Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

Volume 62 | Issue 4 Article 12

1972

Pre-Institutional vs. Situational Influence in a Correctional Community

Barry Schwartz

THE JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE
Vol. 62, No. 4

Printed in U.S.A.

CRIMINOLOGY

PRE-INSTITUTIONAL VS. SITUATIONAL INFLUENCE IN A CORRECTIONAL COMMUNITY

BARRY SCHWARTZ*

THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE PRISON—COMPETING MODES OF ANALYSIS

This report deals with the problem of the inmate's pre-prison and current prison experiences and their differential impact on his behavior. Disproportionate emphasis has been placed on prison experiences as a determinant of prison behavior. As Irwin and Cressey point out:

> In the growing literature on the social organization of correctional institutions it has become common to discuss 'prison culture' in terms suggesting that the behavior systems of various types of inmates stem from the conditions of imprisonment themselves. . . . [t]here has been a glossing over of the older notion that inmates may bring a culture with them into prison.[1]

Roebuck, on the other hand, in criticizing Irwin and Cressey on empirical (rather than analytic) grounds, has tried to demonstrate that all inmate roles are organized around adaptational problems.[2] His thesis, however, completely overlooks the basic feature of the Irwin-Cressey argument: the distinction between inmate behavior as an imported and an adaptive entity. What is important is the theoretical and methodological implications of this distinction rather than its particular application.

There are two theories of inmate organization and change: the "indigenous influence theory" and what might be called the "cultural drift theory." The indigenous influence theory asserts that social structural features or patterns of interaction endemic to the prison, rather than the attributes of the inhabitants themselves, determine a prison's rehabilitative or criminalizing potential. By contrast, cultural drift theorists hold that because all members of the inmate community have exhibited persistent criminal behavior, antisocial values which they share before imprisonment are brought with them into the prison setting. As a result, variations in prisoner perspectives in different penal institutions or among various groups within a single institution may depend on the hardness and criminality of the particular inmate population found in those institutions rather than on the different patterns of interaction by which those institutions are characterized.

The indigenous influence theory depicts the prison as an "homogenizing setting" [3] wherein individual differences among inmates are levelled. Gresham Sykes and Sheldon Messinger are among the major exponents of this theoretical tradition. They argue that the inmate suffers psychologically from a variety of frustrations which are indigenous to the nature of imprisonment itself. They view the inmate community as organized in response to the collective problem of mitigating such deprivations by setting up status criteria which its members can meet. These standards include solidary opposition to the prison administration and a shared refusal to become committed to the conduct and values which it prescribes.[4]

* Assistant Professor of Sociology, The University of Chicago. The author wishes to acknowledge the cooperation of Harold Novick, Superintendent of the Glen Mills Schools, and John Jennings, Director of Social Service, and his staff. The research was partly supported by NDEA (Title IV) and University of Pennsylvania Dissertation Fellowships.

[1] Irwin & Cressey, *Thieves, Convicts, and the Inmate Culture*, in THE OTHER SIDE 225 (H. Becker ed. 1964).

[2] Roebuck, *A Critique of Thieves, Convicts, and the Inmate Culture*, 11 SOCIAL PROBLEMS 193–200 (1963).

[3] The distinction between "homogenizing" and "differentiating settings" is introduced by Stanton Wheeler in his article *The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings* in O. BRIM & S. WHEELER, SOCIALIZATION AFTER CHILDHOOD 78 (1966).

[4] Sykes & Messinger, *The Inmate Social System*, in THEORETICAL STUDIES IN SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE PRISON 5–19 (R. Cloward ed. 1960). Other practitioners of this tradition include Erving Goffman, who has written at length on the "role dispossessing", *i.e.*, "stripping" and "mortifying processes" which reduce the impact of the inmate's past on his present conduct. See E. GOFFMAN, ASYLUMS 12–48 (1961). The first of these two processes is emphasized in Dornbusch, *The Military Academy as an Assimilating Institution*, 33 SOCIAL FORCES 316–21 (1955). In E. SCHEIN, COERCIVE

What is most important in the Sykes-Messinger view is that inmate behavior is immediately referrable to the inmate community and, ultimately, to the very fact of imprisonment. The cultural drift theorists, however, view the prison as a "differentiating setting" wherein individuals express the different backgrounds they bring into it. One major statement of this perspective is given by Irwin and Cressey, who suggest that different kinds of adjustment in prison, i.e., recruitment into the "thief," "convict" and "conventional" inmate cultures, may be traced back to the individual's history of previous institutionalization and criminality.[5] Similarly, Rose Giallombardo demonstrates how the patterns and content of inmate role systems may be linked to attitudes, interests and values associated with sex roles in the civil community.[6] Both Irwin and Cressey's and Giallombardo's arguments derive from Becker and Geer's distinction between "latent" and "manifest" culture. Becker and Geer claim that latent culture has its origin outside of the system in which the individual is currently a member and influences his conduct in that system. Manifest culture, however, refers to the culture that arises as a response to situational influences.[7]

Clearly, the indigenous influence theory stresses the effects of manifest culture while the cultural drift theory employs latent culture as the principal explanatory mode.[8] Clemmer incorporates both of these points of view by suggesting that offenders enter the prison with varying predispositions toward affiliation with inmate primary groups. This assimilation process intervenes between the traits that a person imports into the prison and the development there of a deviant perspective. For Clemmer the inmate society is criminalistic not because offenders must be confined together in an identity-stripping institution but because such an institution contains criminals. The prisoner can become *more* deviant, however, only when he is exposed to and assimilated into a community of men like himself.

> Most persons admitted to prison, already possess criminality in various degrees.... Presumably, the criminality which the individual brought to prison was intensified as a result of prisonization, and remained as a potential in the personality upon release.[9]

Thus, Clemmer, like Sykes and Messinger, stresses the effects of indigenous or situational processes. The basic difference between the two views is that Clemmer attends to homogenizing processes operating in the prison's informal structure while for Sykes and Messinger such processes are given in the condition of imprisonment itself.

The Problem

The two theories which we have just outlined are subject to empirical evaluation. If situational factors, like integration into prison primary groups and interaction with staff, affect inmate perspectives only so far as they are themselves influenced by attributes which the offender imports from without, we should expect to find no relationship between these factors and inmate attitudes and behavior when variation in pre-prison attributes is controlled. Such a finding would be consistent with the cultural drift theory. On the other hand, if the effect of pre-prison attributes on inmate behavior is mediated by situational processes, as Sykes, Messinger, Clemmer, and others suggest, we would expect their influence to disappear when situational processes are held constant. This result would lend support to the indigenous influence theory. Both theories would be upheld if independent effects were found for both pre-institutional and situational factors, or if the effect of some independent variables were direct and others mediated or spurious. What is important is that the relative validity of one theory as opposed to the other has

PERSUASION 117–39 (1961), however, the author subsumes both of them under the broader concept of "unfreezing" which refers to the prison's destruction, by physical as well as psychological deprivation, of the self-conception which the individual brings into prison with him. It is the unfreezing of current identity that, for Schein, is pre-suppositive of change and, at length, the "re-freezing" of a new identity through the influence of peers and captors. Another identity collapse theory is proposed in Bettelheim, *Individual and Mass Behavior in Extreme Situations* in READINGS IN SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY 308–09 (E. Maccoby ed. 1947) which views the homogenizing effects of imprisonment work in the direction of reducing the inmate to the dependent status of childhood. In all these theories the function of identity collapse is to render the inmate susceptible to influences operating within the prison.

[5] Irwin & Cressey, *supra* note 1.

[6] R. GIALLOMBARDO, SOCIETY OF WOMEN: A STUDY OF A WOMAN'S PRISON (1966).

[7] Becker & Geer, *Latent Culture: A Note on the of Latent Social Roles*, 5 AD. SCI. Q. 304–13 (1960).

[8] Other writers who have explicitly treated this kind of distinction include Wellford, *Factors Associated with Adoption of the Inmate Code: A Study of Normative Socialization*, 58 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 197–203 (1969); A Sociometric Analysis of a Correctional Community 93–137, (1969 unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania); Tittle, *Inmate Organization: Sex Differentiation and the Influence of Criminal Subculture*, 34 AM. SOCIOLOGICAL REV. 492–505 (1969).

[9] Clemmer, *Observations on Imprisonment as a Source of Criminality*, 41 J. CRIM. L.C. & P.S. 319 (1950).

direct implications for the question of whether people-changing organizations really socialize or merely serve as arenas wherein predispositions earlier acquired are acted out.

The Research Setting

This investigation was conducted in Glen Mills, a penal institution for delinquent boys who are residents of Pennsylvania. Glen Mills is located 22 miles east of Philadelphia, from which it draws most (69 percent) of its inmates. The majority of other boys come from counties surrounding Philadelphia. The correctional program is organized around academic and vocational training, and "practical" work experience. Also, a strong social work orientation is embedded in this institution's administrative structure. In general, Glen Mills corresponds very closely to the Re-Education/Development institutional model outlined by Street, Vinter, and Perrow.[10]

Measurement

In connection with a broader study,[11] background and questionnaire information were collected from 194 (out of a total of 199) inmates. Case folders provided us with 19 variables by which inmates could be characterized prior to their commitment. We shall henceforth refer to these as pre-institutional factors. (They are listed below in Table 2.) From the questionnaire data six scales were constructed all of which satisfied the Likert criterion[12] for a scale and the Guttman criteria for a quasi-scale (which correlates just as highly with an outside criterion as a perfectly reproducible scale).[13] Three of these instruments indexed our independent, situational variables and three, our dependent variables. The situational variables consisted of a number of dimensions by which inmates could be characterized during their confinement:

1. *Integration into Prison Primary Groups.* This scale consists of eight items requiring information on frequency and intensity of interaction with other inmates and willingness to "stick together" with them.

2. *Staff Orientation.* This seven item scale calls for information on degree of inmate liking, friendliness, and close relations with staff.

3. *Family Contact* involves three items indexing letters sent and received, and visits.

4. Also *Length of Confinement* (in monthly units) was ascertained for each inmate.

We shall refer to the above four variables as "situational factors."

Three dependent variables were employed to assess whether pre-institutional and situational influences may be more forceful on some levels than on others. First, prisons are often evaluated on the basis of whether they inhibit or facilitate the further development of criminal value-orientations. Indeed, Ohlin suggests that "the central task of penal administration is to affect changes in the criminal value system of the imprisoned inmates."[14] We therefore developed a *Criminal Value-Orientation Scale* consisting of fourteen items which tapped admiration of criminal exploits, cynicism regarding the real honesty of the allegedly respectable, acceptance of certain mitigating circumstances excusing criminality, effect of criminality on self-respect and the like.

Although the values to which an inmate orients himself may contribute to his being in prison, they do not directly influence his conduct there; norms perform this function more directly. Therefore, a measure of *Conformity to the Inmate Code,* similar to Wheeler's[15] index, was developed. These nine items contained hypothetical situations in which staff and inmate norms are in conflict. By endorsing hypothetical courses of action inmates were able to order themselves on this dimension.

The inmate is also faced with alternatives on the level of identity. Therefore, we constructed a *Peer Identification Scale* which consists of seven items calling for information on the respondent's psychological distance from or sense of sameness with other inmates.

For the sake of brevity, we shall refer to the dependent variables[16] collectively as inmate perspectives.[17]

[10] D. Street, R. Vinter & C. Perrow, Organization for Treatment 21 (1968).

[11] B. Schwartz, The Influence Structure of a Correctional Community, (1970 unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania).

[12] A. Edwards, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction 149–71 (1957).

[13] 4 S. A. Stouffer, L. Guttman & P. Lazarsfeld, Measurement and Prediction: Studies in Social Psychology in World War II 159–63 (1966). Computations for scaling were performed by a technique described in W. Dixon, Biomedical Computer Programs 379–89 (1968). For a complete description of these six scales, including their statistical properties, *see* Schwartz, *supra* note 11, at 299–317.

[14] L. Ohlin, Sociology and the Field of Corrections 29 (1965).

[15] Wheeler, *Socialization in Correctional Communities,* 26 Am. Sociological Rev. 697–712 (1961).

[16] It may be asserted that in a cross-sectional design

Techniques of Analysis

We analyzed our data with zero-order, partial, multiple, and multiple-partial correlation coefficients. The conceptual framework into which the independent variables were cast is incompatible with the use of regression coefficients as measures of effect. As Gordon notes, only conceptually distinct variables may be controlled.[18] The basic theoretical distinction in this investigation was between pre-institutional and situational determinants of inmate perspectives. Accordingly, variables within each of these units were considered to be in the same theoretical realm. By holding all such variables constant but one, as we do in computing regression coefficients, we expose ourselves to what Gordon calls the "partialling fallacy" whereby valid effects cancel each other out because of their covariation.[19] However, regression coefficients may be used for the limited purposes of isolating suppressed associations and showing the extent to which valid effects are not mutually cancelling. In the following tables, then, an indication will simply be made as to whether or not the regression of one variable over another is significantly different from zero.

Results

Situational Effects

In the cultural drift perspective the effect of situational factors on inmate perspectives is explained by their covariation with pre-institutional ones.[20] The latter effects, in other words, are assumed to be determinative of both situational involvement and inmate perspectives. As noted, the explanatory power of the cultural drift theory may be said to vary in proportion to reductions in the size of original zero-order correlations between these latter two sets of variables. In contrast, the indigenous influence theory becomes more compelling so far as the original relationships stand up under the pre-institutional controls imposed.

In the following table, zero-order and nineteenth-order partial correlation coefficients are presented. The functions of situational variables are therefore studied with all 19 background variables simultaneously controlled. A slash (/) indicates a significant regression coefficient with *all* variables in the equation and therefore controlled.[21]

Table 1 shows that zero-order correlations generally hold up remarkably well when 19 controls

such as ours there is no justification for designating modes of interaction as independent variables and inmate perspectives as dependently variable. To reverse this temporal ordering—or to deny that any temporal ordering exists—may seem reasonable.

There is indeed a tendency for persons to associate with those whose attitudes, opinions, and ideologies are similar to their own. It is also true, however, that persons who interact extensively and intensively with with their social surroundings tend to internalize the attitudes and opinions that prevail in them. Because this second perspective is the one from which we are working, we must show that the subjects of our investigation are, for the most part, cast together without the operation of a self-selection process.

In Glen Mills, boys are assigned to living, working, and school units (and their supervisors) on the basis of available space and not according to the desires of the boys themselves. They are also assigned by other people (cottage parents, job supervisors, and teachers) to a geographical status within the unit itself. Inmates are therefore fit into the ecology of the institution; they do not fit themselves into it.

Moreover, as demonstrated in W. Festinger, P. Schachter & H. Back, Social Pressures in Informal Groups 154 (1963), interpersonal contact is more dependent on physical proximity than on initial interpersonal attraction; therefore, it is for the most part passive or "outside the control of the people to whom it happens." To the extent that such a principle is applicable in our setting, differential association may be assumed to generate the friendships in which attitudes and values may be anchored.

Thus, in view of the restrictions on free access (to other persons) that do prevail in Glen Mills, it seems to us that inmate perspectives are far more likely to be attributable to interaction than vice-versa. These restrictions seem also to cast doubt on a functional model where no variable is designated as independent or dependent. The causal model that we have chosen, then, appears to be the most plausible of the three considered.

[17] As correctly pointed out in J. Stratton, The Measurement of Inmate Change during Imprisonment 27–42, 1963 (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois), the inmate's locations on dimensions such as these index the conventionality or deviance of his chief reference group; that is, they indicate the kind of world he lives in. Thus, we subsume them under the rubric of "inmate perspectives." This term is employed in a somewhat broader way by Street, Vinter & Perrow, *supra* note 10, at 195–200.

[18] Gordon, *Issues in Multiple Regression*, 73 Am. J. Sociology 592–94 (1968).

[19] *Id.* We do not wish to imply that *both* classes of variables and variables of classes cannot be (simultaneously) conceptually distinct and therefore pitted against one another as explanatory modes. What is absent in the present case is a theoretical rationale for a within-class distinction. For a more complete discussion of this problem—and its arbitrary solution—as it applies to our data, *see* Schwartz, *supra* note 11, at 338–41.

[20] In a separate analysis we found the multiple correlations between 19 pre-institutional factors and *Integration into Prison Primary Groups*, *Staff Orientation* and *Family Contact* to be .362, .345 and .457 respectively. No such figures are available for *Length of Confinement*.

[21] Partial correlation and regression data were computed by the BMD Stepwise Multiple Regression Program. *See* Dixon, *supra* note 13, at 233–57.

TABLE 1

CORRELATIONS[a] BETWEEN SITUATIONAL FACTORS AND INMATE PERSPECTIVES

Situational Factors	Inmate Perspectives					
	Criminal Value Orientation		Conformity to the Inmate Code		Peer Identification	
	Zero-Order	Partial[b]	Zero-Order	Partial[b]	Zero-Order	Partial[b]
Integration into Prison Primary Groups	.063	.037/	.035	.022/	.178*	.161*/
Staff Orientation	−.424*	−.379*/	−.442*	−.412*/	−.138*	−.114/
Family Contact	−.034	.061	−.037	.034	−.076	−.031
Length of Confinement	−.000	.024	−.152*	−.111/	−.009	−.047
Multiple Correlation	.456*	.405*	.485*	.448*	.272*	.241*

[a] Asterisk denotes significance at or beyond .10 level in this and in later tables.

[b] All pre-institutional factors held constant. Slashes (/) indicate significant regression coefficients whose direction is the same as corresponding correlation coefficients.

are simultaneously introduced. On the average, partial correlations are only a few points below the original ones. We may therefore reject the cultural drift theory when it is stated in its most radical form wherein situational or indigenous factors are permitted no influence independent of pre-institutional ones.

However, there exists no invariant pattern of situational influence. The impact of different situational factors varies according to the dependent variables upon which they act. Examining the partial correlations in Table 1, we see that the *Criminal Value Orientation* and the *Conformity to the Inmate Code* variables are similar in that they both correlate well and in about equal measure (−.379 and −.412, respectively) with an inmate's *Staff Orientation.* In contrast these same dependent variables are insignificantly related, in terms of zero-order or partial correlations, to *Integration into Prison Primary Groups* because of the supressor effect of *Staff Orientation.*[22] They appear as significant direct correlates when this effect is eliminated by multiple regression. Comparable associations with an inmate's *Family Contact* are insignificant. Our third dependent variable, *Peer Identification,* is unique in that it is somewhat more closely correlated with an inmate's *Integration into Prison Primary Groups* (.161) than with his *Staff Orientation* (−.114). It is also unrelated to his *Family Contact.* Finally, *Conformity to the Inmate Code* is the only variable that is related to *Length of Confinement.* The inverse partial correlation (−.111) is slightly suppressed by *Integration into Prison Primary Groups*[23] and so appears significant when this effect is removed by regression analysis.

Although a number of suppressed relationships have been identified, regression analysis does not alter the pattern that emerges by way of partial correlations: the effect on the *Criminal Value Orientation* and *Conformity to the Inmate Code* variables is significantly greater for an inmate's *Staff Orientation* than for his *Integration into Prison Primary Groups,* and equally great when *Peer Identification* is the dependent variable.[24] This pattern is inconsistent with the widely held belief that what happens to an inmate during his confinement depends exclusively upon the extent of his assimilation into inmate primary groups.[25] Our data are also inconsistent with the idea that length of confinement's influence on conformity is mediated by integration into inmate groups.[26] Theoreti-

[22] This effect is due to the fact that *Integration into Prison Primary Groups* and *Staff Orientation* are directly correlated (.232) but exercise opposite effects on inmate perspectives.

[23] This effect is due to the fact that *Integration into Prison Primary Groups* and *Length of Confinement* are directly correlated (.136) but exercise opposite effects on inmate perspectives.

[24] This result constitutes an affirmative response to Schein's question "whether 'authority influence' produces different results from 'peer influence' in terms of type and degree of influence accomplished." SCHEIN, *supra* note 4, at 280.

[25] For a detailed critique of this perspective, *see* Mathiessen, *The Sociology of Prisons: Problems for Future Research,* 17 BR. J. SOCIOLOGY 360–79 (1966).

[26] *See* Atchley & McCabe, *Socialization in Correctional Communities: A Replication,* 33 AM. SOCIOLOGICAL REV. 778–79 (1968).

cal and further empirical implications of the above data are discussed more fully elsewhere.[27]

The Joint Impact of Situational Factors

Having assessed the relative effects of particular situational variables, we now wish to consider the pattern of their joint influence. In so doing we shift the focus of our attention from the differential impact of independent variables taken singly to the differential sensitivity of dependent variables to these effects taken jointly. In the last row of Table 1 multiple and multiple-partial correlations are given. The latter were obtained by a procedure which first allowed the pre-institutional factors to account for all of the variance in the dependent variables that they could and then permitted the situational factors to operate. The proportion of variance explained by all situational factors working together is divided by the amount of variance left unexplained by the pre-institutional ones. This ratio represents the multiple-partial correlation.[28]

Analysis shows that the pre-institutional variables collectively account for 18.8, 16.8, and 21.0 percent of the variance in an inmate's *Criminal Value-Orientation*, his *Conformity to the Inmate Code* and his *Peer Identification*, respectively. Situational variables account for 13.3, 16.7 and 4.6 percent of the corresponding variance over and above that explained by pre-institutional ones. These figures give partial R's of .405, .448, and .241 for the *Criminal Value-Orientation*, *Conformity to the Inmate Code*, and *Peer Identification* variables, respectively. We might put this differently by saying that variance accounted for in *Value-Orientation* is increased by about 71 percent when the four situational variables are entered into the equation; the corresponding increase for *Conformity* is 100 percent; the increase for *Peer Identification*, however, is only 22 percent. All of these increments are, of course, significantly different from zero beyond the .10 level.

[27] *See, e.g.*, Schwartz, *supra* note 11, at 146–76.

[28] These coefficients, along with the multiple correlation coefficients, are slightly biased in the upward direction because of the ratio of variables to observations. However, this bias is constant across dependent variables and does not affect the propriety of our comparisons. The inflation of R was not corrected because the standard procedure for doing so does not take into account the stepwise entry of variables (according to their partial correlation with the criterion) and may therefore yield such absurd adjustments as an inverse $\bar{R}$.

Pre-institutional Determinants of Inmate Perspectives

By demonstrating that situational factors exert an independent influence on inmate perspectives we may only claim that the indigenous influence theory has been partially validated. Its complete verification would require that pre-institutional influences be unrelated to inmate perspectives or act upon them through situational variables. We may take up this possibility by examining Table 2, which contains zero-order correlations between 19 pre-institutional factors and inmate perspectives as well as correlations with these same independent variables partialled on our four situational factors.

Examining the data in Table 2, we find that over half of all the zero-order correlations are statistically significant. We therefore cannot assert that the inmate's past is in general unrelated to his present perspectives. However, the above covariation may be mediated by situational factors. If this were the case, their control would reduce pre-institutional effects to non-significance and the indigenous influence theory, in its most radical form, would be verified. From a less absolute standpoint, we may say that this theory gains in plausibility in proportion as zero-order correlations are reduced by the control of situational variation.

Table 2 shows that, of the 30 originally significant correlations, 21 or 70 percent remain significant after partialling. We may therefore reject the indigenous influence theory when this theory is stated in such a radical form as to exclude the influence of earlier, pre-institutional life on inmate perspectives. On the other hand, the theory is applicable to a certain range of variables, particularly those whose significant correlations were partialled out. (A separate analysis of the above data reveals that *Staff Orientation* is the most effective mediating variable in six of the nine cases where pre-institutional factors owed their statistical significance to covariation with situational factors. In the other three cases,[29] mediation was a joint effort of two situational factors: *Integration into Prison Primary Groups* and *Staff Orientation*.)

We must now ask which background characteristics are independently associated with which inmate perspectives.[30] Such information should

[29] Relationships between number of brothers and *Criminal Value Orientation*, and number of brothers, siblings and *Peer Identification*.

[30] We assume that 10 percent or 4.2 of the "signifi-

TABLE 2

CORRELATIONS[a] BETWEEN PRE-INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS AND INMATE PERSPECTIVES

Pre-Institutional Factors	Inmate Perspectives					
	Criminal Value Orientation		Conformity to the Inmate Code		Peer Identification	
	Zero-Order	Partial[b]	Zero-Order	Partial[b]	Zero-Order	Partial[b]
Race[c]	.302*	.223*	.124*	.026	.218*	.172*
Residence[d]	−.163*	−.098	−.084	.003	−.259*	−.227*
Migration[e]	−.170*	−.130*	−.191*	−.158*/	−.072	−.056
Age at commitment	−.002	−.044	.193*	.145*	−.263*	−.304*/
Family status[f]	−.074	−.080	−.012	−.006	−.031	−.019
Family relationships[g]	−.120*	−.059	−.049	.025	−.052	−.022
Number of siblings	.171*	.148*	.062	.029	.119*	.074
Number of brothers	.159*	.091	.088	.031	.175*	.116
Age rank[h]	.165*	.135*	.056	.018	.200*	.174*
IQ	−.249*	−.234*	.055	.117	−.279*	−.271*/
Achievement	−.146*	−.139*	.082	.122*	−.295*	−.280*
School grades	−.170*	−.142*	−.055	−.017	−.108	−.085
School status[i]	−.081	−.063	−.062	−.038	−.077	−.061
Truancies	.126*	.143*/	.009	.010	−.086	.068
Suspensions	.002	−.011	−.047	−.089	−.011	−.008
Number of arrests	.065	.044	.157*	.134*/	.144*	.124*
Number of arrests for violent offenses	.163*	.092	.181*	.084	.121*	.086
Age at first arrest	−.020	−.002	.104	.121*/	−.309*	−.296*
Prior commitments	.061	.040	.140*	.126*/	.153*	.120*
Multiple Correlation	.433*	.378*	.410*	.360*	.459*	.443*

[a] Coefficients for race, residence, migration, and school status are bi-serial. The bi-serial is a product moment correlation coefficient. Slashes (/) indicate significant regression coefficients whose direction is the same as corresponding correlation coefficients.

[b] All situational factors held constant.

[c] High score given to Negro.

[d] High score given to non-Philadelphia residents.

[e] High score given to those not born in county from which committed.

[f] Highest score given to those living with both natural parents before commitment.

[g] Highest score given to those with favorable relationships.

[h] Highest score given to most recently born among siblings.

[i] High score given to those enrolled in a non-disciplinary school before commitment.

help us construct theories about how the attributes which an individual imports into prison relate to and codetermine the development of his perspectives.

We believe that at least six of the eight significant correlates of the *Criminal Value-Orientation* scale may be taken as indicators of an admittedly loosely-defined "cultural deprivation" concept. Associations involving IQ, achievement, grades and truancy show that inmates who score high on the *Criminal Value-Orientation* scale perform poorly in the school, which plays an important role in the transmission of the dominant culture. Also, Negroes and youths with large and often poor families are generally those for whom school presents the most difficulty and also those who display relatively high scores on the *Criminal Value-Orientation* scale. It is important that non-significant correlations are in the direction which we would expect them to be if they are held to index the influence of "cultural deprivation." For example, Philadelphia residence, broken homes, poor family

cant" partial correlations in the table may actually be due to chance (because we have set a .10 criterion for rejection); consequently, their meaning must be found in the general pattern that they display.

relationships, and disciplinary school attendance which all correlate positively with *Criminal Value-Orientation* rankings are all aspects of the disadvantaged ghetto life-style where school and family fail as transmitters of conventional culture.

The significant correlation between age rank, stability of residence, and *Criminal Value-Orientation* scores may be integrated into the above picture if we follow Savitz in making the plausible assumption that length of residence in a deprived area aggravates its effects.[31] Later-born children may receive less parental supervision than their older siblings did (and so be especially exposed to the influence of such an area) because of the additional economic burden which they pose for their parents—a burden which can be normally carried only at the expense of their supervision. Although we have no data to support this speculation, it is consistent with other research.[32]

An inmate's *Conformity to the Inmate Code* ranking appears to be related to a rather different mixture of pre-institutional factors. These include migration, age at commitment, achievement, number of arrests, age at first arrest, and number of prior commitments. What is unique in this set of relationships appears when we compare them to those obtained for the *Criminal Value-Orientation* scale. Where that scale tends to be correlated with family and school variables and uncorrelated with prior criminality indicators, the *Conformity to the Inmate Code* measurement is relatively unaffected by school and family background and strongly related to delinquent history.

It can be seen in Table 2 that eight of the nine pre-institutional factors which significantly correlated with an inmate's *Peer Identification* are similarly related to an inmate's *Criminal Value-Orientation* or *Conformity to the Inmate Code. Peer Identification* is similar to *Value Orientation* because of its correlations with race, age rank, IQ, and achievement; it is similar to *Conformity to the Inmate Code* in that it correlates with number of arrests and prior commitments. *Peer Identification* is thus related to both cultural deprivation and delinquent history indicators.

Three other variables act on *Conformity to the Inmate Code* and *Peer Identification* in opposite ways. Achievement, for one, is directly correlated with the *Conformity to the Inmate Code* scale but inversely correlated with *Peer Identification*. More interestingly, age at commitment and age at first arrest are positively associated with the *Conformity to the Inmate Code* scale and negatively associated with *Peer Identification*. This means that prior delinquency influences both of these measures in different ways. High *Conformity* is related to advanced age and later embarcation on a delinquent career. High *Peer Identification*, on the other hand, is related to a relatively early age and an early commencement of delinquent activities.

The differential impact of the prior criminality variables is a particularly interesting aspect of the pattern in Table 2. It suggests that actual delinquency involves not so much a criminal value-orientation as a sense of kinship with peers and a desire to conform to their expectations. Of course we must be careful about this interpretation because it is based on retrospective correlations. It remains to be seen which of the three dependent variables best predict subsequent criminality. However, our findings tend to be consistent with Short's conclusion that delinquent conduct involves conformity and identification and is rarely an expression of criminal value orientations.[33] Hostility or cynicism toward the legal code thus appears among Glen Mills inmates to be an expression of a culturally alienated life-style, but not of the delinquent experiences that are associated with it.

A Comparison of the Joint Effects of Situational and Pre-institutional Factors

Earlier we found that *Conformity to the Inmate Code* was most highly correlated with situational contingencies and that *Peer Identification* was least so. An additional element in this pattern will now be explored as we move to the question of whether pre-institutional effects differ according to the perspective that they are called upon to explain. Such effects would complement the data on differential joint situational influence if they demonstrate an opposite pattern, that is, if personal history is most and least determinative of *Peer Identification* and *Conformity to the Inmate Code*, respectively. To test these effects it is necessary to shift from analysis of the diverse impact of independent variables taken singly to the differential

[31] Savitz, *Delinquency and Migration*, in The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency 339–41 (M. Wolfgang ed. 1962).

[32] *See, e.g.*, Glueck & Glueck, *Working Mothers and Delinquency*, in The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency 339–41 (M. Wolfgang ed. 1962).

[33] Short, *Behavior Dimensions of Gang Delinquency*, 28 Am. Sociological Rev. 426–27 (1963).

sensitivity of dependent variables to their joint effect.

The data in the last row of Table 2 were obtained by first permitting the four situational factors to account for all the variance in the dependent variables that they could; this amounted to 20.8, 23.5, and 7.4 percent of the variance in the *Criminal Value-Orientation*, *Conformity to the Inmate Code*, and *Peer Identification* scales respectively. The amount of corresponding variance accounted for by pre-institutional factors over and above that explained by situational factors is 11.3, 9.9, and 18.2 percent. In other words, pre-institutional variables add to the explanatory power of joint situational influence by 54 percent when *Criminal Value Orientation* is the dependent variable and by 42 percent when *Conformity to the Inmate Code* is the dependent variable. The corresponding increase for *Peer Identification*, however, is 246 percent. Table 2 thus shows that the multiple-partial correlation coefficients are .378 for *Criminal Value-Orientation*, .360 for *Conformity to the Inmate Code* and .443 for *Peer Identification*. Comparable correlations with situational factors as independent variables are .405, .448, and .241 respectively (*See* Table 1).

We now have two points of comparison. First, it may be recalled that when pre-institutional factors were controlled the percentage increase in variance accounted for by joint situational effects was greatest for *Conformity to the Inmate Code* (100 percent), intermediate for *Criminal Value-Orientation* (71 percent) and least for *Peer Identification* (22 percent). When situational influence is controlled, however, the percentage increases due to joint pre-institutional effects is greatest for the *Peer Identification* scale (246 percent) and least for the *Conformity to the Inmate Code* measure (42 percent). This means that whatever variance is accounted for in the *Peer Identification* scale is explained mainly by pre-institutional factors whereas most of the explained variance in the *Criminal Value-Orientation* and *Conformity to the Inmate Code* is associated with situational factors. From the standpoint of the two competing sets of independent variables, this means that the joint situational effects (as measured by partial R) are 7.2 percent higher than comparable pre-institutional effects for the *Criminal Value-Orientation* scale and 24.4 percent higher for the *Conformity to the Inmate Code* scale. With respect to *Peer Identification*, however, the joint situational influence is 45.5 percent lower than the joint pre-institutional effect.

Secondly, we may compare the degree to which joint pre-institutional effects on the three dependent variables above are mediated by situational factors. Comparing multiple and partial R's in Table 2 we observe that control of all situational variation reduces total pre-institutional influence by 13 and 12 percent in the *Criminal Value-Orientation* and *Conformity to the Inmate Code* scales respectively, and by less than four percent for *Peer Identification*. Comparable reductions in multiple-partial situational effects for these three variables were 11, 8, and 11 percent respectively. These data show that not only is most of the explained variation for *Peer Identification* associated with pre-institutional factors (whose influence is greatest when the *Peer Identification* scale is the dependent variable) but also that less of the pre-institutional effect is mediated by situational variation when *Peer Identification* is the dependent variable than when *Criminal Value-Orientation* or *Conformity to the Inmate Code* is the dependent variable. On the other hand, when pre-institutional variation is controlled less of the joint situational effect is lost on the *Conformity to the Inmate Code* scale than on the *Peer Identification* scale.

Conclusion

Taken together, our data suggest that the cultural drift theory is most applicable to an inmate's *Peer Identification* and least appropriate for his *Criminal Value-Orientation* and *Conformity to the Inmate Code*. Conversely, the indigenous influence theory is most valid in respect of an inmate's *Conformity to the Inmate Code* and least valid with respect to his *Peer Identification*.[34] To explain why these inmate perspectives reflect a differential sensitivity to pre-institutional and situational variation, we shall begin with the *Conformity to the Inmate Code* scale.

Conformity to the inmate code may be more sensitive to situational contingencies than are value-orientation and self-conception because the latter transcend the situations to which the code refers and by which it is limited. Inmate perspectives which are most visible to others are probably most likely to be affected by group expectations.

[34] Although this conclusion is based on statistically insignificant differences the pattern which these differences form is, as we have seen, a rather consistent one. It is the detection of just such patterns that best protects us against Type II errors.

Although groups cannot easily monitor members' value-orientations and sense of identification, their conformity to norms against squealing, against refusal to render assistance to peers and the like is quite visible and therefore subject to control. The inmate's value-orientation and self-conception are more likely to be his own rather than the group's business and are therefore less affected by his relations with the group.[35] This reasoning might help explain why *Conformity to the Inmate Code* alone correlates with length of confinement. Because an inmate's *Conformity to the Inmate Code* is easily observable, he will be increasingly less likely to engage in action that will delay his release the greater the possibility of release becomes.[36]

But how are we to explain the exceptional resistance of *Peer Identification* to situational influences? This resistance seems plausible when it is considered against the relatively high sensitivity of the *Conformity to the Inmate Code* scale. Yet the greater sensitivity of *Criminal Value-Orientation* to situational influences must also be accounted for. If we suppose that *Peer Identification* is conditioned by the fact that each resident of Glen Mills shares an identical status and that this status is conducive to mutual identification, the length of an inmate's confinement and his relation to his peers and the staff does not alter the objective fact that he is, after all, a prisoner. In contrast, value-orientations are independent of status; they are held in varying degree by each of the inmate's reference groups and are therefore more affected by his relations with them than is identification with members of his own status group. Consequently, we should expect *Peer Identification* to be most strongly influenced by the very factors which determine commitment itself—for commitment is presupposed by inmate status. Clearly, such factors must be pre-institutional ones and, as we have seen, they are more determinative of *Peer Identification* than of the other dependent variables.

From the reference points of social structure and personal history, the findings show that our image of the prison depends upon the dependent variables that we address. By devoting itself to behavior which is more dependent on and highly variable according to situational contingencies, the sociology of the prison exaggerates the effects of social relationships within the penal institution. In neglecting behavior that is deeply rooted in the inmate's past, and therefore more correlated with pre-institutional factors, current theory underestimates the role of extra-prison experiences in shaping current prison life.

The above findings and considerations, it seems to us, set Goffman's general approach to the total institution[37] in broader perspective. Within this framework social organization is studied from the standpoint of the actor. Unfortunately, the model does not recognize the multiple standpoints which the actor provides. For Goffman, the self stands always at the center of analysis. The total institution is in turn viewed always in terms of what it does to identity. Our results, however, do not justify this perspective, for they show that identity is both *less* influenced by experiences within the institution and *more* influenced by the inmate's past than are other modes of consciousness and action. Therefore, while experiences in Glen Mills do have an impact on identity, we need to specify that what they do to the self is little compared to what they do to value and norm-orientation. Identity, as far as we can infer from our results, is not so fragile a thing as Goffman implies.

The above results may be cast into Becker and Geer's terms if we assume that each perspective considered has a manifest and latent[38] component, the former dominating in conformity; the latter, in identification. From this viewpoint, conformity to peer expectations would be typed as a response to situational or manifest cultural influences, and inmate peer identification would be classed as a response to past or latent culture. Thus stated, our findings directly support Giallombardo's claim that "... greater understanding of prison communities may be accomplished by focusing our attention on the relationship of the external and internal cultures rather than trying to understand the prison as an institution isolated from the larger society."[39] The data take us beyond Giallombardo, however, by showing that the relative influence of external and internal cultures may not only be ascertained

[35] Theoretical support for this explanation may be found in E. SCHEIN, COERCIVE PERSUASION 261 (1961); D. CARTWRIGHT & A. ZANDER, GROUP DYNAMICS 175 (1960); Garrity, *The Prison as a Rehabilitating Agency*, in THE PRISON 374 (D. Cressey ed. 1961).

[36] This principle might be inversely applicable to institutions which do not employ point systems to determine release. In this respect see Galtung, *Prison: The Organization of Dilemma*, in THE PRISON 112–22 (D. Cressey ed. 1961).

[37] E. GOFFMAN, ASYLUMS 12–48 (1961).

[38] Becker & Geer, *supra* note 7, at 304–13.

[39] Giallombardo, *Social Roles in a Prison for Women*, 13 SOCIAL PROBLEMS 280 (1966).

but also specified according to the dependent variable. We have also seen that inmate perspectives are differentially sensitive to the separate as well as the joint effects of pre-institutional and situational variables. Whereas *Criminal Value Orientation* is particularly sensitive to indices of cultural deprivation and *Conformity to the Inmate Code* is sensitive to measures of prior criminality, *Peer Identification* is responsive to both. In respect of situational influences, *Staff Orientation* exceeds *Integration into Prison Primary Groups* in its influence on *Criminal Value-Orientation* and *Conformity to the Inmate Code* but is about equivalent to *Integration into Prison Primary Groups* when *Peer Identification* is the dependent variable. *Length of Confinement*, on the other hand, exerts an influence on *Conformity to the Inmate Code* alone. Thus, each dependent variable seems to be determined by a unique pre-institutional and situational "mix."

On a more general level we have shown that, in Glen Mills at least, the cultural drift and indigenous influence theories are wrong when each is stated in a form which denies the other. It seems to us that the invalidity of the latter theory is of particular theoretical relevance. Because the inmate's perspectives cannot be fully explained without reference to his past we must reject those theories which divorce him from it. Much current theorizing about the prison does exactly this. It is of course natural that the sociologist concerned with prison life should preoccupy himself with prison stratification, communication, accommodation systems, and the like. However, to demonstrate their influence on the individual prisoner's behavior is one thing; to explain his behavior involves another focus. Although extra-prison influences have not been of interest to the sociologist (except, from time to time, as conditions under which the impact of indigenous effects vary)[40] it cannot be said that they do not help explain inmate behavior or that they are irrelevant to an understanding of the prison itself. The influence of pre-institutional effects on behavior may be taken as one measure of the prison's failure to level individual differences by erasing the influence of the inmate's past which, according to Berger and Luckmann,[41] is the principal goal of total institutionalization.

Because pre-institutional effects do not simply cease to operate or leave off where situational ones begin, as Clemmer suggests, but rather continue to influence perspectives along with them, the prison may be best conceived as a structure whose members stand at once inside and outside of it. That which is imported from without does not simply lie passively beside what is confronted within. Those characteristics of the inmate which are influenced by his prison surroundings are also affected by what he brings into them. Our results therefore point to a need for convergence between the genetic framework, which draws upon the past for explanations of present behavior, and the functional point of view, which refers such behavior to the system in which it is embedded.

[40] *See, e.g.*, D. Garrity, The Effects of Length of Incarceration upon Parole Adjustment and Estimation of Optimum Sentence: Washington State Correctional Institutions, 1956 (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington); H. Cline, The Determinants of Normative Patterns in Correctional Institutions 189, 1966 (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University).

[41] P. Berger & T. Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality 159–63 (1966).