they were not incarcerated.

In answering a related question, "what do you think is your wife's most serious and pressing concern since your incarceration," the present study was congruous with other prison studies in which a majority of inmates (both intacts and not-intacts) reported financial matters as being perhaps the most difficult with which their families had to contend in their absence.

Not surprisingly in view of the above, when inmates were asked "what is your most serious and pressing concern following general "survival" and getting out of Jackson prison," the majority reported concerns about finding employment, especially with the attached label of being an "ex-con."

In as much as on a daily basis the inmate is confronted with a number of serious concerns (often just thinking of ways to make the hours seem less long), the

researcher attempted to get a picture of the coping strategies utilized on a daily basis to combat the repitition and boredom, so commonplace in prison institutions. Inmates stated that in an effort to cope mentally with being away from their loved ones, most of them simply tried to think of happier times spent with them, often enjoyed looking at family pictures and writing to their loved ones, reading quietly, and when given the opportunity to engage in physical exercise (i.e., basketball, weightlifting, jogging, etc.) found these types of things to be helpful. Additionally, a major complaint rendered by inmates to the researcher was the lack of and/or availability of current reading materials and too little opportunity for physical exercise.

Part Two: Analyses of Data

As has been mentioned earlier, the data analyzed here were collected during interviews with 110 incarcerated male offenders. The material on these 110 inmates and their families consists of the responses of the husbands to structured as well as open-ended questions asked during private interviews. The information collected from the inmates included background information about themselves and their families, their financial and economic standing, basic composition and reactions of the members of these families to the inmate's imprisonment, as well as the interpersonal adjustments required, and so forth.

In analyzing the material, the first task was to code all of the qualitative data. Once a code had been established for all of the data, the amassed information was transferred to IBM cards and run through a computer.

Since a large proportion of the data presented in part one were either nominal or ordinal in nature, the largest part of the analyses involved cross tabulations, frequency counts, and the use of non-parametric tests for answering specific questions. An attempt was made by the researcher to develop a scale (the Perceptual Prison Adjustment Scale) by which to measure each family's reaction to the husband's imprisonment, the changes experienced by both the inmate and his family due to his incarceration, etc.

Throughout the analyses the coded data were used and additionally, this information was further substanti-

ated by the personal comments and statements recorded during the interviews.

TESTS OF PREDICTED HYPOTHESES

Central to this research was the generation of two specific hypotheses which were both marginally supported. They are presented below:

Hypothesis 1. Inmates whose marriages are perceived as "intact" and who experience good familial support have greater program participation than those whose marriages lack in emotional support.

This hypothesis was supported in part. It was tested using a multiple regression analyses which utilized four variables it was felt might have a significant bearing on the inmate's individual participation in prison programs. The actual recommendations (i.e., participation in Alcoholics Anonymous, Drug Counseling, Group Psychotherapy, Academic and/or Vocational Education, etc.) for each inmate is made by either a psychologist, social worker or counselor upon his initial entrance into the prison. The four variables utilized in the regression equation were GROUP (intact vs not-intact) $F=2.08$, $p < .07$, the amount of OUTSIDE CONTACT maintained via mail or visits with the inmate during his incarceration $F=2.53$, $p < .05$, his responses to the amount of FAMILIAL SUPPORT (both emotional and financial) received during his incarceration $F=.14$ NS, and his responses to the Locke-Wallace FAMILY-CHANGE questionnaire $F=.90$ NS. There was marginal significance with 4, 64 degrees of freedom suggesting that the importance of whether or not an inmate was involved in an intact marital relationship, the degree to which he regularly received mail or visits while incarcerated,

and his perceptions of whether his family provided emotional and/or financial support cannot be understated because it does appear to impact upon his active participation in prison programs recommended to better assist him in his adjustment.

Hypothesis 2. Inmates whose marital relationships are described as "intact" (good) receive fewer misconduct reports (tickets) than those whose marriages are "not-intact" (not good).

This hypothesis was supported in that there was a tendency for those inmates who perceived their marriages as being intact to receive fewer tickets or misconduct reports than those whose marriages are not-intact and for single inmates. A t-test was performed and yielded the following values $t(80) = 1.95$, $p < .06$. Table 21 show the mean number of tickets received by group.

TABLE 21.--Mean Number of Tickets Received by Inmate Groups

Groups	# Tickets Received
Intact	1.31
Not-Intact	3.72
Single	2.95

The data presented in the above table certainly lends itself to the idea that for prison personnel interested in maintaining "the smooth flow of prison

operations" to ignore the influence of an inmate's wife and family on his mental attitude toward his incarceration may prove costly beyond our belief.

Additionally, a discriminant analysis (SPSS, 1975) was used to further analyze the relationship between the demographic characteristics and the criterion variables. Discriminant analysis allows a researcher to statistically distinguish between two or more groups of cases. To distinguish between the groups, the researcher selects a collection of "discriminating variables" that measure those characteristics on which the groups are expected to differ. In the present research, seven variables were chosen on which it was felt the two groups (intacts, not-intacts would differ. The seven variables were as follows: PROGRAM PARTICIPATION (actual number of prison programs partcipated in); TICKETS (number of tickets received); LOCKE-WALLACE(responses to family-change scale); OUTSIDE CONTACT (amount of mail and/or visits received); FAMILIAL SUPPORT (responses to question #20 on PPAQ developed by the researcher); EFFFAM (responses to questions #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, on family change scale); and LFSEX (responses to questoons #7, 10, 14, 15 on family change scale). The scores for these variables were used to discriminate between variables. These scores were computed and scored during the principal component procedure. The criterion by which independent variables, discriminating variables, were selected for inclusion in the discriminant analysis was WILKS LAMBDA. When the method for inclusion is WILKS LAMBDA, the criteria is the "overall multivariate" F ratio for the test of differences among the group controls. The variables which

maximize the F ratio also minimizes WILKES LAMBDA, or measure of group discrimination. WILKS LAMBDA also takes into consideration the differences between all the centroids and homogeneity within the groups (SPSS, 1975). In order to determine which variables (discriminating variables) did in fact discriminate between groups, the significance of change in the Raos V was used. If the significance level was less than or equal to .05 that variable would be seen as discriminating between the two groups.

There were four primary components that discriminated between those who had intact marital relationships and those who did not. The four discriminating variables were PROGRAM PARTICIPATION F=.022, OUTSIDE CONTACT F=.529, FAMILIAL SUPPORT F=.524, and EFFECTS OF INCARCERATION ON FAMILY F=.483. (WILKS LAMBDA = .5523, CHI SQUARE =33.532, df=7, $p < .0001$. Thus, the profile of the group who had intact marriages tended to participate in those prison programs receommended for them, maintained regular contact their wives and families, received emotional and financial support from their families, and had families whose lifestyles were adversely affected financially and socially due to their incarceration. They also experienced sexual longings for their spouses. The above stated prediction function correctly classified overall 80 percent of inmates. It was better at correctly classifying 91.4 percent of the intact group and 66.7 percent of the not-intact group.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The present study attempted to explore the impact of marital stability and good familial support on the incarcerated male offender's participation in prison programs and prison misconduct. More specifically, this study investigated the differential effects of an inmate's marital stability and the amount of familial support received on participation in recommended prison programs and the number of tickets (major misconducts) the inmate received during his incarceration. Coping strategies utilized by both the inmates and their families were also explored. In an effort to discuss the importance and implications of these findings, highlights of the demographic characteristics and the researcher's interpretation of perceived needs are presented. Thus, this discussion section will be divided into three parts: (1) the demographic characteristics of the incarcerated male offenders and their families; (2) the researcher's interpretation of needs in view of tests of the hypotheses; and (3) the implications of this study for future research.

CHARACTERISTICS OF INMATES AND THEIR FAMILIES

A primary objective of this research was to collect a survey of data regarding married inmates' experiences as a result of their forced separation, in addition to information on the inmates' wives and fam-

ilies as they struggled to cope with his absence.

For this sampled group, it was found that the married inmates were young adult Blacks and Whites with low socio-economic status, who had approximately a twelth grade education, and had less than one child per couple. They presently were serving a sentence for a "property-type" offense, and had served at least one prior prison term. While in large part this group was representative of the adult inmate population nationwide, there were some surprises.

One surprising finding of this research was the revelation that a majority of the inmates sampled had either completed high school or earned the general equivalency diploma (GED). The national average for an inmate's educational attainment is approximately the eighth grade. Another surprising finding was the low number of children conceived by incarcerated fathers -- contrary to the widespread misconception that these men with criminal tendencies are promiscuous, impregnating and subsequently abandoning to the "welfare culture" every woman with whom they become intimate. Perhaps the sensitivity with which the sampled fathers spoke of their children was in part due to the lower father-child ratio; and in as much as the majority of couples had less than one child per family, there may have been increased opportunity for the inmate father to become closer to his offspring. While several studies have been conducted on the children of incarcerated parents (Blackwell, 1959; Morris, 1965; Zalba, 1964; Burkhart, 1973; Adler, 1975; Glick, 1977; Stanton, 1980) all of these

have focused on women inmates with the exception of Blackwell (1959) and Morris (1965).

A less surprising finding was there was a high percentage of black males in the sample (63 percent), even though the percentage of Blacks residing in the State is less than 10 percent. Also consistent with expectations was that the sample who were from the lower socio-economic strata contained a large percentage of respondents who were serving sentences for property-type offenses such as burglary, larceny, and breaking and entering. This pattern is in keeping with results obtained by other researchers (Glick, 1977; Simon, 1975) and national statistics (Uniform Crime Reports, 1980) which show a greater incidence of property type offenses by both male and female offenders.

Based on previous literature compiled on the incarcerated male offender, the remaining findings also were expected --i.e., statistics regarding the ages of the sampled population, the prior incarcerations and commitments, living situation prior to incarceration, and employment history (or lack thereof), etc.

INTERPRETATION OF NEEDS

In view of the exploratory nature of this research, a survey technique was used to provide answers to two hypotheses. The first of these hypotheses outlined an expected relationship between the influence of good familial support and an inmate's increased desire to participate in those prison programs recommended for him prior to his release. The second hypothesis was

an expectation that good familial relations would impact positively upon an inmate and, thus, increase his desire to return swiftly to his family without the possibility of getting more time added on to his prison sentence because of major prison misconduct (tickets). Both hypotheses were at least supported.

Separation from family and children has been reported to be one of the most difficult aspects of incarceration (Ward and Kassenbaum, 1965; Burkhart, 1973). Once incarcerated, visitation is the one means by which inmates can try to maintain some semblance of a relationship with their wives and families. The presence and maintenance of strong family ties is seen by many to be a very critical factor in an inmate's successful adjustment after release. Certainly one of the serious effects of confining persons convicted of crimes is the resulting destruction of family relationships (Morris, 1965). It has long been documented empirically that the existence of a supportive relationship is one of the few factors that can have an affirmative influence on recidivism (Glasser, 1964; Holt and Miller, 1972; N. Morris, 1974). While the results of the present research are consistent with this general notion, they extended it by showing a positive impact between good family ties and participation in prison activities while still incarcerated and prior to release from the institution.

The American Correctional Association in one of its most recent Manuals (6.2 pg 542) has stated that "the members of the inmate's family should be permitted

and encouraged to maintain close contact with the inmate, not only to help his morale while serving a sentence but to sustain family life, ensure close ties after release, and assist in the inmate's institutional adjustment, giving him encouragement and helping him keep in touch with the outside world in a practical way."

This researcher maintains, as does numerous others in the field, that conviction and criminal punishment should not destroy familial relationships. Also, in as much as prisons will continue to exist for the foreseeable future, in part because of what Morris and Zimring (1969, p. 138) refer to as "the four horsemen of political inaction: inertia, irresponsibility, ignorance and cost," the results of the present study suggests that it would be foolish to ignore the impact of familial support and its ameliorative effects on prison misconduct.

Noted criminologists John Irwin and Donald Cressey (1962) posited a similar thesis in their emphasis on the fact that the patterns of inmate behavior and culture are determined primarily less by prison conditions (rigid organizational structure, banality, etc.) than factors associated with the prisoner's background in the community. In the years since their article appeared, a number of other observers have published studies which support the view that preinstitutional behavior patterns are the crucial determinants of behavior inside prison (Cline, 1968; Schwartz, 1971; Jacobs, 1974). The present study, in which pre-incarceration familial relationships were explored also adds to this body of literature.

Furthermore, in recognizing that no matter what other goals prisons have attempted to achieve from time to time -- be it, for example, to reform prisoners or to earn money with convict labor -- two tasks have always been their primary responsibility: preventing escapes and maintaining internal order. It is the latter of these two on which this study focused.

There are few who would claim that in the complete absence of supervision and control, the inmate population would live harmoniously within the walls of the prison. However, much criticism has been directed against the apparent triviality of many regulations which seem to have no other purpose than the domination of the prisoners for the sake of domination alone. Prison custodians, on the other hand, adamantly disagree and maintain that in large part these regulations are needed for control, given the ratio of inmates to staff is so very large. (At Jackson Prison, the ratio of inmates to guards is approximately six to one.)

This is to say that even a moment's escape from surveillance, from the perspective of the custodial staff, provides the inmate with an opportunity to perform a variety of serious, illegal acts. For indeed what may be innocent enough now may prove dangerous later--as a route of exchange for cigarettes becomes a route of exchange for weapons; or gambling may lead to unpaid debts, unpaid debts may lead to a knifing, and so forth. It seems prison custodians are ever aware that they are dealing with men with proclivities toward violence and other forms of anti-social behavior, and internal order can be maintained only

if the situation that promote such behavior can be eliminated from prison life.

The present research examined the number of prison violations for married inmates and in so doing found support for her hypothesis that custodial staff would have less difficulty maintaining this internal order for a smoother flow of prison operations from those inmates whose marital relationships were positive and whose families provided much needed emotional support.

Due to the correlational nature of this research, one needs to be cautious about making causative inferences regarding relationships between family support and prison behavior. While this obtained relationship is consistent with the idea that family support fosters good prison adjustment, other possible explanations cannot, as yet, be dismissed. For example, it could be that family situation and prison behavior are associated because they both reflect level of ego functioning. These, as well as other alternative explanations, are quite feasible. Thus, while the present study establishes the "fact" of the relationship, between family support and prison conduct, it remains for future research to examine more directly the various explanations that this relationship really reflects.

TREATMENT

From the standpoint of correctional treatment, the present research also supported the hypothesis that participation in recommended prison programs (i.e., drug and/or alcohol counselling, academic and/

or vocational programs, etc.) would be enhanced for those inmates who reported good family ties and intact, stable marriages. Unless an inmate has been convicted and sentenced for a heinous crime to a lifetime of imprisonment with no chance of parole, it is reasonably certain that he will eventually be released from prison. The concept of imprisonment as "putting someone away"--with its implication of finality--which some people seem to have, is actually just an expression of their own wishes. Certainly the very communities which send men to prison have a stake, as do we all as a society, in the adequacy of prison treatment, since more often than not these men return to the same counties which sent them to prison.

In considering the findings of the present research, it may prove advantageous for prison officials to stress upon the wives and families of those who are imprisoned that they need to be more encouraging; and, if these families could help to instill in the inmates a sense that self-advancement and good citizenship were important--and could be achieved by taking advantage of opportunities for training and treatment during imprisonment--the likelihood of recidivism would be greatly lowered. Also, in as much as many prisoners' motivation for treatment, is influenced by a desire to overcome a deeply felt hurt over the separation from their loved ones, if these inmates develop strong desires to make amends and to reduce the anxieties of their loved ones, all the better for everyone.

PAROLE

Because most of the men communities send to prison will be released once again into those very same communities, a discussion of parole is relevant. Parole is defined as:

. . ."the act of releasing or the status of being released from a penal institution in which a criminal has served a part of his maximum sentence, on condition of maintaining good behavior and remaining in the custody and under the guidance of the institution or some other agency approved by the State until a final discharge is granted." (Sutherland and Cressey, 1974)

Parole is "conditional liberation," that is, liberation on condition that the prisoner live in accordance with specified rules. These conditions are fixed sometimes by law, sometimes by the parole board, and sometimes by other agencies. These conditions may included abstaining from intoxicating liquors and drugs, keeping away from bad associates, curfews, not changing residence or employment without permission, not being in the presence of a minor child without approved adult supervision, not marrying without permission, and/or making reparation or restitution for the crime.

PRINCIPLES AND METHODS OF SUPERVISION OF PAROLEES

There are at least three different views of supervision, differentially emphasizing punishment and treatment that are found among lay and professional parole workers. One conception, which is rapidly on the de-

cline, is based on the assumption that parole is a system of leniency which permits the early release of many dangerous criminals who should continue to suffer punishment. Consequently parole work based on this view emphasizes supervision rather than assistance, and "supervision" is taken to mean zealous "police work," "parole officer" to mean "police officer". A primary assumption here is that most parolees have not reformed and will commit new crimes if given the opportunity. The parole officer then becomes charged with the duty of keeping parolees under close surveillance and coercing the offender into conformity by means of punsihment and threats of punishment (namely the return to prison).

A second conception is based on the assumption that reformation is a matter of individual self-determination to "make good" in free society. The primary notion here being that reformation is almost complete at the time of release, and the function of the parole officer is to watch the parolee to determine whether he is maintaining the conditions fixed for his parole. This supervisory system may be viewed as "watchful waiting." Coupled with the idea that society must be protected by a careful watch over the parolee is a belief that the parolee must be protected from society. Parole officers with this approach are likely to give direct help and assistance in locating jobs or solving other problems, to lecture, and to use both praise and blame. They often believe that frequent contacts will destroy the parolee's initiative or confidence in himself.

A third conception is based on the belief that essential work of promoting adjustment has to be done after release from prison, and that this requires assistance, not to prevent the parolee from exercising his own initiative, but to assist him in exercising it correctly, so that crimes will not be repeated. This is to say that it is not assumed that all parolees are dangerous criminals, but it is recognized that "reformation" in the form of "making good" is not always sufficient to prevent recidivism. Parole thus is viewed as a system for improving the welfare of the parolee by helping him in his individual capacity. Assistance, rather than surveillance, is emphasized, on the ground that we already have police to act as surveillants and detectives. In parole work based on this conception, parole officers perform more as social workers.

Few would argue that in practice, of course, it is difficult to separate supervision and assistance of treatment and even in parole systems emphasizing assistance, the parole officer must do some policing (Cressey, 1959). Also, it should be remembered that from the parolee's point of view almost any contacts, whether one chooses to call it "assistance" or "supervision" are regarded as snooping. If the parole officer is to be of real assistance to the person on parole, he should have an intimate acquaintance with the personality and background of the offender. And it would be advantageous if this information was secured before a proper method of dealing with the offender could be determined.

In view of the present research findings it appears that if these data are utilized, the returns could prove quite propitious. We know that the information now secured through the original investigation for the institutional classification committee (the "diagnosis"), and the data on the institutional adjustment of the offender are accessible to the parole officer; however, additionally it is suggested that an effective parole officer should also have an intimate knowledge of the family and other salient groups with which the parolee will interact. These steps to familiarize the parole officer with the potential parolee's family situation ideally should be undertaken so as to prepare such groups for the parolee's return before he is actually released from the institution.

Also, in as much as the period of parole supervision will eventually end, it is important that the parole officer assist the parolee in securing friends and contacts of his own. A study conducted by Horlick (1961) of fifty inmates in the District of Columbia revealed that the men had four primary areas of concern about their release from prison on parole -- these were community acceptance, employment, family relationships, and relationships with police and parole officers. The primary goal is to assist the parolee in adjusting to society. Of course, this is much easier said than done, since the criminal justice system up to this point in the prisoner's life has done much to convince him that he is an outcast; but, in face of the author's and other's research regarding the importance of familial support and its ameliorative effects on

the inmate's outlook, it is imperative that parole agents across the country consider such variables as they aim to assist released prisoners in their readjustment.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The most important finding in the author's research was that family ties and emotional support does relate positively to the inmate's participation in prison programs and negatively to his prison misconduct. Another salient feature of the research was that prior to their incarceration, a majority of inmates had been contributing financially to their respective households, and the effects of monetary losses did create hardship on the family's ability to maintain an adequate standard of living.

In as much as no research is without its limitations, this research was also limited by at least three factors. The first of these was the sample size. A larger sample size might have made the analyses, particularly the discriminant function, more meaningful and perhaps more generalizable. However, given the time involved and lack of funding available for inceasing the size of the sample, this was not feasible.

A second limitation of the research was that initially the researcher envisioned being allowed to interview inmates from each of the various cell blocks chosen randomly from a list of all inmates confined to Jackson Prison, however, due to a lack of security personnel, this was not a viable procedure and the men were all interviewed while housed in the prison's Reception and Guidance Center.

Another limitation was the partial use of self-report and archival data. Archival data were used to collect only the offense history of the inmate, his marital

status, and the amount of time he had served on his sentence. However, not much focus was given to the offense history of the inmate, nor to the amount of time served. Much criticism has been directed against using both self-report data as well as archival data, particularly in the area of corrections. Having recognized the tendency of some inmates to "put their best foot forward" while participating in this, and perhaps other research, it should be noted that the quality of data derived from interview respondents was quite good. Even taking into account the number of "false positives" (those inmates who reported intact marriages but whose relationships were not-intact), any biases in this direction would not have resulted in achievement of the expected relationships. Despite criticism levied against the use of self-report data, it should be pointed out that many policy level decisions are made utilizing this very type of information. Therefore, the usefulness of this method of data resource should be taken seriously.

Certainly in terms of the author's findings, which found some support for her hypothesis that family ties and emotional support does relate positively to inmate participation in prison programs and negatively to his prison misconduct, the implications are that this information could prove quite useful in the development of specific programs with the prison, as well as for those interested community agents. Also further research may be generated to identify specific ways in which families contribute to the aim of greater participation in recommended prison programs and reductions in prison misconduct.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH

APPENIDX A

EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH

Hello:

You are being asked to participate in a research study designed to look at the means by which you cope with being locked up at Jackson Prison. I will also ask you questions about how you feel your wife and family are getting along without you while you are imprisoned.

The purpose of the study is to identify some of the things you do to help you "do your time" and also to learn about some of the changes you have experienced since being here at Jackson. Hopefully, this study will help develop programs within the prison which may help out in this regard.

All of your responses to this interview are confidential and it is hoped that you will be as frank and open as possible.

APPENDIX B

RESEARCH PARTICIPATION FORM

APPENDIX B

RESEARCH PARTICIPATION FORM

Consent Form

1. I have freely consented to take part in the study being conducted by: Cosandra I. Douglas
   under the supervision of: Lawrence A. Messe, Ph.D.
   Academic Title: Professor of Psychology, M.S.U.

2. The study has been explained to me and I understand the explanation that has been given to me and what my participation will involve.

3. I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation in the study at any time without penalty.

4. I understand that the results of the study will be treated in strict confidence and that I will remain anonymous. Within these restrictions, results of the study will be made available to me at my request.

5. I understand that my participation in the study does not guarantee any beneficial results to me.

6. I understand that, at my request, I can receive additional explanation of the study after my participation is completed.

_____

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION AND DATA SHEET

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION AND DATA SHEET

AGE	1. Inmate 2. Wife 3. Children	_____ _____ _____
RACE _____		_____ _____ _____ _____
Marital Status	1. Married 2. Single 3. Divorced 4. Widowed 5. Separated	_____
Education (in years)	1. Inmate 2. Wife	_____ _____
#Times Changed Address(Wife)		_____
Area Inmate Arrested(Cty)	1. Wayne/Oakld 2. Genesse 3. Kent 4. Ingham 5. Other	_____ _____ _____ _____ _____
#Years lived in Area of Arrest	1. Inmate 2. Wife	_____ _____
Length of Present Marriage	Month Year	_____
Length of Acquaintance before Marriage	_____ _____	_____
#Previous Marriages	1. Inmate 2. Wife	_____ _____
#Separations During Current Marriage		_____
#Times Arrested Since Present Marriage		_____
Length of Current Sentence	Month Year	_____

Record 1
ID# ____

Time Served on Present Sentence ____ ____ ____ ____

#Prison Terms Served ____

Offense of Current Sentence
1. Person Offense
2. Property Offense
3. Drug Offense
4. Sex Offense
5. Other
____

Present Source of Family Income
1. Welfare (ADC)
2. Wife Working
3. Combination 1/2
4. Social Security
5. Disability
6. Other
____

Present Custody of Children
1. Wife
2. Court
3. Relatives
4. Other
____

	(1) Yes	(2) No	
Does Family Rent Apartment?	____	____	____
Does Family Own Home? Value of Equity	____	____	$____
Did Family Own Home at Time of Arrest?	____	____	____
Did Family Rent Home at Time of Arrest?	____	____	____

Monthly Household Income Before Incarceration (Combined) $____

Monthly Household Income After Incarceration (Combined) $____

Occupation Before Incarceration (Inmate) ____
1. Unemployed
2. Unskilled
3. Semi-skilled
4. Skilled
5. Professional
____

Occupation Before Incarceration (Wife) ____ (From Above) ____

Wife's Occupation Following Inmate's Incarceration ____ (From Above) ____

	(1) just	(2) unjust	
Attitude Toward Current Prison Sentence (Inmate)	____	____	____
Attitude Toward Current Prison Sentence (Wife)	____	____	____

Estimate of Amt of Contact w/Wife by mail or visits ____

1. None
2. Once or twice yearly
3. Once a month
4. Twice mthly
5. Once a week or oftener

Number of Misconduct Reports Received by Inmate ____

Number of Programs Rec'md for Inmate ____

Actual Number of Programs Inmate Has Participated In ____

APPENDIX D

FAMILY - CHANGE SCALE

Record 2
ID# ____

FAMILY-CHANGE SCALE

1. To what extent did your wife and family lose or gain friends since you came to Jackson?

   A. Wife

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
gained many friends	gained some friends	have the same number of friends	lost some friends	lost many friends

   B. Children

2. How have your relatives reacted to your being sent to Jackson?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
They are much more helpful or friendly now.	They are a little more helpful or friendly now.	They are about the same as before.	They are less helpful or friendly now.	They are much less helpful or friendly now.

3. Compared to before your incarceration, to what extent is your family being insulted because of you since your arrival at Jackson?

   A. Wife

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Not at all.	A little less now.	About the same as before.	A little more now.	Much more now.

   B. Children

4. Compared to before your incarceration, how often do you feel your family avoids people or places now that you are at Jackson?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Not at all.	A little less now.	About the same as before.	A little more now.	Much more now.

5. Compared to before your incarceration, how often do you feel your family is embarrassed because of your being here at Jackson?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Not at all.	A little less now.	About the same as before.	A little more now.	Much more now.

6. Compared to before your incarceration, how often do you feel embarrassed about your life's plight?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Not at all.	A little less now.	About the same as before.	A little more now.	Much more now.

7. Since you came to Jackson how has your family's income changed?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
It is much more now.	It is a little more now.	It is about the same as before.	It is a little less now.	It much less now.

8. How has the condition of the family home changed since you came to Jackson?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
It is much better now.	It is a little better now.	It is about the same as before.	It is not quite as good now.	It is not nearly as good.

9. Has the family experienced a change of cars since you came to Jackson?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Now have a car before we didn't.	Have a nicer car now.	Have the same, similar, or still no car.	Car have now is not quite good.	No longer have a car.

10. Has your family's life-style (food, clothing, etc.) canged much since you came to Jackson?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
It is much better now.	It is a little better now.	It is about the same as before.	It is not quite as good as now.	It is not nearly as good as now.

11. How often do you experience wishing that you could show love and affection toward your wife now that you're at Jackson?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Much less frequently now.	Less frequently now.	About the same as before.	A little more frequently now.	Much more frequently now.

12. How much do you miss having sexual relations with your wife now that you are here at Jackson?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Not at all.	Very little.	About as much as before.	A little more now.	Much more.

13. From your observations now that you are at Jackson, how much do you think other inmates find themselves attracted to other men now that they are locked up in prison?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Never	Less often.	About as often as before.	A little more often.	Much more often.

14. If conjugal visits (explain) were allowed in the prison and baby sitters and transportation for your wife to the prison were furnished, how often do you think your wife would like to have these visits?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Never.	Once or twice a year.	Once a month.	Twice a month.	Once a week or oftener.

15. If conjugal visits (explain) were allowed in the prison and babysitters and transportation for your wife to the prison were furnished, how often do you think you would like to have these visits?

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Never.	Once or twice a year.	Once a month.	Twice a month.	Once a week or oftener.

APPENDIX E

LOCKE-WALLACE SHORT MARITAL ADJUSTMENT TEST

LOCKE-WALLACE SHORT MARITAL ADJUSTMENT TEST

1. Circle the dot on the line scale below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your marriage before the present separation caused by incarceration. The middle point, "happy" represents the degree of happiness which most people get from marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience exteme joy in marriage.

0	2	7	15	20	25	35

State the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement experienced between you and your wife on the following items.

AA = Always Agreed
AAA = Almost Always Agreed
OD = Occasionally Disagreed
FD = Frequently Disagreed
AAD = Almost Always Disagreed
AD = Always Disagreed

2. Handling Family Finances

(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	(0)	
AA	AAA	OD	FD	AAD	AD	____

3. Matters of Recreation

AA AAA OD FD AAD AD ____

4. Demonstration of Affection

AA	AAA	OD	FD	AAD	AD	
8	6	4	2	1	0	____

5. Friends

AA AAA OD FD AAD AD ____

6. Conventionality (right and proper conduct)

AA AAA OD FD AAD AD ____

7. Sex Relations

AA	AAA	OD	FD	AAD	AD	
15	12	9	4	1	0	____

8. Philosophy of Life

AA	AAA	OD	FD	AAD	AD	
						____

9. Ways of Dealing With In-Laws

AA	AAA	OD	FD	AAD	AD	
						____

10. When disagreements arose, did they usually result in: ____

1. Husband giving in (0)
2. Wife giving in (2)
3. Agreement by mutual give and take (10)

11. Did you and your wife engage in outside interests together? ____

1. All of them (10)
2. Some of them (8)
3. Very few of them (3)
4. None of them (0)

12. In leisuretime (freetime) did <u>you</u> generally prefer to be:

1. "On the go"
2. To stay at home ____

In leisuretime (freetime) did <u>your wife</u> prefer to be:

1. "On the go"
2. To stay at home ____

(Stay at home for both, 10 pts; "on the go" for both, 3 pts; disagree, 2 pts)

13. Prior to the separation caused by the present situation (incarceration) did you ever wish you had not married your present wife?

1. Frequently (0)
2. Occasionally (3)
3. Rarely (8) ____
4. Never (15)

14. If you had your life to live over prior to the present situation (separation caused by incarceration), do you think you would have:

    1. Married the same person (15)
    2. Married a different person (0)
    3. Not married at all (1)

    _____

15. How often did you confide in your wife:

    1. Almost Never (0)
    2. Rarely (2)
    3. In most things (10)
    4 In everything (10)

    _____

APPENDIX F

PERCEPTUAL PRISON ADJUSTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

PERCEPTUAL PRISON ADJUSTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How much has your family's income changed since you have been incarcerated at Jackson? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
It is much more now.	It is a little more now.	It is about the same as before.	It is a little less now.	It is much less now.

2. To what extent are you bothered by the change in status of your family's income now that you are incarcerated at Jackson? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.
It bothers me a great deal.	It bothers me somewhat.	It rarely bothers me.	It doesn't bother me at all.

3. If your wife is working, do you know who cares for the children during her working hours? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Inappli-cable	Day-Care	Relatives	Friends	Other

4. Do your children know that you are in prison? _____

1.	2.
Yes	No

5. If not, where do they think you are? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Out-of-town work-ing.	Out-of-town at rel-atives.	In jail	Parents' Separated	Other

6. Do you enjoy having your children visit you in prison? _____

1.	2.
Yes	No

7. Are you aware of any behavioral problems your wife is currently experiencing with your children? _____

1.	2.
Yes	No

If yes, please explain.

8. Has it been necessary for your wife or children to seek medical/psychiatric treatment since your incarceration? _____

1.	2.
Yes	No

9. Are you aware of your wife seeking greater support (both psychological and/or financial) from family members? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.
Inmate's Relatives.	Wife's Relatives.	Both	Neither

10. Since your incarceration at Jackson, how do you cope mentally being away from loved ones? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Makes mind up to do time.	Tries to think of happier times.	Tries not to think about often	I often get depressed.	Combin.

11. Since your incarceration at Jackson, what kinds of physical activities have you found helps you to cope with being locked up? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Engage in physical exercise.	Reads Bible.	Look at pics of loved ones.	Writes to loved ones.	Raps with fellow inmate.	Other

12. What kinds of things do you do to help rid yourself of the "blues" that often accompany being locked up? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Engage in physical exercise.	Reads Bible.	Look at pics of loved ones.	Writes to loved ones.	Raps with fellow inmate.	Other

13. Is there any particular time that you feel blue most? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Just before bedtime.	Following a visit.	On holidays.	Special Birthdays.	Other.

14. Since your incarceration at Jackson, what is your most serious and pressing concern following general "survival" and getting out? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Employment.	Adjustment to family.	Appeals	Re-establishmt of social ties.	Other.

15. Since your incarceration at Jackson, what do you think is your wife's most serious and pressing concern? ____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Financial matters.	Getting her social & sexual needs met.	Husband's re-involmt in crime.	Is husband to leave her upon his release.	Other.

16. How often do you and your wife discuss her dating other men? ____

1.	2.	3.
Never discuss.	Seldom/ sometimes discuss.	Frequently discuss.

17. Since your incarceration at Jackson, how do you think your wife is coping with her sexual needs? ____

1.	2.	3.
They are being met.	She is abstaining.	Don't discuss.

18. If you and your wife were ever separated before this imprisonment, what was the primary reason for the separation (s)? ____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Infidelity of inmate.	Infidelity of wife.	Financial troubles.	Disagreement about choice of friends.	Other.

19. How would you characteristize your marriage? ____

1.	2.
Intact.	Not intact.

20. During your incarceration at Jackson, how would you characterize the amount of overall support (both psychological and financial) given to you by your wife and/or loved ones? ____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Much more than expected.	More than expected.	About average.	Much less than expected.	Less than expected.

21. In your effort to keep emotional ties alive, what do you do most often? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Writes or calls loved ones.	Sends cards.	Makes hobbycraft items.	Other.	Combina.

22. To what extent do you discuss your difficulties in dealing with the "pains of imprisonment" with fellow inmates? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
To a great degree.	More than average.	Average.	Almost never.	Never.

23. When you are feeling especially "low" do you feel there is any prison personnel to whom you can turn? _____

1.	2.
Yes	No.

24. If yes, whom of the following have you found most sympathetic to your problems? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Fellow inmates.	Counselors.	Psyc's.	Chaplain	Other.

25. From what you have observed since your incarceration at Jackson, what do fellow inmates do most often after receiving "bad" news (i.e., a Dear John letter, etc.) _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Engage in violence.	Have a homosexual experience.	Smoke a "joint".	Stay locked up all day.	Other.

26. Since your incarceration at Jackson, how have you handled yourself if you had a "bad time" with a prison official? _____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Got in fight.	Talked it out.	Wrote a grievance.	Wrote home.	Other.

27. On those occasions when you experience a "rotten day" how often do you think of the negative consequences of prolonging your stay at Jackson by acting out some illicit behavior? ____

1.	2.	3.	4.
Very often.	Often.	Seldom.	Never.

28. Which of the following best characterizes your feelings about fellow inmates? ____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Just trying to "get over".	Not to be trusted.	Trustworthy.	Doing his "own time".	Other.

29. Which of the following best characterizes your feelings towards the guards? ____

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Untrustworthy.	Trustworthy.	Just doing his job.	Basically hostile.	Caring.

LIST OF REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Anderson, Nancy. "When Father Goes to Gaol." Victorian Council of Social Service. Melbourne, Australia, 1965.

Biegel, A. and Russell, M. "Suicidal Behavior in Jail: Prognostic Considerations." B. Danto (ed.). Jail House Blues. Orchard Lake, Michigan: Epic Books, 1973.

Blackwell, James E. "The Effects of Involuntary Separation on Selected Families of Men Committed to Prison from Spokane County, Washington." Unpublished PH.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, State College of Washington, 1959.

Bloodgood, Ruth. Welfare of Prisoners' Families in Kentucky. U.S. Department of Labor, Children's Bureau. (Bureau Publication No. 182) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1928.

Burgess, Ernest W., and Locke, Harvey J. The Family from Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Company, 1945.

Carter, Robert, Daniel Glaser and L. Wilkins (eds.). Correctional Institutions. Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1972.

Cavan, Ruth S., and Zemans, Eugene A. "Marital Relationships of Prisoners in Twenty-eight Countries," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, XLIX, No. 1 (July-August, 1958), 133-139.

Clemmer, Donald. The Prison Community. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1958.

Clemmer, Donald. "Observations on Imprisonment as a Source of Criminality," Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, XLI (September-October, 1950), 311-319.

Cline, Hugh and Wheeler, Stanton. "The Determinants of Normative Patterns in Correctional Institutions." In Nils Christie, ed. Scandanavian Studies in Criminology: Aspects of Social Control in Welfare States. Scandanavian University Books, 2: pp173-183, 1968.

Cloward, Richard A., et. al. Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison. New York, Social Science Research Council, 1960.

Cressey, Donald R. The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Cressey, Donald R. "Professioaal Correctional Work and Professional Work in Corrections," National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 5: 1-15, January, 1959.

Danto, B. "Suicide at the Wayne County Jail: 1967-1970." B. Danto (ed.) Jail House Blues. Orchard Lake, Michigan: Epic Books, 1973.

Duffy, Clinton T. "A Frank Discussion of the Prison Problem Nobody Talks About," This Week Magazine (October 21, 1962), 8-12.

Eaton, Joseph W. Stone Walls Not a Prison Make: The Anatomy of Planned Administrative Change. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1962.

Esparza, R. "Attempted and Committed Suicide in County Jails." B. Danto (ed.) Jail House Blues. Orchard Lake, Michigan: Epic Books, 1973.

Fenton, Norman. The Prisoner's Family. Palo Alto, Calif.: Pacific Books, 1959.

Fogel, David. "We Are the Living Proof." Anderson, 1975.

Forst, M. "Effects of Determinant Sentencing on Prison Disciplinary Procedures and Inmate Inmate Misconduct." Unpublished Manuscript, 1980.

Fox, Vernon. The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, "Prison Disciplinary Problems". John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

Gibbs, J.J. "Violence in Prison: Its Extent, Nature and Consequences." Critical Issues in Corrections, St. Paul, MN pp110-149, 1981.

Gillin, John L. Taming the Criminal. New York: MacMillan Company, 1931.

Glasser, Daniel. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1964.

Goode, William J., and Hatt, Paul L. Methods in Social Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952.

Griffieth, Winnie R. "Reintegration -- Need Assessment of Female Offenders Being Released from Incarceration." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, 1980.

Hawkins, Gordon. The Prison: Policy and Practice. University of Chicago Press, 1976.

Heffernan, Ester. Making It In Prison: The Square, The Cool, and the Life. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972.

Heilig, S. "Suicide in Jails: A Preliminary Study in Los Angeles County." B. Danto (ed.) Jail House Blues. Orchard Lake, Michigan: Epic Books, 1973.

Hillery, George A. Communal Organizations: A Study of Local Societies. Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1968, p. 144.

Hopper, Columbus. "The Conjugal Visit at Mississippi State Penitentiary," The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, LIII (September, 1962), pp. 340-344.

Hopper, Columbus. Sex in Prison: The Mississippi Experiment with Conjugal Visiting. Louisiana State University Press, 1969.

Irwin, John. Prisons in Turmoil. Lttle Brown Press, 1980.

Irwin, John. The Felon. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Irwin, John, and Cressey, Donald. "Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture," Social Problems 10, (Fall, 1962): pp 145-147.

Jacobs, James. "Street Gangs Behind Bars." Social Problems, 21: pp395-409, 1974.

Kalinich, David B. The Inmate Economy. Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath and Co., 1980.

Komarovsky, Mirra. The Unemployed Man and His Family. New York, The Dryden Press, 1940, pp. 74-77.

Leinwand, Gerald. Prisons: Problems of American Society. Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1972.

Locke, Harvey J., and Wallace, Karl M. "Short Marital Adjustment and Prediction Tests: Their Reliability and Validity," Marriage and Family Living, XXI (August, 1959), pp. 251-255.

McCord, William, and cCord, Joan. Psychopathy and Delinquency. New York, Grune and Stratton, 1956.

McCorkle, Lloyd W., and Korn, Richard R. The Sociology of Punishment and Correction, "Resocialization Within Walls". John Wiley and Sons., Inc., 1962.

McGowan, Brenda and Blumenthal, Karen. Why Punish the Children?. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1978.

Morris, Norval. The Future of Imprisonment. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Morris, N. and Zimring, F. "Deterrence and Corrections." Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1969, pp.137-146, Vol. 381.

Morris, Pauline. Prisoners and Their Families. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1965.

Murton, Thomas. The Dilemma of Prison Reform. Praeger, 1976.

Nie, N.H. SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York, McGraw Hill, Inc., 1975.

Ohlin, Lloyd, Piven, Herman, and Pappenfort, Donald. "Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole," National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 2: pp211-225, July, 1956.

Parisi, Nicolette. Coping With Imprisonment. Beverly Hills, Sage Publications, Inc., 1982.

Propper, Alice M. Prison Homosexuality. Lexington, Massachusetts, D.C. Heath and Co., 1981

Reckless, Walter. The Crime Problem. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955, pp. 428-429.

Rector, Milton G. "Factors in Measuring Recidivism as Presented in Annual Reports," National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 4: pp218-232, July, 1958.

Roebuck, Julian. "A Critique of 'Thieves, Convicts and the Inmate Culture'," Social Problems 11 (Fall, 1963): pp193-201.

Sacks, Jerome G. "The Social and Economic Adjustments of the Families of a Selected Group of Imprisoned Felons." Unpublished Master's thesis, School of Social Work, Catholic University of America, 1938.

Schneller, Donald P. The Prisoner's Family: A Study of The Effects of Imprisonment on the Families of Prisoners. San Francisco, CA: R & E Research Associates, 1976.

Schwartz, Barry. "Pre-Instiutional vs Situational Influence in a Correctional Community." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science. Vol. 62 (1971): pp532-542.

Stanton, Ann M. When Mothers Go to Jail. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co., 1980.

Sutherland, E.H. and Cressey, D.R. Criminology. New York, J.B. Lippincott Co., 1974.

Sutherland, Edwin H. The Professional Thief. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1937.

Swan, L. Alex. Families of Black Prisoners: Survival and Progress. Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1981.

Sykes, Gresham. The Society of Captives. Princeton, 1958.

Tappan, Paul W. The Legal Rights of Prisoners. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, May 1954, pp.99-111.

Tittle, Charles, and Tittle, Drollene. "Structural Handicaps to Therapeutic Participations: A Case Study", Social Problems 13 (Summer 1965):81.

Tittle, Charles, and Tittle, Drollene. "Social Organization of Prisoners: An Empirical Test", Social Forces 43 (December 1964): pp216-221.

Toch, Hans. Living in Prison. Free Press, 1977.

United States Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Uniform Crime Reports. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Waller, I. Men Released From Prison. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

Wright, Martin. Making Good: Prison, Punishment and Beyond. Great Britain: The Anchor Press, Ltd., 1982.

Zalba, Serapio R. Women Prisoners and Their Families. Los Angeles: Delmar Publishing Co., Inc., 1964.

Zemans, Eugene S., and Cavan, Ruth S. "Marital Relationships in the United States," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, XLIII (May-June 1958), pp50-57.